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The Mayor and Councillors

WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

A meeting of the WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL will be held in the COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA on TUESDAY 29 MAY, WEDNESDAY 30 MAY and THURSDAY 31 MAY 2018, commencing at 9.00am, for the purposes of deliberating the Draft Long Term Plan 2018-2028.

Sarah Nichols
GOVERNANCE MANAGER

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

In addition to this agenda, members i-Pads will have the following information for the meeting:

- Draft Long Term Plan 2018-2028
- Copy of all submissions received

Summary of submissions by topic and officers comments will be provided to members in hard copy form.

BUSINESS

1. APOLOGIES

2. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

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

3. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

3.1 Minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on Tuesday 8 May and Wednesday 9 May 2018 to hear submissions to the Draft Long Term Plan 2018-2028

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Confirms as a true and correct record the minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on Tuesday 8 May and Wednesday 9 May 2018.
4. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

5. REPORTS

5.1 Draft Long Term Plan 2018-28 Special Consultative Procedure – Maria Edgar (Corporate Planner)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report LTC-03-13-04/TRIM Number 180517054560

(b) Receives all 850 submissions and associated submission points raised by submitters, which are included in the ‘Deliberations Pack’ previously distributed to Councillors.

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

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180430046651

(b) Notes the submissions to the Draft LTP on the multi-use indoor court facility

(c) Notes the letter of offer from DM and AD Smith Investments Ltd for an alternative proposal at Flaxton Road.

(d) Declines the proposal from DM and AD Smith Investments Ltd because the long-term cost of leasing will be greater than through Council ownership by around $12.575 million.

(e) Approves the Master Plan for the layout of the Council owned land at Coldstream Road. (Trim 170816088145).

(f) Agrees to proceed with the development of the Multi Use Sports Facility at Coldstream Road for a total project cost of $27.85 million with the construction of the facility being completed around September 2020.

(g) Requests staff to submit a report on procurement of professional services for the detailed design of the facility to the July Council meeting.

(h) Notes that the rate effect of the facility is an increase of $91.00 per property per annum.

(i) Circulates the resolution and the report to the Community Boards.
5.3 Multi-Use Sports Facility Operating Agreement – Craig Sargison (Manager Community and Recreation)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180516053790

(b) Approves that the Multi Use Sports Facility will be operated by the North Canterbury Sport and Recreation Trust.

(c) Notes the key terms of the proposed agreement with the Trust.

(d) Approves staff negotiating a formal agreement for the operation of the Multi Use Sports Facility at Coldstream Road with the Trust for the consideration of Council.

(e) Notes that the agreement will be prepared for Council’s consideration prior to the Council awarding a contract for the construction of the Multi Use Sports Facility.

5.4 Community Facilities Provision – Craig Sargison (Manager Community and Recreation)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180514052564

(b) Notes the feedback received from submissions

(c) Confirms the following financial provision and timing in the LTP as follows (note these are unchanged from the provisions in the Draft LTP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LTP YEAR</th>
<th>PROVISION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>INVESTIGATION INTO LOCATION OF A LIBRARY RAVENSWOOD/PEGASUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>FURTHER PLANNING FOR LIBRARY EXTENSION AT RANGIORA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>DETAILED DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION COMMENCEMENT OF RANGIORA LIBRARY EXTENSION Car-parking development for land approved for community groups buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>COMPLETION OF RANGIORA LIBRARY EXTENSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>LANDSCAPING/CAR-PARKING ON LAND APPROVED FOR COMMUNITY GROUP’S BUILDINGS. New Library at Ravenswood/Pegasus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(d) Notes that staff will be further investigating the provision of a library/community facility at North Woodend/Pegasus during 2018/19 financial year.
(e) **Notes** that a separate report on the provision of land for community owned buildings in the Regeneration Area will be progressed once the Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan is finalised.

5.5 **Community Facilities Fees and Charges** – Craig Sargison (Manager Community and Recreation)

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council

(a) **Receives** report No. 180514052641

(b) **Notes** the submissions received on community facilities fees and charges.

(c) **Confirms** that the applicable charge for ground rental at the Rangiora Airfield is $4.00m² applicable to lease renewals occurring from 1 July 2018.

(d) **Notes** that staff are reviewing the basis of charging at the airfield with the intent of reducing the operating subsidy to the airfield and will present a report to Council prior to the adoption of the 2019/20 Annual Plan.

(e) **Approves** the Woodend Combined Friendship Club continuing to utilise the Woodend Community Centre for its monthly afternoon meetings on the basis of having the two meeting rooms available but only being invoiced for one room.

(f) **Approves** Staff concluding an agreement with Agape Dance Academy for the use of Pearson Park Pavilion and Oxford Town Hall as detailed in 4.3 of the report.

(g) **Approves** the following definition of user types for charging:

Where the event or meeting is run by an association managed by a committee and all profits after reasonable operating expenses are returned to the community in some verifiable manner. Profits may also be held by the group and applied to the upgrading of equipment for use in future events or improving services to the members of the group and/or the community at large.

This category would also include an event or meeting where there is a passive or active recreational value to the community and activities where meetings or events are organised on a regular, scheduled basis but attended by members of the public on a casual basis and where a nominal fee is charged to cover the cost of the venue and reasonable operating costs. This would include events such as fitness or aerobic type classes, music and dance groups, gardening groups and other activities designed to provide recreation on a not for profit basis. Organisers of subscription based, or classes with a rate per term or per month will be charged the applicable tutor rate unless the use is covered by a separate Council approved agreement.
(h) **Approves** the following table of fees and charges for community facilities with effect from 1 July 2018 applying to all users unless otherwise agreed by the Community and Recreation Committee:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pavilion</th>
<th>Commercial per hour (incl gst)</th>
<th>Tutor Rate per hour (incl gst)</th>
<th>All other users per hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cust Domain</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohoka Domain</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sefton Domain</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View Hill</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pavilion</th>
<th>Commercial users (incl gst)</th>
<th>Other users (incl gst)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Column 1</td>
<td>Proposed 2018/19</td>
<td>2019/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Hall</td>
<td>$28.75/hour</td>
<td>$15/hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Room A or B</td>
<td>$28.75/hour</td>
<td>$15/hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Meeting Rooms A &amp; B</td>
<td>$57.50/hour</td>
<td>$40/hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entire Complex</td>
<td>$414 per day</td>
<td>$200 per day</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pavilion</th>
<th>Commerci al per hour (incl gst)</th>
<th>Tutor Rate per hour (incl gst)</th>
<th>All other users per hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* oom One</td>
<td>$28.75</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* oom Two</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other venues: (excl those above, Rangiora Town Hall, Oxford Town Hall)</td>
<td>$28.75</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td>$20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pavilion</th>
<th>Commercial users (incl gst)</th>
<th>Other users (incl gst)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Town Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A &amp; P Room</td>
<td>$57.50/hour</td>
<td>$15/hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Hall</td>
<td>$57.50/hour</td>
<td>$25.00/hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entire venue – per hour</td>
<td>$86.25/hour</td>
<td>$40/hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entire venue – day rate (six hour or more)</td>
<td>$517.50</td>
<td>$240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wedding rate (incl 3 hrs set up, full day hire and 2 hrs)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>cleaning)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Auditorium projection equipment (incl technician)</strong></td>
<td>$57.50/hour</td>
<td>$50.00/hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OB&amp;I League for movies (x3 hrs, incl WDC owned projection equipment, wi-fi and electricity)</strong></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rangiora Town Hall</th>
<th><strong>Commercial users (incl gst)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Other users (incl gst)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Auditorium – Performance Day</td>
<td>$1,035.00</td>
<td>$373.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Auditorium – Pack In/Out, Rehearsal (maximum 14 days)</td>
<td>$230.00</td>
<td>$143.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Auditorium – Pack In/Out, Rehearsal (additional days)</td>
<td>$287.50</td>
<td>$172.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Theatre – per hour (minimum 2hrs)</td>
<td>$115.00/hour</td>
<td>$57.50/hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Theatre – day rate</td>
<td>$690</td>
<td>$345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Theatre – Projection Equipment (incl Tech)</td>
<td>$57.50/hour</td>
<td>$57.50/hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function Room</td>
<td>$57.50/hour</td>
<td>$345.00/day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studio Room</td>
<td>$23.00/hour</td>
<td>$23.00/hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Room</td>
<td>$23.00/hour</td>
<td>$23.00/hour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(i) Circulates this report to the Boards.

5.6 **Regeneration Work Programme – Craig Sargison (Manager Community and Recreation)**

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council

(a) Receives report No. 180518054707

(b) Notes the submissions that have been received.

(c) Approves the deferral of the provision of $1.4million for the development of the Memorial Garden to an outer year of the LTP (beyond Year 10).
Approves the balance of the Regeneration Budget as per the Draft LTP and the re-spread of the funding for the implementation of Recreation and Ecological linkages to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$520,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes that this re-spread does not affect the overall budget provision for Regeneration.

5.7 Oxford Surveillance Cameras – Craig Sargison (Manager Community and Recreation)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council

(a) Receives report No. 180517054436

(b) Notes the report from Visual Networks on Oxford Street Surveillance Cameras.

(c) Approves an additional $31,000 in the Greenspace Budget for the installation of additional surveillance cameras and infrastructure in Oxford during 2018/19.

(d) Circulates this report to the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board.

5.8 Kaiapoi Town Centre Activation – Simon Markham (Manager Strategy and Engagement) and Simon Hart (Business and Centres Manager)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180516053730.

(b) Allocates $150,000 over 2018/19 and 2019/20 to fund investigations into a sustainable mechanism for managing the divestment and development of the Kaiapoi Town Centre (KTC) mixed use business areas (MUBA) into the long term.

(c) Notes that cost incurred in such investigations leading to an ongoing mechanism to manage the Council’s interest in the MUBA land would be a cost against which future revenues from divestment could be applied.

(d) Notes that the extent and future timing of take up of this funding beyond the initial report costed at up to $50,000 would be determined by Council decision-making on that report.

(e) Notes that the potential for the Government’s Provincial Growth Fund among other funding sources to contribute to the costs of these investigations and any follow-on actions will be considered as part of the initial investigation.
Notes the potential for the learning out of this investigation to be applied to the challenges faced in ensuring long term activation of the Rangiora Town Centre, as key sites there undergo comprehensive redevelopment.

5.9 Community Board Submission for a Waimakariri Youth Development Grant – The Community Board Chairs – presented by Edwina Cordwell (Governance Advisor)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180423043863.

(b) Approves the introduction of an annual Waimakariri Youth Development of $4,000 to operate as described in attachment I. Draft Youth Development Grant Criteria and Allocation Process (Trim 180410038656).

(c) Confirms the establishment of a Youth Development Grant Committee comprising the Community Board Chairs and a representative of the Youth Council to administer the Grant Fund and that the Youth Council now be invited to make such an appointment.

(d) Requests the Governance Manager to make all necessary arrangements to introduce the Waimakariri Youth Development Grant for the 2018/2019 financial year.

5.10 Public Submissions to Long Term Plan: General – Kitty Waghorn (Solid Waste Asset Manager)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180515053040.

(b) Notes that there was no significant demand during LTP consultation from rural residents wanting Council to extend kerbside collection services into rural areas.

(c) Endorses staff continuing to work with rural residents and communities as requests arise to determine if the Council could provide appropriate and cost effective kerbside collection services to, or recycling facilities closer to, those communities.

(d) Notes that the draft Waste Management & Minimisation Plan includes an Action to continue funding for Enviroschools.

(e) Notes that the Solid Waste Budget allocates $25,000 per annum to fund Enviroschools over the next ten years.

(f) Notes that any expansion of the Enviroschools Programme would require an increase in funding above current levels.
(g) **Notes** that the Southbrook resource recovery park is an unsuitable location for composting operations for a number of reasons, including:

   i) Proximity to several composting operations results in competition for the feedstock and end markets

   ii) The limited space available for compost maturation

   iii) The sensitivity of the receiving environment to leachate and odour in particular

   iv) Proximity to businesses that sell compost both in bulk and in bags

(h) **Notes** that once the reuse and recycling areas have been expanded there may be an opportunity to sell compost produced from our residents green waste, but that the implications of this with regard to Council competing with local businesses would first have to be considered by the Council.

(i) **Requests** that staff develop a campaign around correct disposal of recyclable and reusable materials and the responsible disposal of rubbish, which can be run in local media and social media.

5.11 **Public Submissions to Long Term Plan: Kerbside Collection Services - Kitty Waghorn (Solid Waste Asset Manager)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180515053012.

(b) **Approves** inclusion of the "your choice" kerbside collection service in the 2018-28 Long Term Plan.

(c) **Notes** that 284 (76.5%) of the 371 submissions received are in favour of the "your choice" kerbside collection service.

(d) **Notes** that the Solid Waste Activity Management Plan and the Waste Management & Minimisation Plan will be amended to include the "your choice" collection service: fortnightly rubbish bag or bin collection and/or weekly organics bin collection.

(e) **Notes** that the final version of the Waste Management & Minimisation Plan will be presented to Council for adoption in July 2018.

(f) **Approves** increasing the level of education and community engagement around waste minimisation.

(g) **Endorses** the provision of support to and promotion of local waste minimisation initiatives that are led by businesses and community groups.

(h) **Notes** that there is sufficient budget in the Waste Minimisation account to fund an increase in community engagement and provide support to and promotion of local waste minimisation initiatives that are led by businesses and community groups.
(i) **Requests** staff to investigate requiring better waste and litter management by developers and building companies through consenting processes in order to reduce the impact of earthworks and windblown construction materials on the surrounding environment.

(j) **Notes** that there was no significant demand from rural residents wanting Council to extend kerbside collection services into rural areas during the LTP consultation.

(k) **Endorses** staff continuing to work with rural residents and communities as requests arise to determine if the Council could provide appropriate and cost effective kerbside collection services to, or recycling facilities closer to, those communities.

5.12 **Solid Waste - Utilities and Roading Staff Submission to the 2018-2028 Long Term Plan– Kitty Waghorn (Solid Waste Asset Manager)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180509051042.

(b) **Approves** that the kerbside collection targeted rates be increased as follows in the 18/19 year:

   i) Recycling and Refuse Area: $103.00 including GST

   ii) Recycling-only Area: $93.00 including GST

(c) **Notes** that this is a $17.00 increase on the targeted kerbside collection rate

(d) **Approves** reducing the transfer from the Collection Account to the Disposal Account by $40,000: from $380,000 to $340,000

(e) **Approves** increasing the general rate funding to the Disposal Account by $151,498 in the 19/20 year which will increase the General Rate from $732,000 to $883,498

(f) **Notes** that the increase in the General Rate will fund the cost of processing recycled materials delivered directly to the transfer stations by members of the public

(g) **Approves** charging commercial collection companies the $65.00/tonne excluding GST ($74.75/tonne including GST) processing charge for their recyclable materials

(h) **Notes** that staff will bring a report to the Council to request approval to adjust the recyclables charge in the event that EcoCentral Ltd advises a change in the processing charge

(i) **Approves** the following capital works carry-over:

   i) Southbrook Recycling Compactor Shed: Carry over $226,300 to 18/19.

(j) **Approves** removing the following capital works from the 17/18 budget and including these capital works in the 19/20 budget:

   i) RPZ installation (backflow protection) Oxford: $43,900
ii) RPZ installation (backflow protection) Southbrook: $50,000

(k) Approves removing the $1,488,000 budget for Land Purchase for Future Upgrades from the 17/18 budget and including the following capital works in the LTP budget:

i) In 19/20: $400,000 Land Purchase for Screening

ii) In 22/23: $1,385,000 Land Purchase for Future Upgrades

5.13 Earthquake Recovery - Utilities and Roading Staff Submission to the 2018-2028 Long Term Plan – Gary Boot (Senior Engineering Advisor), Kalley Simpson (3 Waters Manager) and Joanne McBride (Development Manager)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No 180518054681.

(b) Approves bringing the Earthquake Recovery budget for Jones Street road and drainage works forward from 2019/20 to 2018/19, as outlined in tables 1, 1A, 2, and 2A of this report.

(c) Approves an increase to the Drainage component of the Earthquake Recovery budget of $181,000, as outlined in tables 2, and 2A of this report, to cover additional risks associated with potentially contaminated land and high groundwater table in the area of the SMAs.

(d) Notes that the Wastewater component of the Earthquake Recovery budget is on track to be underspent by in excess of $400,000 at the end of the 2017/18 year, with all projects being complete, which will more than offset the $181,000 increase in the Drainage budget.

5.14 Funding and Budget Options Kaiapoi River Dredging Proposals – Janet Fraser (Utilities Planner) and Duncan Roxborough (Implementation Project Manager – District Regeneration)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180514052211.

(b) Notes an existing budget of $250,000 is available for the marina basin dredging to enable berthing at the proposed new floating pontoons.

(c) Notes a budget of $50,000 has been allocated by the Waimakariri District Council in 2018/19 as part of the river rehabilitation programme, intended to be used to contribute to the costs of dredging of the navigation channel.

(d) Notes a total estimated budget of $500,000 is likely to be required to undertake the combined marina basin and navigation channel dredging projects, based on a 50% cost share from each project.
(e) **Approves** staff approaching Environment Canterbury to request a 50% share ($125,000) of the navigation channel dredging project costs ($250,000).

(f) **Approves** an additional budget of $200,000 to fund the navigation channel budget shortfall of $200,000 from a district wide rate, which covers the immediate need and includes underwriting the suggested Environment Canterbury cost share until repaid by ECan.

(g) **Notes** details of the current and proposed funding are included in tables in Section 6.

(h) **Notes** the proposed $500,000 combined budget may need to be revised following completion of the procurement process with the selected contractor.

(i) **Circulates** this report to all the Community Boards, and the Regeneration Steering Group.

5.15 **Staff Submission re Possible Government Policy Statement and other Funding Changes – Bill Rice (Senior Transport Engineer)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180426044997.

(b) **Makes no changes** to the draft LTP as a result of the GPS.

(c) **Notes** that a second GPS is expected to be released in 2019.

(d) **Notes** that the uncertainty regarding government funding of transport projects may require variations to the LTP in future years.

5.16 **New Arterial Road – Noise Concerns – Gerard Cleary (Manager Utilities and Roading) and Joanne McBride (Development Manager)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180511051676;

(b) **Approves** resurfacing of the northern half of the New Arterial Road from the Kaiapoi River bridge north along Butchers Road to the 60/80km speed limit change at the northern end of the development with an asphalt surface at a cost for $250,000, and;

(c) **Approves** the reallocation of $250,000 from the Waikuku to Pegasus Connection budget of $605,000 to allow for the funding of the asphalt surfacing.

(d) **Approves** the resurfacing of the southern half of the New Arterial Road (from west of Island Rd to the Kaiapoi River bridge) with an asphalt surface in the next 3 to 5 years, with staff to submit a request for funding in the 2021-24 NZTA funding bid and 2021-31 LTP.
(e) **Notes** that if Council does reallocate budget from the Waikuku to Pegasus Connection budget that it is not subsidised by NZTA.

(f) **Notes** that this is unlikely to qualify for NZTA subsidy because it does not yet meet NZTA Guidelines or Council Policy requirements, and the final NZTA ‘bid’ for the 2018-21 period has already been submitted and assessed.

(g) **Notes** that if Council decides to resurface Butchers Road adjacent the existing houses it will come under pressure to seal the remainder of the New Arterial Road in the 60km/h area when the new houses are built and occupied.

5.17 **Request to Increase Vehicle Entrance Application Fees – Maree Harris (Customer Services Manager)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180518054893.

(b) **Approves** an increase to the fees for vehicle crossing applications to take effect from 1 July 2018 as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Crossing electronic application</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Crossing paper application form</td>
<td>$160.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Crossing re-inspection fee</td>
<td>$80.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fees include GST

5.18 **Staff Submission to recommend changes to the Roading Capital Works Budget in the 2018-2028 Long Term Plan – Yvonne Warraar (Asset Planning Engineer Roading) and Joanne McBride (Roading and Transport Manager)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180510051603.

(b) **Approves** the budget changes as shown in the Table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>LTP changes</th>
<th>18/19 $</th>
<th>19/20 $</th>
<th>20/21 $</th>
<th>21/22 $</th>
<th>22/23 $</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Kaiapoi Mill Rd / Skewbridge Rd</td>
<td>Draft LTP</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>2,044,000</td>
<td>2,611,250</td>
<td>533,750</td>
<td>546,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft LTP</td>
<td>Proposed Changes</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>2,299,500</td>
<td>2,611,250</td>
<td>533,750</td>
<td>546,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbrook Outline Development Plan (Flaxton Rd Improvements)</td>
<td>Draft LTP</td>
<td>830,417</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft LTP</td>
<td>Proposed Changes</td>
<td>415,209</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main North Road improvements including Belfast to Kaiapoi cycleway</td>
<td>Draft LTP</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>766,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft LTP</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>919,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>52,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Changes</td>
<td>Draft LTP</td>
<td>Proposed Changes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend Improvements in conjunction with NZTA PBC and Woodend Bypass</td>
<td></td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>255,500</td>
<td>130,563</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Changes</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>255,500</td>
<td>208,900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Woodend Road Improvements including Boys Road</td>
<td></td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>306,600</td>
<td>156,675</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Changes</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>153,300</td>
<td>261,125</td>
<td>160,125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Rangiora Outline Development Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>456,592</td>
<td>228,296</td>
<td>228,296</td>
<td>228,296</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Changes</td>
<td>280,000</td>
<td>233,319</td>
<td>238,455</td>
<td>243,706</td>
<td>442,178</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silverstream Collector Rd (Adderley-Island)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,901,868</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Changes</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>921,709</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbrook Road Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>255,500</td>
<td>130,563</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Changes</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>51,100</td>
<td>78,338</td>
<td>266,875</td>
<td>109,210</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Purchase - Designations for growth</td>
<td></td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>106,750</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Changes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>104,450</td>
<td>109,210</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Purchase – Improved LoS</td>
<td></td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>106,750</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Changes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>104,450</td>
<td>109,210</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(c) **Notes** that budget may need to be brought forward if work progresses according to the original program.

5.19 **Drainage - Utilities and Roading Staff Submission to the 2018-28 Long Term Plan – Owen Davies (Drainage Asset Manager)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180514052798.

(b) **Approves** a new capital works budget of $80,000 in 18/19 for drainage improvements at West Station Road (Main Street), Oxford under the Oxford urban drainage account.

(c) **Notes** that this has an increase on the Oxford Urban Drainage rate of $6.5% or $7.63 per property.

(d) **Notes** that the following works, referred to in the draft LTP Drainage Commentary (Trim No 171124127869) are programmed to be undertaken in Oxford in 17/18 and 18/19 using existing approved drainage budgets.

- Matai Place Soakpit - 17/18 minor improvement works.
- Kowhai Ave Overland Flow - 18/19 minor improvement works.
Notes that flooding in Burnett Street will be investigated to determine the cause and extent of the problem. Drainage staff will request further budget from Council if required.

Notes that improvements at Siena Place and Sillano Place, Mandeville, will be carried out in 18/19 under the existing Flood Response drainage account.

Notes that improvements at Siena Place and Sillano Place, Mandeville will have no financial impact on the Ohoka Rural Drainage budgets.

Notes that remaining portion of the improvements at Siena Place and Sillano Place, will be funded from existing approved Roading budgets.

Approves additional annual budget of $96,000 from 18/19 to cover Project Management fees in the Drainage Maintenance Contract.

Notes that additional annual budget of $96,000 from 18/19 to cover Project Management fees in the Drainage Maintenance Contract will increase drainage rates within the rural drainage schemes, by $5.00 per property.

Approves new budgets on the Ohoka Rural drainage scheme of $15,500 p.a., Central Rural drainage scheme of $7,500 p.a., Coastal Rural drainage scheme of $8,500 p.a. and Clarkville Rural drainage scheme of $3,500 p.a. to build up a Maintenance Works Reserve Fund over 10 years. Notes that this has an increase per property on the Ohoka, Central, Coastal, and Clarkville Rural drainage schemes rates as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>18/19</th>
<th>19/20</th>
<th>20/21</th>
<th>21/22</th>
<th>22/23</th>
<th>23/24</th>
<th>24/25</th>
<th>25/26</th>
<th>26/27</th>
<th>27/28</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clarkville</td>
<td>19.06</td>
<td>18.38</td>
<td>17.31</td>
<td>16.22</td>
<td>15.13</td>
<td>14.19</td>
<td>13.28</td>
<td>12.49</td>
<td>11.64</td>
<td>10.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Rural</td>
<td>8.64</td>
<td>8.28</td>
<td>7.83</td>
<td>7.37</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.48</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approves a new budget of $100,000 in 19/20 and $100,000 in 20/21 of the LTP under the District Drainage account (previously referred to as the Flood Response account) for Zone Implementation Plan Addendum minor capital works.

Notes that this has no overall impact on rates as existing Flood Response projects have been deferred as per recommendation (p).

Approves a new capital works renewal budget of $100,000 in 18/19, for drainage upgrades as part of the Flaxton Road Urbanisation.

Notes that this has an increase on the Rangiora Urban Drainage rate of $0.5% or $1.27 per property.

Approves an additional drainage maintenance budget of $190,000 in 19/20 for Pond C remedial works.

Notes that this has an increase on the Rangiora Urban Drainage rate of $0.9% or $2.37 per property.

Notes this budget estimate is based on the sediment being uncontaminated and able to be taken to a local landfill site. If tests
show that the sediment is contaminated the budget may need to be increased to allow for disposal at Kate Valley. This will cost considerably more money. Staff may need to request more budget from the Council if the sediment is found to be contaminated.

(s) **Approves** deferring the following drainage capital works budgets.

(t) **Notes** that a number of capital works and developer lead projects are being moved out to allow full project plans and investigations to be completed. Staff can manage this by reprioritising existing projects to better align with resource availability and Council long term infrastructure requirements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project ID</th>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Changes</th>
<th>New Budget Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>URD0012</td>
<td>Rangiora Urban</td>
<td>North Drain Ashgrove Park</td>
<td>Budget deferred for 3 years to 21/22</td>
<td>$300,000 each year in 26/27 and 27/28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URD0014</td>
<td>Rangiora Urban</td>
<td>Middlebrook Enhancement / Pond</td>
<td>Budget deferred for 3 years to 21/22</td>
<td>$180,000 in 21/22 and $200,000 in 26/27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URD0017</td>
<td>Rangiora Urban</td>
<td>Blackett St piping</td>
<td>Budget deferred for 4 years to 22/23</td>
<td>$50,000 in 22/23 and $323,500 in 23/24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URD0023</td>
<td>Rangiora Urban</td>
<td>Palmer / Church Pipework Upgrade</td>
<td>budget deferred for 3 years to 20/21</td>
<td>$70,000 in 20/21, $379,000 in 22/23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URD0031</td>
<td>Rangiora Urban</td>
<td>North Brook - Enhancement Work</td>
<td>Budget deferred for 3 year to 21/22</td>
<td>$50,000 in 21/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URD0037</td>
<td>Rangiora Urban</td>
<td>Todds Road SW Pond</td>
<td>Budget deferred for 2 years to 23/24</td>
<td>$935,000 in 23/24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URD0043</td>
<td>Coastal Urban</td>
<td>Pines Kairaki Upgrade</td>
<td>Budget deferred for 2 years to 21/22</td>
<td>$35,300 in 21/22, $125,000 in 22/23, $125,000 in 23/24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URD0044</td>
<td>Coastal Urban</td>
<td>East Woodend Detention Pond 2.5Ha</td>
<td>Budget deferred for 2 years to 21/22</td>
<td>$150,000 in 21/22,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URD0068</td>
<td>Kaiapoi Urban</td>
<td>Pond areas 1&amp;2; Land purchase</td>
<td>Budget deferred for 1 year to 19/20</td>
<td>$1.856 m in 20/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URD0071</td>
<td>Kaiapoi Urban</td>
<td>Parnhams Drain Catchment Improvements</td>
<td>Budget deferred for 4 years to 22/23</td>
<td>$600,000 in 22/23, $3.0 m in 23/24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URD001</td>
<td>Flood Response</td>
<td>Flood Response Rangiora - Lehmans Road Stage 2</td>
<td>Budget deferred for 3 years to 27/28</td>
<td>$375,000 in 27/28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URD002</td>
<td>Ohoka Rural</td>
<td>Wetherfield Lane Improvements,</td>
<td>Budget partially deferred for 2 years to 20/21</td>
<td>$100 in 21/22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| URD003    | Flood Response | Flood Response Rural Areas - Cones Road | Budget deferred for 2 years to 21/22 | $100,000 in 20/21,
5.20 Water Supply – Utilities and Roading Staff Submission to the 2018-28 Long Term Plan – Colin Roxburgh (Water Asset Manager) and Kalley Simpson (3 Waters Manager)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180509050672.

*UV Treatment Budgets*

(b) **Approves** an increase to the Rangiora UV Installation capital works budget from $600,000 to $1,400,000, and increasing the timeframe by which the project will be completed by one year, such that the budget will be $100,000 in 2018/19, $500,000 in 2019/20 and $800,000 in 2020/21, noting that this will increase the Rangiora water rate by $8.20 per connection per year from 2022/22 onwards and the Rangiora water development contribution by $86 per new connection.

(c) **Approves** an increase to the Kaiapoi UV Installation capital works budget from $800,000 to $1,800,000, and increasing the timeframe by which the project will be completed by one year, such that the budget will be $100,000 in 2018/19, $700,000 in 2019/20 and $1,000,000 in 2020/21, noting that this will increase the Kaiapoi water rate by $14.8 per connection per year from 2021/22 onwards and the Kaiapoi water development contribution by $164 per new connection.

(d) **Approves** an increase to the Cust UV Installation capital works budget from $270,000 to $600,000, and increasing the timeframe by which the project will be completed by one year, such that the budget will be $50,000 in 2018/19, $100,000 in 2019/20 and $450,000 in 2020/21, noting that this will increase the Cust water rate by $173.70 per connection per year from 2020/21 onwards and the Cust water development contribution by $2,063 per new connection.

(e) **Approves** the deletion of the $120,000 Cust Water Supply headworks renewal budget in 2022/23 and approves a new headworks renewal budget of $400,000 split $100,000 in 2019/20 and $300,000 in 2020/21 noting that the renewal of the headworks is triggered by the need to upgrade the treatment plant to accommodate UV treatment which cannot be accommodated within the existing site.

(f) **Approves** an increase to the Pegasus UV and Transfer Pumps Upgrades budgets from $420,000 to $750,000 for the level of service portion and from $78,110 to $150,000 for the growth portion, and also allowing for the timing of the project to be split with $100,000 Level of Service budget and $50,000 Growth budget in 2018/19, $100,000 Level of Service budget and $100,000 Growth budget in 2019/20, and $550,000 Level of Service budget in 2020/21, noting that this will increase Woodend-Pegasus water supply rates by $8.90 per connection per year from the 2021/22 year onwards.

(g) **Approves** an increase to the Ohoka UV Installation capital works budget from $270,000 to $500,000 and increasing the timeframe over which the project will be completed by one year, such that the budget will be $10,000 in 2020/21, $90,000 in 2021/22 and $400,000 in
2022/23, noting that this will increase the Ohoka water rate by $193.50 per connection per year from 2023/24 onwards and the Ohoka water development contribution by $288 per unit.

(h) **Approves** an increase to the Oxford Urban UV Installation capital works budget from $400,000 to $560,000 and increasing the timeframe over which the project will be completed by one year, such that the budget will be $100,000 in 2018/19, $200,000 in 2019/20 and $260,000 in 2020/21, noting that this will increase the Oxford water rate by $138.30 per connection per year from 2021/22 onwards and the Oxford water development contribution by $138 per connection.

(i) **Approves** an increase to the Oxford Rural No.2 UV Installation capital works budget from $100,000 to $140,000 and deferring the completion date by one year, such that the budget will be $70,000 in 2019/20 and $70,000 in 2020/21, noting that this will increase the Oxford Rural No.2 water rate by $35.40 per unit per year from 2021/22 onwards and the Oxford Rural No.2 water development contribution by $35 per unit.

(j) **Approves** an increase to the West Eyreton UV Installation capital works budget from $100,000 to $170,000 and increasing the timeframe over which the project will be completed by one year, such that the budget will be $25,000 in 2020/21, $25,000 in 2021/22 and $120,000 in 2022/23, noting that this will increase the West Eyreton water rate by $22.70 per unit per year from 2022/23 onwards and the West Eyreton water development contribution by $601 per unit.

(k) **Approves** an increase to the Summerhill UV Installation capital works budget from $100,000 to $170,000 and increasing the timeframe over which the project will be completed by one year, such that the budget will be $25,000 in 2020/21, $25,000 in 2021/22 and $120,000 in 2022/23, noting that this will increase the Summerhill water rate by $11.20 per unit per year from 2022/23 onwards and the Summerhill water development contribution by $325 per unit.

(l) **Approves** an increase to the Poyntzs Road UV Installation capital works budget from $100,000 to $170,000 and increasing the timeframe over which the project will be completed by one year, such that the budget will be $25,000 in 2020/21, $25,000 in 2021/22 and $120,000 in 2022/23, noting that this will increase the Poyntzs Road water rate by $12.20 per unit per year from 2022/23 onwards and the Poyntzs Road water development contribution by $364 per unit.

(m) **Notes** that Poyntzs Road will only contribute to the UV treatment system if they join to the West Eyreton scheme prior to the project commencing. This strategy is proposed as a means of upgrading the Poyntzs Road scheme to achieve compliance with the Drinking-water Standards, but is subject to community consultation (as noted elsewhere in this report).

(n) **Notes** that allowance has not yet been made to operational budgets for the proposed UV treatment systems due to advice still being sought on this. These rating implications are expected to be modest relative to the implications of the capital cost, and will not come into effect until after the projects have been completed (2021/22 at the earliest). This will be addressed as part of a future Annual Plan.
Notes that the requirement for UV treatment on supplies that are currently compliant with the Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand is in response to recommendations made in the Havelock North Drinking-water Inquiry Stage 2 Report, and is based on the best understanding that staff have of what future requirements will be. Until Central Government provides clear direction there will be a degree of uncertainty regarding the requirements for these treatment systems.

Approves changing the Ohoka, West Eyreton, Summerhill and Poyntzs Road UV treatment budgets from level of service budgets to a partially growth funded budgets, to reflect that the projects will be sized for future growth as well as existing demand on the scheme, and for consistency with the other UV treatment budgets where this is already the case.

Notes that the reason for the recommended increases to the UV Installation budgets is due to detailed assessments being carried out at all sites, while original budgets included in the draft 2018-28 Long Term Plan were based on high level engineering judgement until more detailed assessments could be completed.

Well Head Upgrade Budgets

Approves a new capital works budget for the Kaiapoi water supply scheme of $100,000 in 2018/19 to allow the existing 4 underground well heads to be better sealed to reduce the risk of contamination, noting that this will increase the Kaiapoi water rate by $1.50 per connection per year.

Approves a new capital works budget for the Woodend-Pegasus water supply scheme of $25,000 in 2018/19 to allow one existing underground well head to be better sealed to reduce the risk of contamination, noting that this will increase the Woodend-Pegasus water rate by $0.70 per connection per year.

Notes that the reason for better sealing the well heads is in order to maintain the secure status of the schemes, and to address the public health risk associated with the existing underground well heads, also noting that this is in particular in response to stricter application of requirements of below ground well heads by drinking water assessors which puts Council at risk of losing its secure status.

Kaiapoi Source Capacity Upgrade

Approves a new capital works budget for the Kaiapoi water supply scheme of $800,000 over the 2025/26 ($50,000), 2026/27 ($150,000) and 2027/28 ($600,000) financial years to fund a new well, noting that this is forecast to increase the Kaiapoi water development contribution by $1,345 per new connection.

Notes that the reason for this new budget being identified is due to high demand over the 2017/18 summer causing the water modelling to be refined for the Kaiapoi scheme, which has resulted in the realisation that a new well will be required to accommodate future growth on the scheme.

Mandeville Storage Upgrade
(w) **Approves** an additional capital works budget for the Mandeville water supply scheme of $250,000 for the 2021/22 financial year, noting that this will increase the Mandeville water rate by $10.4 per unit per year from the 2022/23 year onwards, and the development contribution by $107 per new unit from 2018/19 onwards.

(x) **Notes** that the reason for requiring the additional storage for the scheme is in order to provide emergency storage to reduce the risk or duration of an outage on the scheme.

---

*Garrymere Source Upgrade*

(y) **Approves** the deferral of $140,000 capital works budget that is forecast for the 2018/19 financial year for the Garrymere water supply scheme to the 2019/20 financial year.

(z) **Approves** the deferral to the increases to the operational budgets for the Garrymere water supply scheme as noted within the contents of this report, to reflect the proposed treatment system being constructed 12 months later than originally planned.

(aa) **Notes** that deferring this budget will allow staff to establish a water supply advisory group for the scheme in order to work through issues and options with the source upgrade project prior to committing to a solution, which is in response to feedback received when the community was consulted on this project.

---

*Poyntzs Road Source Upgrade Project*

(bb) **Approves** deferring $693,000 of the $793,000 capital works budget for the Poyntzs Road source upgrade budget from the 2018/19 financial year to the 2019/20 financial year.

(cc) **Notes** that deferring this budget will allow staff to continue to work with the West Eyreton and Summerhill water supply advisory groups regarding the sharing of their source water prior to consulting with the Poyntzs Road community regarding the source upgrade budget.

---

*Kaiapoi Water Headworks Renewals*

(dd) **Approves** increasing the Kaiapoi water supply headworks renewals capital works budget for the 2018/19 financial year from $40,000 to $250,000 to allow for renewal of pumps and a generator that has failed subsequent to the draft Long Term Plan going out for consultation.

(ee) **Notes** that staff have obtained 3 quotes for the pump replacements at the Peraki Street headworks, and the new pumps (which take 12 weeks to deliver) will be ordered upon the approval of this report, to reduce the risk of a lack of pumping capacity for the scheme during the upcoming summer months.

(ff) **Approves** the deletion of the $180,000 Kaiapoi water supply headworks renewals capital works budget for the 2020/21 financial year as this was intended for the renewal of the Damley Square generator, which is now proposed to be renewed in the 2018/19 financial year.
Other Rescheduling and Minor Adjustments

(gg) **Approves** deferring 50% of the $731,000 capital works budget allocated to the Gladstone and Pegasus Well Raw water main project (split $511,700 for level of service and $219,300 for growth) from the 2018/19 financial year to the 2019/20 financial year for the Woodend-Pegasus water supply scheme.

(hh) **Notes** that this budget was recently increased by $231,000 for the reasons noted in report 180322031093[v2].

(ii) **Approves** deferring 50% of the $700,000 capital works budget allocated to the Rangiora Water Supply Smith Street 5th Bore capital works project from the 2018/19 financial year to the 2019/20 financial year.

(jj) **Notes** that deferring the above budgets will allow staff to provide a greater level of certainty that the project will be completed in accordance with the timing of the budgets, and reduce the risk of carry overs.

(kk) **Approves** removing the $15,000 capital works budget allocated to the Woodend-Pegasus water supply scheme for the Ravenswood Trunk Main North Upgrade 1 project for the 2018/19 financial year as this main has already been installed as part of the Ravenswood development.

(ll) **Approves** reducing the capital works budget for the 2018/19 financial year for the Rockford Road Trunk Main Stage 1B project on the Oxford Rural No.1 scheme budget from $150,000 to $50,000 given that the majority of the work will be able to be completed under the budget allocated to the 2017/18 financial year, noting that this will decrease the Oxford Rural No.1 development contribution by $135.10 per unit.

(mm) **Approves** the following changes to the Woodend water supply renewals budget, noting that overall this will reduce the Woodend-Pegasus water rate by $1.6 per connection per year:

   i) In 2018/19 removing the $40,000 level of service budget and $70,000 renewal budget

   ii) In 2019/20 increasing the renewal portion of the budget from $70,000 to $80,000.

   iii) In 2020/21 reducing the level of service portion from $40,000 to $20,000, and the renewal portion from $70,000 to $40,000.

(nn) **Approves** deferring the $110,000 Gladstone Road Wells Electrical Kiosk Control Renewal budget for the Woodend-Pegasus water supply scheme from the 2020/21 financial year to the 2021/22 financial year in order to better spread expenditure over the Long Term Plan period.

(oo) **Approves** deferring the $75,000 level of service and $175,000 renewal portion of the Waikuku Beach water pipeline renewals budget from the 2020/21 financial year to the 2021/22 financial year, in order to better spread expenditure over the Long Term Plan period.
(pp) **Approves** deferring $300,000 of the $350,000 capital works budget for the Darnley Square and Peraki Street Reservoir Strengthening and Sealing budgets from the 2018/19 financial year to the 2019/20 financial year in order to reduce the risk of a carry over on this project.

(qq) **Approves** deferring the $20,000 renewal and $180,000 level of service budgets for the Gammans Creek backup source project for the Oxford Urban water supply scheme from the 2020/21 financial year to the 2021/22 financial year, in order to better spread expenditure over the Long Term Plan period.

(rr) **Approves** reducing the Kaiapoi water renewals capital works budget for the 2018/19, 2019/20 and 2020/21 financial years from $380,000 per year to $300,000 per year in order to minimise expenditure over the first 3 years of the Long Term Plan period where possible.

(ss) **Approves** reducing the Oxford Urban water renewals capital works budget for the 2018/19, 2019/20 and 2020/21 financial years from $100,000 per year to $50,000 per year in order to minimise expenditure over the first 3 years of the Long Term Plan period where possible.

(tt) **Approves** reducing the Rangiora water supply renewals capital works budget from $380,000 to $330,000 in 2018/19 and from $430,000 to $330,000 in 2019/20 and 2020/21 in order to minimise expenditure over the first 3 years of the Long Term Plan period where possible.

(uu) **Approves** deferring $80,000 of the $100,000 budget for the Coldstream Road water main extension project for the Rangiora water supply scheme from the 2018/19 financial year to the 2019/20 financial year in order to reduce the risk of carry overs.

(vv) **Notes** that for all budgets proposed, and proposed changes to budget beyond 2018/19 the community will have the opportunity to provide feedback on as part of future Annual Plans or Long Term Plans.

---

5.21 **Wastewater Utilities and Roading Staff Submission to the 2018-2028 Long Term Plan – Chris Parton (Wastewater Asset Manager)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180327032669.

(b) **Approves** the request for additional funding in year 1 of the draft Long Term Plan for $14,000 from the wastewater renewals account for upgrades to the Ohoka Road wastewater catchment in Kaiapoi. The cost will be recovered through Eastern District Sewer Scheme rates.

(c) **Approves** the request to increase the budget for a main extension in Tuahiwi Road by $33,000 in year 1 of the daft Long Term Plan to account for a contribution from the Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga.

(d) **Approves** the request for funding of $86,109 in year 1 of the draft Long Term Plan for a reticulation main extension in Topito Road in...
Tuahiwi. This cost will be recovered through development contributions.

(e) **Approves** the request to investigate inflow and infiltration on the Tuahiwi scheme in year 1 of the draft Long Term Plan. This cost will be managed through existing operations and maintenance budgets.

(f) **Approves** the request to develop a contingency plan for minimizing wastewater overflows as required by the Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan. This work will be completed in year 1 of the draft Long Term Plan. The cost will be managed through existing resource consent budgets.

(g) **Approves** the request to analyse the configuration of the Kaiapoi wastewater treatment plant to determine if a more efficient configuration is possible. This work will be completed in year 1 of the draft Long Term Plan. This cost will be managed through existing resource consent budgets.

(h) **Approves** the request to mitigate hazards at wastewater facilities on the Eastern District Sewer Scheme. This work will be completed in years 1 through 9 of the draft Long Term Plan, with the bulk of the work occurring in years 1 through 5. This cost will be managed through existing maintenance and renewal budgets.

(i) **Approves** the request to mitigate hazards at wastewater facilities on the Oxford scheme. This work will be completed in years 1 through 5 of the draft Long Term Plan. This cost will be managed through existing maintenance and renewal budgets.

(j) **Approves** the request to mitigate hazards at wastewater facilities on the Loburn Lea scheme. This work will be completed in years 1 through 4 of the draft Long Term Plan. This cost will be managed through existing maintenance and renewal budgets.

(k) **Approves** the deferral of the projects as set out in the following table to provide an achievable capital works programme for 2018/19.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme - Project</th>
<th>Budget Type</th>
<th>Draft LTP Budget 2018-28</th>
<th>Revised Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Sewer - Central Capacity</td>
<td>Solely Growth</td>
<td>$1,011,000 (2018/19)</td>
<td>$505,500 (2018/19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrade Stage 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$505,500 (2019/20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Sewer - WWTP</td>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>$92,000 (2018/19)</td>
<td>$46,000 (2018/19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inlet Works – Septage Disposal Facility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$46,000 (2019/20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Sewer - Additional Aeration</td>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>$500,000 (2018/19)</td>
<td>$500,000 (2020/21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWTP Ponds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi Sewer - Charles Street Rising</td>
<td>Solely Growth</td>
<td>$93,000 (2018/19)</td>
<td>$46,500 (2018/19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$46,500 (2019/20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi Sewer - Moorcroft Sewer Main</td>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>$404,171 (2018/19)</td>
<td>$202,086 (2018/19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$202,086 (2019/20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Renewals</td>
<td>$1,109,029 (2018/19)</td>
<td>$554,515 (2018/19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$554,515 (2019/20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi Sewer - Cridland Street Sewer</td>
<td>Solely Growth</td>
<td>$70,000 (2019/20)</td>
<td>$70,000 (2024/25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairs</td>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>$100,000 (2018/19)</td>
<td>$100,000 (2018/19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,000,000 (2019/20)</td>
<td>$500,000 (2019/20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$500,000 (2020/21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Activity Type</td>
<td>2018/19</td>
<td>2019/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend Sewer - Wetland Plant Investigations</td>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend Sewer - Desludging Ponds</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>$53,530</td>
<td>$56,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernside Sewer - Connect to EDSS</td>
<td>Solely Growth</td>
<td>$219,225</td>
<td>$812,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernside Sewer - Connect to EDSS</td>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>$73,075</td>
<td>$270,675</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5.22 Carryovers from 2017-2018 to 2018-2019 – Paul Christensen (Finance Manager)

**RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180517054036.

(b) **Adopts** the carryovers as listed for inclusion in the 2018-28 Long Term Plan.

### 6. MATTER REFERRED FROM RANGIORA-ASHLEY COMMUNITY BOARD MEETING OF 16 MAY 2017

#### 6.1 Garrymere Water Supply Upgrade - Feedback from Community Consultation – Colin Roxburgh (Water Asset Manager) and Gary Boot (Senior Engineering Advisor)

*(refer to copy of report no. 180504048871 attached)*

**RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Delays** the upgrade of the Garrymere Water Supply by up to 12 months while a Garrymere Water Supply Advisory Group is established to consider and recommend a preferred approach to the upgrade that provides a safe and affordable water supply, and meets the Council's legislative requirements.

(b) **Approves** membership of the Garrymere Water Supply Advisory Group to comprise:

- 4-6 Volunteer representatives from the Garrymere water supply (noting that there should be an appropriate balance of representatives from the Landcare group and those that were not part of the group)
- 3 members of the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board – D Lundy, D Gordon and C Prickett.
- Councillor Williams as portfolio holder for water and wastewater
- Council’s Water Asset Manager and 3 Waters Manager (or Manager Utilities & Roading)
• 1 representative from the CDHB (Drinking Water Assessor), if agreeable,
• And that the Advisory Group be directed to report its recommendations to Council in by June 2019.

(c) **Approve** provision in the Long Term Plan budget for the Garrymere water supply upgrade, based on upgrade Option A, but that it be deferred to reflect the additional 12 month delay while the Advisory Group considers issues and options and reports back to Council, meaning that the budget would be required to be split over the 2018/19 and 2019/20 financial years.

(d) **Notes** that the current programme is based on the project being funded entirely from the Garrymere water supply scheme members.

7. CONSIDERATION OF SUBMISSIONS TO THE DRAFT LONG TERM PLAN 2018-2028

8. QUESTIONS

9. URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS

10. NEXT MEETING

The Council will meet at 3.15pm on Tuesday 19 June to adopt the Long Term Plan.
MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL TO HEAR SUBMISSIONS TO THE DRAFT LONG TERM PLAN 2018-2028, HELD IN THE MEETING ROOM, RUATANIWHA KAIAPOI CIVIC CENTRE, KAIAPOI ON TUESDAY 8 MAY 2018 COMMENCING AT 2.00PM

PRESENT:

Mayor D Ayers (Chair), Deputy Mayor K Felstead, Councillors, N Atkinson, K Barnett, A Blackie, W Doody, D Gordon, J Meyer, S Stewart and P Williams.

IN ATTENDANCE:

J Palmer (Chief Executive), and Mrs A Smith (Committee Advisor).

The meeting adjourned at 3.30pm and reconvened at 4.00pm. The meeting adjourned at 6.30pm and reconvened at 7.00pm.

1. APOLOGIES

Moved Councillor Meyer  seconded Councillor Gordon

THAT an apology for absence be received and sustained from Councillor R Brine.

CARRIED

2. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Councillor Barnett declared an interest on the submission for the Cust Community Network.

3. HEARING OF SUBMISSIONS TO THE DRAFT LONG TERM PLAN 2018-2028

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME/ORGANISATION</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ohoka Domain Advisory Group (Annie Bonifant and Rod Buchanan)</td>
<td>Ms Bonifant spoke on behalf of the Ohoka Domain Advisory Group, who are seeking financial assistance of $10,000 from the Council for the restoration of the Gatekeepers Lodge. This historic building has recently been relocated to Ohoka Bush. The cost of this move was covered by fundraising. There is restoration required for both the inside and outside of the building, which includes relining the entire inside. This is a Category 2 Building and the Advisory Group has received some expert advice on the restoration required from Mr Stephen Cashmore, who is experienced in restoring historic buildings. $10,000 will be a start to cover some skilled labour for this job and costs of some of the materials. Councillor Gordon asked if there is any idea of the costs to complete the restoration. Ms Bonifant said</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
this is not known. The group will also be seeking funding from other sources to cover the costs. The building cannot be used in its current condition and it is estimated if may take up to two years to complete this project.

Mr Rod Buchanan also acknowledged that the Domain Advisory Group has been receiving annual funding from the Council to go towards the costs of plants in Ohoka bush and with plans in place to extend the bush, it is hoped that this grant will continue to be made to the Group.

Community Wellbeing North Canterbury Trust (Julia Howard)

Ms Julia Howard (Board Chair), Ms Deidre Ryan (Manager) and Mrs Mary Sparrow (Trustee) were present to speak to this submission, aided by a PowerPoint presentation. Ms Ryan provided a background of the history of the Trust, noting there has been a partnership with WDC spanning 30 years. There are now 13 regular services that are based at the Kaiapoi and Rangiora bases. It is a real benefit for the community to have locally based providers.

The increase in the local population of 34% in the last 12 years was noted and that this is putting an increasing demand on services. There is challenges in sourcing funding with some historical sources under pressure or are no longer available. The biggest challenge for the Trust is the costs of rental for the High Street, Rangiora property. All the support that the Council provides to the Trust is well utilised and is really appreciated, as is the ongoing partnership with the Council.

Councillor Atkinson noted the increase in population, and asked how this correlates with the work of the Trust. Ms Ryan noted that it has been necessary for waitlists to be established for some services, which has never been needed before. Percentage figures of the increased demands were not able to be provided at the hearing, but these figures will be made available to the Councillors at a later date.

Silverstream Volunteer Group (Noelene Francis)

Ms Heidi Quinn spoke to this presentation, (Noelene Frances was unable to attend). A hand out map showed various projects that will require funding that the Group are hoping to progress. In the Silverstream Reserve East it is hoped to restore vegetation to reflect the natural history of the Canterbury Plains and create habitat for indigenous fauna. There has also been discovered recently infestations of English Ivy at the entrance and across the reserve which could have a serious impact on all the planting that has been carried out.
to date. It has been quoted (by Weedbusters) a cost of $5,000 per year for five years to control this. Also important to conserve biodiversity of indigenous vegetation (recently discovered Gratiola sexdentata growing in the reserve). In Silverstream Reserve West, it is suggested that an additional bridge could be installed to create a loop track through the reserve and upgrade tracks to increase the range of public spaces accessible. The volunteer group is grateful for the Council for supporting the work they do in Silverstream Reserve and encourage the Council to continue this support.

Councillor Stewart asked how much money the Group is seeking from the Council, with the $5,000 per annum for controlling the ivy infestation. Ms Quinn said that the Group would be grateful for any funding that was made available.

Mayor Ayers extended thanks to the volunteers for all the work they do at Silverstream Reserve.

Cure Boating Club Inc. (Paul Curgenven)

Mr Paul Curgenven, President of the Cure Boating Club presented the Club’s submission. He noted that the Club has been in existence since 1868, and would be having its 150 year anniversary at Labour weekend this year. The Club is currently having amended (and more affordable) plans drawn up for a building to replace the earthquake damaged portion of the existing building and is seeking funding for this. This is the storage part of the Boat Shed. The Club has the funds of $900,000 to cover the cost of this, but would like to be able to include an upper floor in the building. This would require an additional $500,000 required for this separate flooring but which would make a prime facility in a prime location for the district. It is envisaged that this completed facility would also be available for hire. Funding has been approved from Rata Foundation, and the Club is keen to get this project underway.

Mr Curgenven commented that there is a rowing precinct planned for further up the river, and questioned if any funding directed to this proposal could come to the Cure facility. Any funding from the Council for their plans would be much appreciated. Mr Curgenven said that the current members would like to leave the Club in good position for the younger members and future of the Club.

Councillor Atkinson asked does the Club have facility to pay a loan? Mr Curgenven said the Club does do a lot of fundraising, and would welcome a...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Submission Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drucilla Kingi-Patterson</td>
<td>Mrs Drucilla Kingi-Patterson spoke to her submission and believes that New Zealand should apply to run the 2026 Commonwealth Games in Canterbury. Noted that recent newspaper article said Hamilton and Auckland were going to be lobbying to hold the games in these cities and Canterbury needs to act quickly to start lobbying its case. Mrs Kingi Patterson believes it is a matter for the Mayors to back the lobbying also. Mrs Kingi-Patterson would like to set up strategic planning centres in key locations, suggesting Christchurch Airport, former St Mary’s Hospital Hanmer Springs, Rangiora airfield, Selwyn and Kaikoura. These could have a main focus for emergency management, border security, cyber security, traffic management and forest fire prevention. These could also be used as educational centres.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi District Historical Society (Dale Brown)</td>
<td>Mr Dale Brown presented the submission on behalf of the Society members, and acknowledged the support that is currently provided by the Council to the Historical Society. The Society’s submission requests funding to allow an extension of the Museum on the site which is already available. This would allow more items to be displayed, as currently there are a number of items that the Society has in storage as there is not enough space to show them. Second part of the submission requests the installation of an elevator or lift for the museum to use, or to make the current elevator already in the building accessible to the museum. Current access to the upstairs storage is only via stairs and carrying larger, heavy and sometimes unusually shaped items becomes a health and safety issue. The museum continues to attract a great number of visitors, and receive positive comments on a regular basis. Recently the Society has received several new items that could be displayed, if there was room. There has not been any preliminary costings done for the cost of an elevator or dumb waiter. Mr Brown noted that with the current volunteers at the Museum being predominantly in the older generation, having such a facility would be of great benefit for these volunteers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr Price noted it is important that Kaiapoi is promoted as a destination for people to stay, and not just a town that people pass through. The river is a vital part of the town both historically and in the present. The Trust would like to see provision for maritime history displayed in and around Kaiapoi, including an area for secure display of smaller important items. The Trust supports the Kaiapoi District Historical Society submission seeking funding to extend the museum, which could allow room to display historical nautical and maritime items.

Mr Blackwell spoke seeking funding assistance through the Council LTP process for building a ship playground on the riverbank in Kaiapoi, with a suggested location being adjacent to Charles Street. (photo tabled at the hearing). The Trust would be able to offer assistance by providing some large items salvaged from the MV Tuhoe, including masts and other items. This proposal is similar to that of the Marlborough District Council on the Picton foreshore. The Trust members see this as an important link to the port’s history and there could also be display boards showing photos of other ships that have used the port.

Mr Redmond said the Trust supports the preservation of remaining buildings associated with the port, including the Kaiapoi mill complex. This building is an example of early industrial building and would make an excellent industrial heritage site and display area for items too large for the museum. The Trust members believe the history of the Kaiapoi Woollen Mill is worthy of preservation. Copies of extracts from the Trust Book “Taking the Bar” mentioning the Mill and “A History of the Kaiapoi Woollen Mills” were tabled at the meeting.
Mrs Greengrass noted that when a multi-sport facility is built, there needs to be significant parking facilities with it. Kaiapoi is a more central location for such a facility.

Mr Redmond confirmed that the Board considers the multi-sport facility is too high a cost for the households in the district and does not support it. It is a "nice to have" but don't see it as a priority, irrespective of where it is located.

Memorial garden – the Board believes this is something that would not be needed for a long time and is out of the scope of regeneration. The Board supports the acceleration of the regeneration programme which would reduce costs and for the community to see results much quicker than is currently proposed in the Long Term Plan.

Regarding the footpath for Stirling Crescent, the request is for a gravel track behind the houses on Stirling Crescent between the tennis court and the Council reserve, which is a distance of approx. 200-250 metres.

Mayor Ayers thanked the Board members for the work they do and supporting their community.

Brent Cairns

Mr Cairns sought confirmation that the food forest be included in the LTP along with funding. Mr Cairns asks that a policy be developed relating to when trees are planted using rate payer funding, for any Council reserves, that a percentage of these trees are fruit trees. This would be great for the environment and also provide some food as well. He noted that the food from the food forest is being well used by the community. Would like the food forest to look tidy, especially the entrances and Mr Cairns asks that the Council to support this. There were also concerns raised with the condition of the footpath bordering the food forest and there needs to be an allowance for this.

Mr Cairns believes the costs for developing most sports fields in the Regeneration area is not good economic use of funds, and would be a step backwards. There are not enough facilities to support those using these proposed fields. Does support having softball diamonds put in on the new Jones Street. Sports are changing and the website states that more sports fields are not required.

Regarding the proposed multi-use sport facility,
Mr Cairns believes that the Council could provide funding towards schools for extensions of their current facilities, rather than investing a large amount of funds into a multi-use sport facility.

When questioned on the level of care required for fruit trees, Mr Cairns said that though fruit trees require more care, he would support these as they provide healthy options for families and the benefits outweigh these costs of higher level of care.

Martin Pinkham

Mr Pinkham is concerned about the Kaiapoi Town Centre review which was not completed prior to the draft LTP. Consequently there is no budget recommendations made or included in the LTP. Once the Town Centre plan is completed, there may be work that could be progressed quickly, and recommends that $2 million be allocated in the next two years. Would like the Council to consider a public/private partnership arrangement for the Town Centre, to reduce the costs to ratepayers and share the costs.

Mr Pinkham suggests that the Council should have a review of the Cycling and Walking Strategy, to include both intra community cycleway/walkway development strategy and an inter community cycleway/walkway. Mr Pinkham believes there should be a Transport Strategy. Recommends that $250,000 be set aside for this.

Re Development Contributions – Mr Pinkham believes there needs to be robustness to the way these are calculated and supports the Council engaging someone to peer review these.

The West Kaiapoi Drainage development contributions require review and believes these are calculated on technical information that is out of date.

Councillor Gordon suggested it may be useful for Mr Pinkham to meet with WDC Manager Finance and Business Support Jeff Millward, to discuss the development contributions.

AFTERNOON TEA BREAK

Paul Markholm

Mr Markholm spoke to his submission, specifically regarding roading. He does not believe the Council is getting good level of service from the current contractor and that some of the roads in the district are in appalling state. Mr Markholm would like the Council to take over the roading maintenance repairs and rebuilds work. As the weight of trucks
has increased the roads are not coping. Examples of roads in poor state were Revells Road, Mt Thomas Road (patched and patched), and Oxford to Rangiora Road. The West Belt and Blackett Street corner recent repairs has had a lot of money spent on it and is a very poor job. Roads built today are built far too shallow with not enough aggregate. Mr Markholm believes the Council needs to take this roading more seriously and staff need to be more involved on a day to day basis, perhaps with road building experience.

Mary Anne Brown

Mrs Mary Anne Brown spoke to the submission of Beachvale Farm Partnership. They farm on land which has a series of Council stormwater retention ponds to control the rate of discharge into the existing drainage network (McIntosh’s Drain). This has been necessitated with the boom of residential developments in north Kaiapoi, and the increase of surface runoff stormwater. There has been issues in recent years with flooding of properties, where there is high tides and high rainfall, the retention ponds fail, and do not do the job that they were intended to do. Council has an easement of approx. 230 metres from the retention ponds to McIntosh’s, but when the water levels are elevated, there is no fall at all. Council is effectively using their farm as one big retention pond. Mrs Brown noted that there has been no maintenance work undertaken in the 5/6 years since the completion of the ponds. The easement drains which drain stormwater 230 metres from the ponds to McIntosh’s Drain are overgrown and this restricts drainage resulting in flooding across their paddocks. There needs to be maintenance carried out. Mrs Brown believes the Council is in breach of the easement agreement and needs to maintain the easement drains. This situation has deteriorated since the Sovereign Palms development.

Annette Williams and Claire Spear

Ms Annette Williams and Claire Spear spoke to their submissions. Ms Williams played a recording of the traffic noise along Butchers Road, recorded from her property as an indication on the impact it is having on their daily lives. Photos were tabled of several large trucks using Butchers Road, generating high noise levels and also noting that high vehicles encroaches on the privacy of residents, with the current fence heights. They have concerns regarding the traffic safety and noise affecting the homeowners along the new western arterial road - Butchers Road. Ms Williams suggests there needs to be steps taken to improve
safety, suggesting a safety barrier and double yellow lines. Also suggested installing sound barriers and raised fences to reduce the noise for residents. Noise is a serious problem on this road, and she noted that that the current level of noise in her bedroom (with double glazed windows) exceeds the World Health Organisation recommendations for residential noise. The traffic volume has increased since 2014, a traffic count was undertaken recently over a period of 3 hours, from 3pm to 6pm, which counted 2,360 vehicle movements. 24 homeowners are unified in their concerns and three residents disclosed they are on sleep medication because of the noise.

Mrs Williams noted there appeared to be bias, with the Council planning to build high fences at either end of this stretch of road but residents have been told they are unable to increase the height of their fences at their own cost.

PT on Panckhurst (Laura Organ)  This submitter did not attend.

Oxford Promotions Action Committee (Barry Cuttance)  Mr Cuttance spoke to this submission representing the Oxford Promotions Action Committee. The Committee request that the Council provide funding for the purchase of Christmas street flags in Oxford, which would make the town more vibrant and welcoming.

Representing the businesses, the committee suggests the Council consider providing electric car charging stations in the district, especially in smaller towns. An electric charging port could have the ability for the Council to charge for this facility. The committee is suggesting the installation of the slower charging units (not the higher range $70,000 ones), but ones that take two hours to charge.

The committee requests that the Council seal the car park into Pearson Park where the Oxford Farmer’s Market is held. Currently this is loose shingle and stones. The area is also used by drivers for parking during the week.

Linda Pocock  Mrs Pocock’s submission supports the discontinuation of the Council using glyphosate and is really concerned that there is even consideration for continued use of this in New Zealand. Glyphosate is a highly successful herbicide but it is polluting the waterways and should not be used near water. The use of this has
a severe effect of our soil and there are now concerns with its use on land. Mrs Pocock noted that several countries have banned the use of glyphosate altogether. Information was provided showing the toxic effect on mammals and health researchers have suggested that there is a high risk to vital organs of humans. In carrying out due diligent and acceptance duty of care, Mrs Pocock strongly recommends that the Council monitor the use of glyphosate and follow very strict guidelines of its use. Her recent observations of Council staff and contractors using glyphosate, suggest operators are casual, and they are not wearing the correct clothing or face masks. Tabled information included “Directives for the Use of the Herbicide Glyphosate” and copy of an article from OrganicNZ magazine Jan/Feb 2018 titled “Glyphosate Has Got to Go”.

Cust Community Network  
(Kirstyn Barnett)

Mrs Barnett presented the submission on behalf of the Cust Community Network. A recent meeting of the group with the local residents highlighted road safety, and general consensus that the speed limit through the township should be 50kph, plus 40kph past the school and preschool. Improving and extending street lighting at both ends of the village is requested. There is no public transport, but there are buses from different schools and Red Bus company collecting and dropping off residents in the village. The two bus stops for the school are not in good positions which causes drivers to veer out in front of oncoming traffic. CNN would like to have a bus shelter in the centre of the village and the Network members request Council assistance with improvement of the road shoulder, use of the road reserve and rebated resource consent. It is possible CCN could get sponsorship for the construction of the shelter.

Footpaths in Cust are currently in a bad condition, and the footpaths finish before both ends of the village. Improvements to these would improve walking and cycling in the area. Residents would like to see a better standard of this main road between Oxford and Rangiora.

The Network members would like some improvements to the Cust Community Centre, and suggests better signage for the public, indicating the toilets are in the Community Centre. This group would like to work with the Council and foster these projects.
Councillor Gordon asked about the pot holes across from the Cust Hotel, Mrs Barnett said many of the residents had raised this issue with the Council via a service request about three months ago, and Sicon had responded that the work was on the list of jobs to be done.

Rochelle and Joe Faimalo

Mr and Mrs Faimalo were present to speak to this submission, and spoke specifically on the increase in costs for the use of Pegasus Community Centre. Mrs Faimalo advised that they use the facility for fitness and boot camp classes at low cost with affordable rates. These increases have a flow on effect to all the community. It is important that these fitness opportunities are able to be offered at affordable rates. As a collective of personal trainers in Pegasus, Mr Faimalo said it is quite probable that if the rental prices are increased, the businesses would not operate. The current classes mean that local residents have affordable fitness opportunities.

Mrs Faimalo would like to run a youth group programme but there are many weeks when the current Pegasus Community Centre is booked out every night of the week. It is hoped that there are plans for a future facility to be provided in Pegasus.

Mrs Faimalo also commented on the library advertising in the Community Noticeboard page in the Northern Outlook and does not see this as good use of ratepayer’s money.

Amanda Black

Mrs Black and her husband live on Garrymere Road, on 21 acres. They have lived there since 2002, spending considerable time and energy developing the block, running cattle, growing saffron and hazelnuts. Her submission is concerned with the cost of the upgrades to the Garrymere water supply scheme, with the cheapest option of a rise of water rates to an annual rate of over $3,000. There has been an information evening held that they attended, but has concerns that they were not consulted and residents deserve to be kept in the loop on this matter. The improvement of the water is required to meet the drinking water standards but Mrs Black does not feel that there has been adequate consultation from the Council and requests a deferment of this upgrade for at least a year, and the establishment of a Garrymere Water Supply Advisory Group. There is an issue of affordability in this matter for all members of this community. Mrs Black understands that the Council has an
obligation to upgrade the water, but does not feel that there is an urgency to upgrade it at the present time as it is a chlorinated supply.

Councilor Gordon asked what was the view of other users and Mrs Black said it is the common view of all users that the matter be deferred for 12 months to allow further investigation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courtney Starbuck</th>
<th>This submitter did not attend.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Shirley Cairns    | Mrs Cairns presented her submission. Supports the expansion of the recycling centre, but would also like to see the inclusion of a facility for greenwaste to be turned to compost and it to be bagged and sold. Mrs Cairns suggested a glass or plastic recycling complex in the district, this would create jobs and would put the WDC on the map as a leader with dealing with rubbish. Asked the question - what will the Council do when Kate Valley is full?

Regarding the 3 bin kerbside collection, Mrs Cairns suggested there could be more options for ratepayers with different sizes of bins being made available.

Mrs Cairns suggested that more electric car charging stations be made available— not only in Kaiapoi, but in Pegasus, and Ravenswood. In the future these will be more popular and would be able to cater for their needs.

Mrs Cairns suggested that the current bus system has disadvantaged the residents of Kaiapoi.

She is concerned with the grandiose sports complex in Rangiora, noting that this is likely to have increased in cost to $30m by the time it starts to be built.

Mrs Cairns asked why the Council is only showing the ratepayers just the one plan, and suggests the Council could be looking at other options which may be cheaper.

Regarding the planned sport fields in the Regeneration area, Mrs Cairns asked is there going to be lighting provided on these fields, noting that this may impact on neighbouring properties and possible devaluation. Are these fields going to be of an international standard? There could be issues with tagging and damage to changing facilities if these were built. Mrs Cairns noted the
parking that would be required for the softball and could there be any other parking places.

Mrs Cairns suggested that the Council needs to allow for a large park like area in the Regeneration area, like the Christchurch Botanical gardens, for people to have picnics, walking and jogging. Suggests that some of these proposed sports fields could be relocated in other areas like Woodend, Pegasus or Ravenswood.

**Linda Stewart**

Ms Stewart does not support the multi-use sports stadium but would support a public/private option to build a facility. This is cost effective and would allow the Council to focus on critical needs such as waste water, drinking water and flood management. Ms Stewart suggested provision of a facility that is more suitable to all ages would be better.

Ms Stewart questioned the library space planned for Woodend-Pegasus and does not believe the timing is correct for this. There is still time needed for the development of these areas.

The Dudley Park Aquatic Facility does not provide a good facility for the public and it is often over capacity and there is a serious shortage of a 50metre pools in the region. Ms Stewart suggests that it would be smart to include this in a multi-use sport facility.

**Jo Kane**

Mrs Kane presented her submission and questioned whether the rates increases sustainable, and the high level of service with the inevitable ongoing maintenance and operational costs. There has been a high increase in rates over recent years.

The district has an aging population. Council needs to reflect what the community can afford and set an appropriate work programme.

*Kerbside collections* – Mrs Kane questioned the administrative cost of the options for the kerbside collection.

*Multi-use sports facility* – questions the cost of $91 per property in the district. As an alternative, Mrs Kane suggests that the Council should be looking at facilities that are already available in the community through schools, sports clubs and Council owned facilities.
District Regeneration – Mrs Kane suggests “leave it green” for a very long time – there is now a post-earthquake level of service that is a lot higher. 

Stormwater – the Council needs to work on taking control of the effects on the environment of stormwater and the effects downstream.

Community Facilities - Council needs to look at priorities for community facilities, and making better use of these. Mrs Kane questioned the need for a library in Woodend/Pegasus.

Waikuku Water (Jo Kane)

Waikuku Water is a newly formed group in the community, whose members have concerns with the stormwater.

Mrs Jo Kane and Mr Chris Stewart were present for this submission and spoke to the concerns of the group. Photos were shown of several areas of flooding at Waikuku Beach, with the water lying for a long time, despite it being a dry summer. Mrs Kane suggests the Council should work in tandem with ECan and conduct a LIDAR survey, suggesting that something has changed with the land following the Hurunui/Kaikoura earthquakes. This would inform and drive what should happen in the coastal areas.

Members of the Group fully supports the Council commencing the comprehensive stormwater consent for each town - this is long overdue.

This issue requires urgent attention before winter, with drains to be cleaned and inspection of pipes. Water is lying in the parks at Waikuku Beach, despite not having any substantial rain since 14 April. Both Allens and Kings Drive areas are also experiencing problems.

Mrs Kane said the group would like to have a representative on the Coastal Rural Drainage Advisory Group.

Local knowledge can never be under estimated, and there is something different in the land at the moment.

Mr Stewart then spoke on the continuing ponding over summer and the water flowing back up stream in Taranaki Stream is creating these areas where water is ponding throughout the Waikuku village. ECan have looked at the issue, and members of Waikuku Water would like to see both WDC and ECan working together on this issue. Waikuku is a growing tourist area.
| Thomas Glenn | Mr Glenn spoke to his submission and voiced concerns that he does not believe this Council is operating transparently. Mr Glenn suggests the sports stadium is an ill-conceived plan and ratepayers in the district have not been consulted on this matter. These are the ones who will be paying the extra funding.

Regarding the location of the proposed facility, Mr Glenn believes there will be very few residents from either Kaiapoi or Oxford who would be using it. There are 7,000 older residents in the district but they will have to be a member to use the facility and they will have to pay to use it.

As an Access Group member, Mr Glenn has tried to get improvements to the entrances into the current North Canterbury Sport and Fitness Gym in Rangiora, but hasn’t been successful. |
| --- | --- |
| Grey Power (Linda Stewart) | Ms Stewart spoke on behalf of Grey Power North Canterbury, with 753 members from the Waimakariri District. The issues that concerned members in general was the multi-use sports stadium proposal. This issue was put before an open meeting of Grey Power to get their view, and the members are thoroughly opposed to it. Members are worried about rates – their rates will go up, but they will not be able to use such a facility. Members had supported the private/public offer to building a multi-use facility in Southbrook, based on the information of a submission to the Council LTP, in the Northern Outlook article and speaking to Council staff.

Regarding the Kerbside collection service, the members view is for no change of service. The choice of options are too expensive.

Members are supporting that the Council do the core business. |
| Steve Gregory | Mr and Mrs Gregory spoke to their submission, which also supports the submission of the Garrymere Landcare group. This submission relates to the proposed upgrading of the Garrymere Water Supply Scheme.

Mr Gregory noted that council staff had advised that the ratepayers could not make a lump sum payment to cover the cost of the upgrade, and that it had to be paid over a 25 year period. Also had |
concerns that the increase of maintenance and operating costs from $30,000 to $60,000 and considered this was excessive.

Mrs Gregory presented two photos of the bore take site, showing this is completely deer fenced, so there is no access of livestock on the site. The Gregorys reinforced that the landcare group was set up for the community to have a voice. The group is very much for working with the Council to source a solution that was agreeable for everyone.

Mrs Gregory noted that if any member did get sick in the period of the 12 month deferment, there would not be any responsibility for this laid with the Council.

Garrymere Landcare (Steve Gregory)

Mr Gregory spoke on behalf of the Garrymere Landcare group, who ask the Council to defer the upgrade to the Garrymere water supply for a 12 month period, to give time for an outcome which could be more affordable for the current users in this water scheme. There are people in the community who cannot afford the increase in the options currently being considered by the Council. The water is already chlorinated and there is little chance of users contracting any water borne illnesses. The risk of one of the 40 people who are users of the scheme getting ill in a 12 month period is small. The Landcare group believe the Council is currently complying with the scheme as it is today, and the Council needs to upgrade the risk management plan, to show everyone what is taking place. This would shift any burden of the possible risk of a person contracting a water borne illness from the Council. The group want to work with the Council to come up with the solution to the issue.

The water in the scheme is currently chlorinated, and the UV system is a second tier system.

Mrs Gregory suggests that there are many communities around the country who, along with the local Councils, will be looking at this matter. It was not known what the other members of the Landcare groups preference is for payment of an upgrade.

North Canterbury Sport & Recreation (Don Robertson)

Mr Don Robertson (Trustee), Ms Holly Ray (Personal Trainer), Ben Spark (RHS Head Student) and Mr Liam Connelly (Sports Coach) presented the submission on behalf of the North Canterbury Sport and Recreation Trust supporting the multi-use indoor stadium. Mr Robertson gave
an overview of the Trust activities, noting that it has key sponsors and also support of the Council. The Trust has six community Trustees, two from Rangiora High School and two from The WDC. The Board members understand business, and are fully immersed in sporting codes, they understand the community and sport. The proposed stadium would be a community asset to be used by all the community members and will towards help better communities.

Ben Spark, Rangiora High School student spoke, advising he has grown up in the district and been involved in sport all his life. He believes this asset is a strategic facility and would help bring the community together. The mental health of young people currently has the worst statistics and sport is very beneficial. This would promote a healthy lifestyle, and having a hub or base will bring the community closer, a place to get to know other members of the community.

Mr Connelly, Primary School Sports Coach for the Trust. The benefits for sports have been well noted. The growth of sports in North Canterbury has expanded in recent years and currently there is not enough facilities in the district to accommodate the numbers playing basketball. Soon it will be necessary to put a cap of the numbers playing. There is a need for this four court facility now in the district.

Ms Ray is a personal trainer, particularly taking classes for the older generation. Classes for older generation range in the ages from 62-93. Other activities that this generation could enjoy during the day are bowls, table tennis and other fitness classes, as there is a demand for these classes. Her goal is for everyone to be moving. What people want is a place where they can meet, socialize and Holly believes the proposed four court facility will provide a facility to provide this for the future.

In answer to a question, Mr Michael Sharpe (Manager NC Sport and Recreation Trust), said that it is proposed that cultural events could also be held at the facility and would be able to house up to 3,000 people.

Ray Freitag

Mr Freitag spoke to his submission, noting his concern with the proposed multi-use sports facility but believes that the district can’t afford it and there is much more important things to be funded by the
Council. Mr Freitag does not believe this has to be a $27m cost, and that the people who would be using this facility would be a minority in the community. Currently there are sports facilities around the district, and some people who live in other parts of the district would not travel to Rangiora to use it, they would prefer to use facilities in their own communities. The plan is far too much cost for the majority of people and Mr Freitag believes it could be built at a fraction of the cost.

Mr Freitag referred to the three bin kerbside collection and suggests that funding proposed for the $27m multi use facility could be put towards an updated kerbside collection service.

Mr Freitag also had concerns with the cost of riverbank development currently under construction in Kaiapoi.

GL McKenzie

Mrs McKenzie was present with her daughter. Mrs McKenzie is a resident of Storer Street in Silverstream. The first concern is Butchers Road, and sought information requested on the Butchers Road – Giles Road and the road noise for residents.

Mrs McKenzie requested information on the timeframe for the information on floor levels in Silverstream. Mr Palmer advised that currently if a LIM is requested, any facts that are known for properties are included in the LIM. Mrs McKenzie believes this matter has put a slur on the subdivision and she hopes that it will be sorted very soon.

Questioned the Ecan and WDC roles in regards to the planting over the river and reserve surrounding the new bridge.

Mrs McKenzie sought an update on where the process is currently, in regards to the caravan park proposal. It was advised that this would need to go through a resource consent process.

Satisfy Food Rescue

Ms Philippa Hunt (Founder and Chairperson) and Ms Steph van Meer presented this submission, with the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, showing the work of the group. Satisfy Food Rescue is a registered charity based in Kaiapoi and was set up approximately four years ago. Funding now allows the group to employ a part-time coordinator, a driver and an administrative support person. Monday to Friday food waste is collected from
supermarkets and this is sorted and redistributed to organisations. There are five supermarkets in the district that collections are taken from. Satisfy Food Rescue is currently supporting 31 organisations, including foodbanks, seven local schools and meal providers. It has currently diverted 113 tonnes of food from landfill. The business of Satisfy Food Rescue closely aligns with the Councils minimize food waste.

There has been a close relationship with the WDC Community Teams, and the Solid Waste Asset team. Both recognize the work that Satisfy Food Rescue do and the submissions ask for the Council to come alongside this group.

There are other supermarkets in the district who could come on board with Satisfy Food Rescue and other food providers could also come on board. The current costs are mostly wages and some operating costs.

Satisfy Food Rescue seeks $20,000 funding annually for three years to continue their work and also to grow to add to the waste minimisation in the district.

The meeting was adjourned at 8.30pm to be reconvened on Wednesday 9 May 2018 at 1.00pm in the Council Chambers, 215 High Street, Rangiora.

CONFIRMED

__________________________________
Chairperson

__________________________________
Date
MINUTES OF A RECONVENED MEETING OF THE WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL, 
FOR THE HEARING OF SUBMISSION TO THE DRAFT LONG TERM PLAN 2018-2028, 
HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS, RANGIORA SERVICE CENTRE, 215 HIGH 
STREET, RANGIORA ON WEDNESDAY 9 MAY 2018 COMMENCING AT 1.00PM

PRESENT:


IN ATTENDANCE:

J Palmer (Chief Executive), S Nichols (Governance Manager), E Stubbs (Board Secretary) and A Smith (Committee Advisor).

The meeting adjourned at 3.03pm and reconvened at 3.37pm.
The meeting adjourned at 6.00pm and reconvened at 6.35pm.

1. APOLOGIES

Moved A Blackie second K Felstead

An apology for absence was received and sustained from Councillor R Brine. CARRIED

2. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

North Canterbury Radio Trust – Mayor D Ayers as Trustee.
North Canterbury Neighbourhood Support – Councillor W Doody as Chairperson.

3. HEARING OF SUBMISSIONS TO THE DRAFT ANNUAL PLAN 2018-2028

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME/ORGANISATION</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zumba Zing (Miranda Donnell) and</td>
<td>Ms M Donnell and Julz explained that they ran two group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julz.</td>
<td>exercise Zumba classes per week in the Fernside Hall with around 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>participants. Their submission was to ask for reconsideration of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>increase in fees for facilities such as the Fernside Hall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>They spoke about the benefits of group exercise including mental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>state of mind/friendships/fitness. They explained that many of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>participants including mums with young children would not be able to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>afford to attend if the cost was increased. Currently they charged a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$5 concession fee but they would need to increase that to $7-$8 per</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>person if the fees were raised from $6/hr to $20/hr to hire the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fernside Hall as they had been informed. They believed a community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hall was for the whole community to use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Councillor Doody asked if the classes were a business or a not for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>profit. Ms Donnell explained that they were not</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Councillor Barnett noted that fees had not been increased since 2012 and asked what they believed a reasonable increase would be. Ms Donnell believed $10/hr would be reasonable. It was not the huge leap from $6 to $20/hr.

Pegasus Resident’s Group (Rhonda Mather and Ronel Stephens)

Ms R Mather followed on from Zumba Zing commenting that feedback from Woodend and Pegasus Community Centre users had been quite disturbing. Users were surprised and not happy about the increase in charges. They would look to consolidate by reducing the number of classes and charge more. A number had said they would not book beyond the end of June. They provided a valuable service to the community and if you punished those businesses, you punished the community. It was the opposite direction to growing a community.

With regard to the Pegasus Community Centre, the Pegasus Residents Group (PRG) were grateful to have that. It had been open 11 months and had 12 regular users with multiple classes with 80hrs use per month.

Ms Mather showed a graph with the increase in use over the last three months. The centre had 100m² of useable space. In addition, there was shared storage space and a toilet at the rear. Ms Mather referred to the Council proposed level of service for community facilities. She raised issues where the centre did not meet this level of service.

- A maximum of 50 people rather than 80.
- No smaller room.
- No oven – no ventilation for one.
- Insufficient toilets.

Ms Mather referred to the October 2017 report by Sue Sutherland, which recommended a 260m²-230m² community facility within the next three years and asked why it had not been included in the LTP.

Ms Mather explained what the PRG wanted. She noted that it would help cater for Ravenswood also as that progressed.

- Preferably purchase commercial land available on the corner of Pegasus Main Street and Waterloo Quay for a purpose built facility.
- Purchase the current centre and renovate.
- Get the additional space once Ray White vacates its premises, there would be an additional three toilets.

Ms Stephens introduced herself as the Community Wellbeing Coordinator in the PRG. She explained that current facility was not adequate for big functions and the...
school hall was not always available for public use, in addition, they did not make equipment available and charged a high rental. A church group was using the community centre however, that required restricted numbers and in addition the acoustics were not good. There were limitations with the indoor space and it was only suitable for small, passive activities. Ms Stevens brought to attention a number of uses for which the space was not suitable including for family planning and Plunket providers and youth development.

Ms Mather concluded by saying that the PRG proposed a new permanent community facility for Pegasus prior to Rangiora Library improvements and the PRG was ready and willing to engage.

| Rangiora Gymnastics  | Ms Stef Van Meer spoke about the need for a new facility for the Rangiora Gymnastics Club. They had a large and dedicated Committee. She noted that the North Canterbury population was growing and becoming more diverse. Currently they had year on year growth and had 240 members. They were supported by a full time international coach. Ms Van Meer highlighted the benefits of gymnastics.  
Ms Esther Hyde provided some background on how other large clubs were run in Christchurch. There were two – QEII and Wigram, and they were delivering a great program. Christchurch City Council supported both clubs. At QEII, the Council had donated land and at Wigram, they provided affordable rent. They provided programs to schools and had over 2000 participants. The Rangiora Gymnastics Club believed they could do the same if they access to facilities. She noted that Selwyn District Council was supporting a new Gymnastics Facility being built in Rolleston.  
Ms Van Meer explained some of the current constraints of Rangiora Gymnastics.  
∑ NCSRT owned the current facility and used the clubs equipment 9am to 3pm for their schools program.  
∑ Currently restricted to after 3pm and weekends for their program.  
∑ Facility did not meet space requirements (sharing with ICE trampolining) – new floor that could not be fully installed. Lack of space for competitions and spectators.  
∑ Health and safety issues – space and temperature regulation.  
∑ No opportunity for growth.  
There was a lack of affordable appropriately sized building. |
Councillor Williams asked if the Council was able to provide land would the club have the facility to fundraise for its own building. Ms Van Meer said that they would prefer land and building however if they had land they could build fit for purpose.

Councillor Doody asked if they could use the multipurpose facility. Ms Van Meer explained that their equipment needed to stay up and was not suitable where multiple users were in the same space.

Councillor Atkinson asked did it matter where they were located in the district and Ms Van Meer replied that it did not. There participants were from all over North Canterbury.

| Community College North Canterbury (Trina Lafaele + 10 students from the College) | Ms Lafaele explained that the students at the Community College were attending second change education for 16 to 19 year olds. They looked at vocational pathways including sport, physical fitness, outdoor recreation and sports coaching. The students helped out were needed for sport coaching in the Waimakariri and Hurunui.

Ms Lafaele introduced two students from the college Tsubasa Webb and Matthew Rawlin, who explained why they supported the multiuse sports facility. Points they highlighted were:

- Help achieve a career in sport
- Be able to walk to the facility from class – save time.
- Access to facility that they do not have in non-mainstream school.
- Resources were currently restricted.
- Able to train/learn in all weather.
- Great for new sports to be introduced.

Ms Lafaele explained that the main reason the college supported the facility was that they lost the ability to play in sport as they were not mainstream education. Parks could be cramped. The new facility was inclusive and large enough for different groups to use.

Councillor Barnett asked the students where they were from. Four were from Kaiapoi, one Oxford, two Loburn/Okuku, one Woodend and two Rangiora. |

| Janet Collier | Mrs J Collier spoke to the Council to disagree with the proposal for the multi-use sports facility. She did not have an objection to the centre rather the cost of it. It looked like it was all to be funded by the ratepayers. She noted that when the East Belt sports centre was built, there had been a phone around residents and sporting bodies to ask people to donate. Her family had donated at that time as her children would use the centre. |
Mrs Collier asked if there were any other options for funding the centre rather than it all going on rates and she noted that there was to be a 4% rate rise. Mayor Ayers commented that the 4% was an average and included across the district. The $91 was included in the percentage.

Mrs Collier advised that when they had moved from England 44 years ago it was in part because they could not afford the rates in England and it felt like it was coming full circle. She did not believe the sports centre classified as a total community asset like the library or the swimming pool as the sports centre had a narrow age group. She believed the capital amount should be spread rather than just on rate payers.

Councillor Doody asked if Mrs Collier would use the sports centre for sports such as bowls or age concern events. Mrs Collier advised she would attend an age concern event. She attended a yoga class at Rangiora High School and noted halls were useful for those activities.

Oxford-Ohoka Community Board (Doug Nicholl - Chairperson)

Mr D Nicholl went through the Board’s submission highlighting;
The Community Board totally supported the multi-use centre and believed it would be a great asset to the district.
The Board supported kerbside collection and consultation.
The Board supported community facilities but were concerned at the cost of the Woodend-Pegasus Library compared to what was spent in Oxford. They were supportive of the Ohoka Domain upgrade and believed the Ohoka Bush was a tremendous asset. They supported the Rangiora Library upgrade.

The Board would like to see decorative flags flying in Oxford at Christmas, there was not sufficient local business support for those and they requested Council support.

The Board would like to see the area where the Oxford Farmers Market was held to be sealed as it had an uneven surface. They requested upgrades for the Oxford Skate Park. There was a perception of excessive speed on Oxford Main Street however speed measurements showed the average speed was 48km/hr – following the recent presentation from NZTA it was possible a 40km/hr speed limit for Oxford Main Street may be sensible. There was a push for charging points for electric cars.

The Board were in support of Ashworths Road between Mill Road and Diversion Road being sealed in the next six to eight years. The tree root damage on German Road...
and Browns Rock Road had been raised eight years ago and fixing it was becoming urgent. There was also tree root damage to Mountseys Road.

Glyphosate – was an emotive issue, there was a need to minimise negative impacts and loss of habitat. Tree plantations needed to be replaced so that the district did not become short on supplying its own timber.

Oxford Area School – the Board suggested a footpath on both sides of the road with a pedestrian crossing was required. For many years the board had been pushing for improved footpaths in Oxford without success and the board would like to see positive movement on that. The extension on the footpath on Mill Road, Ohoka had also been in the pipeline for a number of years.

Councillor Williams asked if the board had discussed the proposal for a private funder to build a multiuse centre. Mr Nicholl noted the board were aware of that proposal but had not formally discussed. The feeling was the Council owned was better, and the private proposal was not in the right area. The Council’s proposed location was better.

Councillor Doody asked how long the footpath extension at Oxford High School was and Mr Nicholl estimated 400m to 500m.

Councillor Meyer asked in reference to the 40km/hr on Oxford Main Street, whether Mr Nicholl believed that the timing was right to test the wider community, and had it been spoken about in Oxford? Mr Nicholl commented as far as he was aware, through Board members, many Oxford residents wanted the reduced speed.

Ohoka Drainage Advisory Board (Doug Nicholl)

Mr D Nicholl believed the flooding in Mandeville was due to the system not being able to cope with under current and storm water flow. He noted that the Ohoka Drainage Advisory Board wanted to see the planned diversion of undercurrent flows to be brought forward from years eight and nine as at present, to years one and two. He commented that it was a major problem for quite a few people and needed to be addressed.

With regard to the Ohoka Stream, D Nicholl believed that ten years ago the water level was 1metre lower than what it is now. He accepted that there had been more rain, however believed it was due to the stream needing to be cleaned out properly. It was a major job. The equipment the present drainage contractor had was not big enough. ECan restricted cleaning out of the stream due to trout spawning.
Councillor Doody asked when the Ohoka Stream flooded did it affect Mr Nicholl’s property? Mr Nicholl explained that springs on his property were hydraulically linked. His property was not affected particularly during flooding.

Councillor Stewart asked if the work done in the last few weeks at considerable expense made any difference? Mr Nicholl commented that the water level would be 100mm lower, however it was still definitely 0.5m higher than this time last year.

Councillor Felstead noted that the submission referred to the subdivision and asked if one subdivision was affected or was it a wider problem. Mr Nicholl replied that south of Tram Road was the worst affected however, there was also a problem on the north side especially between No10 Road and McHughs Road.

Ohoka Residents Association (J Lynn) Mr John Lynn presented the submission in support of the Ohoka Domain Upgrade occurring in the proposed 2018/19 year. It was also pleasing to see the Ohoka Domain Pavilion repair work underway. The Group thanked the Council for their support regarding the Gate Keepers Lodge.

A key matter the Group drew to the Council’s attention was the request for an extension of the footpath between Bradleys and Whites Roads, primarily for safety reasons. The Group also requested that when undertaking the Skew Bridge upgrade consideration was given for a pedestrian/cycleway lane as it would benefit the safety of all users.

Mr Lynn advised the speed indication signage in Mill Road was shown to be beneficial and suggested additional use would be good.

The group were sympathetic to residents in Mandeville and supported their requests for the 2027/28 funding allocated for flooding matters being brought forward to 2019/20. The Group were supportive of more riparian planting along neighbourhood waterways and supportive of the Council’s current position on glyphosate.

Mayor Ayers enquired if the footpath between Whites and Bradleys Road would be acceptable if it was not sealed but had a crusher dust finish. Mr Lynn responded that it would be an improvement from what is currently there.

Councillor Williams enquired if it was known how many houses or users would support the cycleway proposal. Mr Lynn advised there were approximately a dozen houses in Whites Road, then the subdivision in Bradleys Road. Families currently avoid the main road,
commenting that the cycleway would be used by many people as there are various walking groups, along with residents and on market Fridays people often explore the area and a safe cycle/pedestrian track would encourage that.

| Oxford Arts Trust (Areta Wilkinson) | Ms A Wilkinson spoke of seeking additional funding to the current recreation grant and concern that any changes or decreases to the recreation grant would have on the Trust. The Group requested an increase in funding support for operational expenses to enable enhanced arts operations to occur. The Group currently receive $4,800 from the Council through the recreation grant but are seeking a longer term view. Fees and operational expenses were putting strain on the Trust functions, with an example of the building being recently valued and the subsequent insurance premium increasing $1,000 from the previous year. The Group were requesting $8,900 each year for the next three years.

Ms Lynley McDougall outlined how the Oxford Arts Trust adds value to the Oxford experience, and the requirement to fund administrators for what they do. Currently there is a large volunteer basis, but the Group require a paid administrator. Seeking support in kind, advice and/or mentoring for strategies would also be appreciated from the Council.

The final request related to the implementation of public art in Oxford. A Wilkinson spoke of the benefits of art in the community and a proposal to increase art vibrancy. Art, workshops, exhibitions, education and retail is provided by Arts in Oxford. A Wilkinson stated that there needs to be a higher valuing of arts by the Council.

Mayor Ayers stated he was a member of Friends of Oxford Art, as were several other Councillors, however this was not a conflict of interest.

Councillor Gordon sought clarification on expenses. A Wilkinson confirmed the latest insurance information was not included in the financial information the Group provided in their submission.

Councillor Barnett asked where the income sheet information is as the Councillors only have expenditure sheet. A Wilkinson advised the income sheet was not provided. Staff have been provided an accountability form and set of accounts with the last recreation grant funding application. Income is based on donations, fundraising and art sales. It was advised the gross profit is $43,000 with operations requiring $18,000. Not all expenses information has been supplied.
Richard Connelly

As a keen sports photographer Mr Richard Connelly spoke in support of the proposed new stadium/facility (his preferred term) to allow for the development of sport, recreation, cultural and business events. Mr Connelly commented positively on the hockey facility at Coldstream Road and Dudley Pool; both being facilities that he does not use, but was comfortable to contribute to through rates.

Mr Connelly commented on the Ohoka Hall facility for basketball use and other events, but believes a larger facility is needed to cater for the district’s basketball needs. He reflected on the Ashburton Stadium and his personal experience of attending events at the facility. Also compared the four courts of Ashburton catering for a local population of 33,000 people verse the Waimakariri population of 59,000 people with what he considers a lesser facility. Mr Connelly believes a five court layout would be more beneficial, especially given the high growth of the Waimakariri district.

Councillor Williams enquired if Mr Connelly had compared the other facilities the Waimakariri District has against what other districts have such as hockey, soccer, pools. Mr Connelly responded that he had not done such a comparison and had only considered facilities for high school tournaments, primarily being for basketball as that was the sport his family followed.

AFTERNOON TEA BREAK

The meeting adjourned at 3.03pm and reconvened at 3.37pm.

Christine Levett

Ms Christine Levett reiterated key points of the submission. She noted that the Garrymere water scheme proposed upgrade cost was a surprise for residents and many were considering forming a residents group. Residents were seeking that the rates proposal be slowed down for 12months so the emotion can be eased and look at joining a community organization in partnership with the Council and explore all the options.

Ms Levett commented on many aspects of water being a ‘hot topic’ for communities. 41 residents were directly affected and there was a desire to foster a better relationship with the Council.

Ms Levett reflected on a recent public meeting and the impacts of the Havelock North investigation. She believed the proposed Garrymere situation is a quick fix and implementation of new aspects could be three to five years away.

Ms Levett stated she has become aware of a similar situation in Marlborough (Seddon) and residents had formed a Landcare group in 2016, commenting on a cost share arrangement across the whole district. It was suggested the Council consider other options and proposed relooking at that situation, including if something similar to Seddon could be investigated.
The local MP for Kaikoura electorate is aware of the situation. It was acknowledged many Councils were going through similar situations as a result of the Havelock North situation.

Ms Levett drew attention to the Council’s Rating Review being proposed to occur in 2022 and suggested it gets reviewed earlier.

Ms Levett accepted that residents all shoulder costs on Council service aspects that you may not use. Ms Levett commented on Hurunui District Council had taken a different approach and reinforced an earlier suggestion to take another wider look at what approaches other councils have taken or are considering.

Mayor Ayers clarified that the Garrymere rate is included in the draft proposal but the timing could be moved.

Mayor Ayers offered comment on residents groups and Landcare groups.

Mayor Ayers commented on the Rating Review and only looking at 3waters areas to 2022 however dates can change at the decision of Council.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Big Brothers Big Sisters (Karen Shepherd)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frank Endacott (Patron), Malcolm Garvan (Chairperson) and Ms Elli Le Gros (Manager)</strong> presented with additional supporters in the gallery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A brief background was provided on the reasons for the group, which is funded through donations, grants and fundraising. 247 children have gone through the system over the past ten years. The Group were seeking $5,000 for after school activities and outlined the importance of such social development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The group has one full time and one part time person, with all other persons being volunteers. Due to budget constraints and reduced funding over the past two years the Group have cut back on the number of children able to participate in the programme. Last year a limit of 75 children was introduced, and this year it has been capped at 50 children due to funding constraints.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lilly (13) provided an outline of benefits to participating in the programme over last three years and her positive role model in her mentor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piper (9) provided an outline of benefits she had found by participating in the programme for the last 18 months.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Le Gros spoke of a recent match and advantages and benefits to both the mentored and mentor. Comment was made of the value to the community because of the programme. The longest match has been going for nine years and the positive outcomes of such a relationship. There was discussion on the reduction in drug use and crime participation by youth involved with BBBS.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A strategic plan was tabled and Mr Endacott outlined the types of events funds would be used for.

Councillor Williams enquired if BBBS were requesting $5,000 as a one off or seeking funding for additional years. Mr Endacott responded that they were specifically seeking $5,000 for the upcoming year but was open to further funding in future years.

Mayor Ayers thanked the group for the outreach into the community and the work that they do.

Councillor Doody having earlier declared a conflict of interest, sat at the back of the gallery.

Ms T Doe spoke of the work that the group undertake and the agencies that they interact with such as Police and Civil Defence. She commented on sustainability and open sharing of information and outlined what funding was being requested and why. Figures for work in WDC area was only as administration and not promotion and marketing. Approx. 30hrs North Canterbury per week was spent within the WDC area which accounted for 80% of the overall workload.

Year 2 the group envisaged an increase of hours 32hrs per week for the WDC area, (and an additional 8hrs within Hurunui).

Year 3 incorporates growth of the District and 40hours for the WDC area only. A further 10hours per week would be undertaken and funded from Hurunui.

Further information on funding breakdown was given to staff this morning (the pack would be electronically circulated to members tomorrow).

Ms Doe commented on skills, needs in the community and reaching people that are not on social media or email. Also commenting on what Selwyn District Council has ‘adopted’, and outlined the support and funding provided by Christchurch City Council. Both Councils utilize the Civil Defence aspect.

If funded the group would concentrate on core business and promote Council programmes such as ‘Down the Back Paddock’. Ms Doe spoke of positive impacts the group make on the community such as minimising isolation issues, reducing crime etc.

Just launched in Kaikoura District with the Get Ready CD aspect.

Councillor Atkinson asked Ms Doe if she thought that the Council should fund or the community push back to Government to fund? Ms Doe replied this sits with Council as a community as it was not just crime related. There is a small national contestable fund from the Police.
Councillor Barnett asked if they see some duplication from what their group does and Civil Defence with possibly the same people volunteering. Ms Doe spoke of the ongoing encouragement to people to volunteer across all aspects and does not see a double up.

North Canterbury BMX Club
(Aaron Clark)

Mr Aaron Clark advised the Club are wanting to upgrade the facility as it cannot hold major meetings in Rangiora due to the track being 16 years old and not up to a suitable standard. The Club would like to build a national standard track in Rangiora, subject to funding and land acquisition. Mr Clark spoke of recent Championships held in Christchurch over four days and the value injected into the local economy. A suitable track would take three weeks to build.

Councillor Doody clarified the proposal. Mr Clark advised the new track area would encroach 18 meters into the Pony Club land and would cost approx. $80,000.

Councillor Gordon enquired what discussions had occurred with the Pony Club. Mr Clark advised that he had had no conversations personally, however several years ago the Club was advised via Council and the Pony Club did not have an issue with the proposal at that stage. The Pony Club have built infrastructure further east and away from that proposed area.

Federated Farmers of New Zealand
(Elisha Young-Ebert)

Representing the North Canterbury Federated Farmers (NZ), were Mr Duncan Lundy, Ms Elisha Young-Ebert (Regional Policy Advisor) and Cam Henderson (Oxford farmer). Mr Lundy noted the increases of rates and whether this was fair as these do not relate to wage increases. Federated Farmers accepts that the Council needs to make provision for growth, but it believes there could be some fine tuning as to how it could be funded. Ms Young-Ebert also spoke on rates increases, noting that although the Council states the average rate increase per year across the District, will be about 3 – 4% over the next ten years, the average increase for most rural rate payers is 7 - 9%. The general rate increases are higher than the Uniform Annual General Charges (UAGC), and Federated Farmers would like to see the UAGC increase in line with the general rate. This additional UAGC revenue can then be used to reduce the property value-based General Rate. Currently rural property rates are increasing greater than any measure of the rate of inflation. With regard to the library project, it is suggested that the council fund half the cost of this capital project as the benefit for this is more for the urban residents than rural.

Mr Cam Henderson spoke personally as both a rural and urban ratepayer in the district. Mr Henderson farms near Rangiora.
Oxford, but lives in the Oxford township. 97% of his rural rates is based on capital rates value, whereas 50% of his urban rate is on capital value. He is happy to pay his share, but does not see this as fair. Mr Henderson would like to see a proportional increase on UAGC and capital value based, rather than the increases felt heavier in some areas of the district than others.

Councillor Barnett asked was Mr Henderson aware that the cost of roading in the rural areas is much higher? Mr Henderson suggested that he is already paying a higher proportion of roading rates for his rural property compared to his urban property ($6,000 vs $300 approx).

Mayor Ayers thanked the submitters, noting that farming is an important part of the community.

| Environment Canterbury (ECan Councillor Claire McKay) | ECan Councillor Claire McKay spoke on behalf of Environment Canterbury in support of the Waimakariri District Council Long Term Plan. The contributions that WDC Councillors and staff make to the regional forums was also acknowledged. ECan will continue to work with the Council in the regeneration areas in Kaiapoi and Pines Kairaki. ECan commends the Council commitment to giving effect to the Treaty of Waitangi. ECan acknowledges the work signaled in the LTP to meet requirements of the Land and Water Regional Plan by 2025. The continuing partnership of the joint Zone Committee was also recognized and the work to develop solutions to achieve the Canterbury Water Management Strategy targets in the Waimakariri zone. This includes the current work with the Zone Implementation Plan (ZIP) addendum. |
| Ken Turpin | Mr Ken Turpin spoke to his submission, voicing his concerns with the proposed multi-use sports facility that is included in the Draft LTP and the cost to every ratepayer to build this. Mr Turpin is disappointed that there hasn’t been any information provided directly from the Council on the charges to be put on the ratepayers (he has only heard this from the media) for such a facility and he said the Council needs to consult with every ratepayer regarding this. Mr Turpin believes this proposed facility should be a user pays facility. He has two properties to pay rates on, plus is in the Oxford No. 1 Rural Water Scheme for which there is potential to be a big increase for rates. This increase to cover the cost of the proposed multi-use sports facility will put undue pressure on all ratepayers, especially on pensioners. Rural roads are in bad condition and there needs to be more money spent on these. Mr Turpin noted that there is a lot of money spent on urban roads but nothing spent on shingle roads which are in bad condition. |
Edge Landscapes (Grant Edge)

Mr Grant Edge spoke to his submission which focuses on water management, and seeks the Council to adopt better management of waterways including planning and design issues. Mr Edge suggests that there needs to be better collaboration between various council departments working together, with an aim to achieve cost efficiencies for capital works projects and high quality environmental outcomes for the community. Regarding Stormwater – Mr Edge supports the Councils Bylaw, which should provide positive direction for the Council, though he could not see any $ amounts in the LTP to achieve the outcomes, and seeks this information. The Council will soon be required to deal with water quality issues which may involve a lot of money. Mr Edge suggests the Council should be setting aside money now to meet these costs.

Mr Edge would like to see some sub-catchment management plans and stormwater plans introduced to manage the waterways and would like some funding in the LTP to allow these plans to be developed (possibly two or three of these each year).

Climate change is coming and Mr Edge suggests including $2m per annum in the LTP to work on strategies to deal with this. There needs to be resourcing and funding to develop these measures. Also supports funding to be included in the LTP for the Kaiapoi River rehabilitation project, Cam River Fund work and Waimakariri Land and Water solutions programme.

Mayor Ayers asked is the Council talking to the right people now on these matters. Mr Edge suggests there could be further discussions regarding sub catchment plans. Large areas of biodiversity have been lost in this area through land clearance and there is work required to protect and halt the decline of any further areas of natural biodiversity. Environmental considerations need to be taken into account looking at the long term benefit and more gain.

Mandeville Residents Association (Karen Jackson)

The following Committee Members of the Mandeville Residents Association were present to speak to this submission: James Ensor, Richard Jackson (Mandeville Park), Des Lines (No 10 Road/Tram Road), Louise Douglas, Tom McBrearty (Redfern Lane) and Mike Tyree (Sandona). An apology was also noted from Lyndsay Eason (Clearview Lane). The Association has concerns regarding flooding and drainage in numerous areas of Mandeville and believes these matters should be given immediate priority within the Councils LTP.
Many photos were shown of different areas in Mandeville that experienced flooding in July, August and October 2017.

Mike Tyree advised he had moved into Sandona six years ago and there were no issues with flooding until 2014. The drains in Sandona run uphill and water can’t get out, as also the drains are full of grass all the time. This also causes a mosquito problem. The Bradleys Road end of Sienna Place needs attention.

Richard Jackson, Mandeville Park Drive, suggests having another culvert to stop flooding at the back of residential sections.

Des Lines, resident of Tram Road/No. 10 Road showed a property map with suggestions of a weir being installed. This would split the flow of water, with a portion to go down to the old Eyre River bed, rather than it going towards to Millfield, Braeburn and No. 10 Road.

Tom McBrearty, resident of Redfern Lane noted that residents are very concerned and this matter needs to be addressed. Residents don’t believe they should be fully rated for any remedial work.

Members would like a meeting with Council staff, noting that there had been a report promised by 4 April, but this hasn’t been received.

James Ensor concluded that it is hoped that the work can be brought forward in the current programme to deal with these flooding issues.

Members of the Association supports the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board submission to the LTP, requesting that “funding set aside in Year 8/9 to divert storm water away from Mandeville and to address flooding issues, to brought forward to Year 1/2 as this is a significant issue now.”

Gordon Smith

Mr Smith has lived in 44 years in Clarkville, and has a subdivision of a 3 hectare block with a septic tank. Mr Smith suggests that the Council reduce the compliant size of blocks to go down to 2ha, down from 4ha and that bigger blocks have caveats on them to stop any further subdivision in future. He believes 2ha blocks are big enough as lifestyle properties, and often 4ha are too big, and are not necessarily managed well. There could be restrictions put in place as to where these subdivisions of 2ha blocks would be located though, and they should be close in to existing facilities and services. It was suggested that for water supplies, two properties could share an existing well with meters installed, and have a big separation between septic tanks and water systems.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allen Cookson</td>
<td>Mr Cookson spoke to his submission, speaking on stopping population growth and feels it would be a good time for the Council to look at the future and to deal with this in the Long Term Plan. Mr Cookson believes that Rangiora is near an ideal population. He is impressed with the Long Term Plan but believes the future should be managed in a controlled way, rather than dealing with continued large population growth. Mr Cookson suggests that a group be formed to discuss this issue, made up of staff and Councillors. Councillor Felstead asked how it would work to stop people coming to live in the district. Mr Cookson said the Council has the power with granting of consents for subdivisions and developments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep New Zealand Beautiful (Greg Miller)</td>
<td>Messrs Greg Miller and Grant Edge presented this submission on behalf of Keep New Zealand Beautiful seeking funding to be included in the Long Term Plan for Koura Reserve/Northbrook Connections and for Flaxton Road improvements. It was noted the importance of preserving and enhancing the Koura Reserve and the Creek area. Mr Edge noted that Council departments need to be more collaborative to complete works. They are seeking funding for construction of a pedestrian bridge across the Northbrook stream to connect Koura Reserve with the Northbrook development which would enhance the area. Currently the entrance to Rangiora from the South on Flaxton Road, from the Fernside Road intersection, is visually ugly and the Committee would like this to be significantly upgraded. They envisage having an entrance area at the Threlkelds Road corner. The Committee are seeking funds to be included in the LTP to enable some planning to be done and some costings for these two proposed projects.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mayor Ayers thanked the members of Keep Rangiora Beautiful for all the work that is done around the town.

Compass FM (Sally Lane) Mayor Ayers left the table during consideration of this submission (as Trustee of Compass FM) and Deputy Mayor Felstead assumed the Chair.

Ms Sally Lane (Station Manager) and Mr Ron Van Till (Trustee) were present to speak to this submission. Compass FM is a charitable Trust, which has been on air for eight years. This is a community radio station, transmitting from Mt Grey, and reaching as far south as Timaru, Ashburton Banks Peninsular Christchurch Waimakariri and Hurunui areas. Staff are made up of two fulltime and three part time paid staff and eight volunteers. The station provides a valuable connection to the district and also emergency information. It provides work experience for students from Rangiora High School, as well as technical and voice support to major events in the district. The station only advertise North Canterbury businesses and support Waimakariri District facilities. It has a close liaison with Civil Defence, Fire and Emergency and Police. The Trust requests annually funding of $10,000 through this LTP submission for the replacement of technical equipment at the station, some of which is over seven years old. In turn Compass FM would like to provide a closer working partnership with the Council, with an opportunity for added exposure and regular updates of information.

Ms Lane confirmed that Hurunui District Council is also provide funding for this.

Mr Van Till said currently everything in the station is run on a shoestring budget and this is why they are seeking funding to upgrade their equipment which is aging.

DINNER BREAK

Gillian Giller Mrs Giller spoke on the multi-use court facility and believes the facilities planned are still available in other areas in the district. She suggests that some groups would not be able to afford to pay the costs to hire the rooms/courts. Mrs Giller supports this matter being deferred until 2028.

Kerbside collection - supports the Your Choice option.

Indigenous vegetation – Mrs Giller would like to see more funding included to protect this biological heritage in Waimakariri of flora and fauna. Current funding is inadequate. Current remnants are being lost to removal, areas shown in aerial photos show a loss from 95ha in 2005 to 35 hectares in 2015. Restoration sites are
artificial and superficial and are no substitute for original sites. The Council currently has an annual fund of $15,500 available to help owners look after scheduled vegetation sites, notable trees and historic buildings. This was allocated in 2005 and 2008, then in 2011 this money was reallocated to the Canterbury Earthquake Heritage Building Fund. There have been no allocations since then. Council staff are presently working on changes to make allocation of this fund more flexible. The amount available is not sufficient to protect the districts sites, and funding needs to be made available for another survey of sites. Selwyn District allocates $45,000 annually for protection of remnant vegetation, with a maximum limit of $5,000 for each application in any one year. Selwyn District Council also has a Biodiversity Coordinator promoting biodiversity protection. Hurunui District Council provides $10,000 annually through the Mainpower Hurunui Natural Environment Fund.

Mayor Ayers asks how would it be cheaper to delay the multi-use facility? Mrs Giller mentioned the alternative option that had been discussed in the media of a privately owned facility being leased to the Council.

Mrs Whittaker was also speaking on behalf of her daughter Laurens submission. Basketball is the highest growing sport in New Zealand with 18% growth between 2012 and 2015. There are 1,500 participants each year in North Canterbury. In the primary grades on Friday nights there are over 100 teams. Several teams also play in Christchurch competitions. Administrators for the North Canterbury Basketball Association operate from homes and have an operational budget of $250,000 per year. North Canterbury Basketball utilise 11 different gyms around the district. These venues are often dirty and need to be cleaned before they can be used. These facilities are not fit for purpose and there are many occasions when they are booked for other organisations, meaning a further shortage of courts for the Friday night games.

Mrs Whittaker implores the Council to be strong and build this multi-use sports facility. This needs to be established for the community and need to get over this Rangiora/Kaiapoi divide and just “build it”. Mrs Whittaker said that the members of North Canterbury Basketball believe the Council need to respond to the needs of the community and to make it happen. If Council says no, it is saying that money is more important than wellbeing.

Mr Ian Doody then spoke on his childhood when there were just two sports to play, rugby and cricket. There are many other sport choices for children now and his son plays basketball all year round, and sees it as a pathway.
There are currently barriers in the way to growing the sport in Waimakariri.

| Rangiora Southbrook Tennis Club  
( Laurence Smith, President Rangiora Tennis Club) | Mr Laurence Smith (President, Rangiora Tennis Club) spoke to this submission. Also present were Brian Heron (Southbrook Tennis Club), Stuart Wilson (Life Member, Rangiora Tennis Club), Johnny Carter (President North Canterbury Tennis Assoc) and Sarah Davidson (North Canterbury Junior Tennis). The Rangiora and Southbrook Tennis clubs support the building of a multi-sport facility and a ten court tennis facility on Coldstream Road, Rangiora There is a lack of a tennis complex in this district and this has held back the progress of tennis. North Canterbury compares poorly with other areas in Canterbury and the ten court facility would boost the sport. Both Rangiora and Southbrook Tennis Clubs have their own facilities which could be sold to provide a substantial funding contribution to the ten courts in Coldstream Road. This would revitalize the sport in Waimakariri, and allow the ability to host events and bigger tournaments The Clubs have a team of people who have commitment and business acumen. |

Mayor Ayers mentioned previous proposals that had been considered, and asked would the intention still to be a hub for all North Canterbury tennis, and some of the other clubs as well. Mr Smith had not been involved with this previous proposal, but advised that the intention now was for the Coldstream Road site to be the hub of tennis in North Canterbury. 

Ms Sarah Davidson spoke on North Canterbury junior tennis noting that there is growth in junior tennis numbers in the district. There is limitation of facilities on a Saturday morning to accommodate all junior players, and some courts are not well maintained. Ms Davison said it would be great to have a centralized facility for our region to be able to compete with other regions, provide a coaching facility and for tennis to be part of a wider hub for several sport. |

| Canterbury Cricket Association  
(Peter Devlin) | This submitter did not attend. |

| Sport Canterbury (Kevin Collier) | Kevin Collier, Places and Spaces Consultant for Sport Canterbury presented the submission and put in an apology for Julyan Falloon (Chief Executive). Mr Collier thanked the Council for continuing to invest in sport and recreation. Sport Canterbury believes that entrance fees and memberships to facilities be kept as affordable as possible, to allow participation in an active lifestyle and therefore asks the Council to reconsider the proposed increasing of the three and six month platinum membership charges (swimming and aerobics classes) (by up to 30%) which is included in the LTP. Sport |
Canterbury supports the proposed multi-use sports facility.

Although this was not included in the submission Mr Collier commented on the possibility of the introduction of a regional rate for sporting facilities and Sport Canterbury encourages this Council to join in this conversation.

Councillor Atkinson commented on the figures which indicate that 95% of people who recreate do this through walking and cycling, and questioned why are Sport Canterbury supporting investment in covered sports facilities?. Mr Collier said this comes down to choice, and not everyone does walking and cycling. For some people it is a means for getting to and from work each day.

Councillor Barnett asked if there enough sporting facilities? Mr Collier said with what is available now and with what is proposed, in both Christchurch and Waimakariri there would be enough indoor court facilities.

| Woodend Community Association (Andrea Rigby) | Mark Patterson spoke on behalf of the Woodend Community Association. Members support the building of a Multi-Use Sports Facility but there are concerns with the facility being fully funded by debt and asks would the Council have any noncore assets that could be sold to help fund the project, or has the Council considered seeking private or corporate investors to fund the project?

The Association supports building of a new community facility/library and urges the Council to set aside land for this. Woodend and the wider community of Pegasus and Waikuku is growing. Believes this facility should be given priority over expansion of the Rangiora library.

 Updating the Toilet Block and playground at Woodend Beach are two items that the Association has included as part of the WCA community project and would like to work with the Council. It is noted that the Council has these scheduled for renovations in 2025 and 2023 and the Association requests that the timeline for these renovations are brought forward to 2018/2019 and that the funding is increased. They also request assistance from the Council to provide assistance with a concept design for the proposal. The Association will work closely with both the Council and Tuhaitara Trust on this project.

 Mayor Ayers asked does the Association have any view on the location of a community facility. M Patterson said this was Ravenswood. |
| Woodend Combined Club (Elaine Cole and David Mills) | Mrs Elaine Cole and Mr David Mills were present, on behalf of the Woodend Combined Club to speak about the |
community charges. This organization is a successor of the former Woodend Combined Probus Club. This Club represents members who had back in the 1950-60’s helped to fundraise for the former Woodend Community Centre.

The submission requests that the increase in charges to hire the Woodend Community Centre should not apply to the Woodend Combined Club. Members could not afford an increase in membership fee that would be necessitated in the increase in charges to use Woodend Community Centre for its meetings.

Mrs Cole noted that the Club relocated from the Woodend Rugby Club in 2012-13 to the Woodend Community Centre, for its monthly meetings. The Community Centre hire charge was then at a rate of $8 for hiring the two rooms, plus the cafeteria and the locker. There is a membership of over 90 in this Club. The proposed rate increase of $30 to hire this room, is a 275% increase and is clearly a game changer for the Club. As President of the Club, Mrs Cole said she will be recommending that they go elsewhere for their meetings. This is not a fundraising entity, no entry fees are charged and for a lot of members it is a highlight of their month to take part in the social activity that they provide and contributed to the building in the first place.

Councillor Barnett asked what sort of increase could the members of the group cover? Mrs Cole said the issue is the increase itself, rather than how much an increase would be.

Mayor Ayers thanked Mrs Cole for the work that the Combined Club do.

Woodend-Sefton Community Board (Shona Powell - Chairperson)

Shona Powell (Chairperson) and Board members Rhonda Mathers, Andrea Allen and John Archer were in attendance.

Mrs Powell spoke to the submission, firstly spoke on the proposed multi-use sports facility and most concern is the cost to ratepayers. How do people get to the facility to use it – cycle paths? Bus services? Many of those the members of the Board spoke to were concerned at the cost but many of these community members would not be inclined to put in a submission and Mrs Powell noted that it is important not to just hear the voices in support of the proposed facility.

Noted the ground water that is lying at both Woodend and Waikuku beaches and that something needs to be done.
Library – the Board believes that the Council should secure some land in Ravenswood for a library service.

Pegasus Community Centre – this still needs to be part of the LTP and for something permanent to be planned. The current facility that is leased is well used and limited size.

Sefton Hall is not a council facility but is an important facility for the Sefton community, currently needing some earthquake repairs. The Board supports funding being included in the LTP budget for hall improvements as this is an important community focal point.

Public Transport – this is critical for connecting communities and suggests that the Council could be innovative, such as a mini-shuttle orbiter service for the main townships and new subdivisions.

Councillor Atkinson asked regarding the comment about little information on the Regeneration Projects – Ms Powell noted that this refers to the actual LTP document itself.

Councillor Doody asked about Sefton Hall and how much would it be considered is needed to get the earthquake repairs and upgrades completed? This figure was not known. Ms Powell noted that the Community Board will likely be able to assist with landscaping.

Mr Jim Gerard spoke to this submission on behalf of the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board and noted that the Councillors who are members of the Board were not involved in the writing of the submission.

The Board is very impressed with the Long Term Plan and this is a well-balanced plan, and the rates calculator was very beneficial. The Board fully supports all the proposals in the LTP and the base of the rating increases appeared to be sound.

The Board believes the Council needs to put a case to the Government for a rates supplement.

The multi-use sports facility – the Board members were unanimous in support of this facility which will be available for use by the whole district.

The Board supports the regeneration projects continuing, and for Kaiapoi to go ahead as quickly as it can.

Mayor Ayers noted his role as Patron of the Society and Councillor Barnett noted she is a member of the Society but did not take part in the writing of the submission.
Mrs Lyn James (President), Mr Dave Patrick (Treasurer), and Michelle Hampton (Vice President) attended and presented the submission.

Mr Patrick acknowledged the assistance and support that members of the musical society receive from WDC staff member Simon Kong, with setting up any technical equipment and sound system at the Rangiora Town Hall. He also offers advice on any ways to improve systems they may have in place. This assistance is very much appreciated.

As one of the largest and most regular users of the Town Hall, the members wished to comment on the proposed hire charge increases for town hall use, as indicated in the LTP fees and charges schedule. They voiced concern mostly with the proposed high cost of hiring the small auditorium at the Rangiora Town Hall, which would put the hire charge at not much different to the main auditorium. They saw this as quite a disincentive for using this space for smaller more intimate cabaret-style shows. The Society members would like to know if there was any opportunity for these rate increases to be reduced.

Michael Bate

Mr Bate spoke to his submission and presented a series of videos and photos showing the high levels of toxic algae bloom in the Ashley and Waimakariri Rivers, and also in the Groynes, which is in Christchurch City Council area. Mr Bates said our waterways currently are on the verge of complete collapse. Most Canterbury rivers streams and drains have toxic algae in varying degrees. This poisonous toxin will kill every living thing that digests it. One teaspoon of it is enough to kill a 20kg dog. Toxin also affects vital organs of a fish. The use of fertilizer has increased by around 900% in the last 20 years. Fertilizers also contain Cadmium which has rendered many soils toxic for varied uses. Very intensive farming is increasing the nitrates and phosphates in our many waterways causing an explosion of this toxin. Intensive irrigation is resulting in most rivers running at minimum flow or below for most of the summer. Irrigation also results in a rapid leaching of nitrates deeper into the soil. Farming intensification needs to be cut back now to a sustainable level or water quality will continue to deteriorate.

Mr Bate voiced his concern on botulism toxin in the wastewater system which is killing large numbers of native and introduced birds. After four years of botulism, nothing effective is being done by Council. Suggests that only a complete upgrade of the wastewater system will prevent environmental disaster happening to wildlife.
Mr Bate believes the Council has an obligation to be doing something about the state of the waterways. Mr Bate also showed many photos of the foam on Pines Beach.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 8.30pm.
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1. SUMMARY

1.1 This report provides the Council with a summary on the outcome of the Special Consultative Procedure (SCP) undertaken for the Draft Long Term Plan 2018-2028, Consultation Document and supporting information including the Draft 30 Year Infrastructure Strategy and Financial Strategy, which opened on Friday 9 March and closed Monday 9 April 2018.

Attachments:

i. Draft Long Term Plan 2018-2028 Consultation Document 4 Key Topics Comments & Preferences (Trim No.180523056432)

ii. Draft Long Term Plan 2018-2028 Summary of Submissions by Topics with Recommendations (Trim No. 180517054337) (this will be circulated separately in hard copy to members)

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report LTC-03-13-04/TRIM Number 180517054560

(b) Receives all 850 submissions and associated submission points raised by submitters, which are included in the ‘Deliberations Pack’ previously distributed to Councillors.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1 The Draft Long Term Plan 2018-2028, Consultation Document and supporting information including the Draft 30 Year Infrastructure Strategy, Financial Strategy and Draft Revenue & Financing Policy were adopted by the Council for public consultation on Tuesday 20 February 2018.

3.2 Public consultation opened on Friday 9 March and closed Monday 9 April 2018. The Council received a total of 850 submissions on the Draft Long Term Plan 2018-2028 and supporting information.
3.3 Public hearings were held over two days, with 28 submitters heard in Kaiapoi on Tuesday 8 May 2018 and 34 submitters heard in Rangiora on Wednesday 9 May 2018. Over the hearing period a total of 62 submitters were heard by the Council.

3.4 The community engagement and media campaign included sixteen face-to-face public engagements, with the majority (13) fronted by Councillors. The events ranged from supermarket stalls, to appearances at local shows and markets, as well as two high school visits, and presentations at formal meetings such as grey power, Rotary and the District’s youth council.

Attendance/Public engagement numbers at the various events ranged from between 30-50 people to in excess of 200. As well as being able to speak in person to councillors at these events, the public were both offered written collateral and the opportunity to submit their views on the spot through the presence of mobile tablets which enabled access to the online submission form.

The dedicated LTP page on the website produced a total of 4039 views throughout the duration of the consultation period. It was linked to a dedicated email-signature banner which carried set messages and accompanied all council emails sent in the lead up to (preview), during (promotion of campaign) and after (thank you for participating) stages of the campaign.

Our online activity was aligned with efforts in the social media space via Facebook. We made 30 LTP-related posts during the consultation period, collectively being viewed on a total of 96,300 occasions.

On the print media front, we ran three full page educational advertorials locally in the Northern Outlook newspaper explaining the LTP and what the key issues were. These were accompanied by a further 16 half (six) and quarter (ten) page advertisements that promoted the overall campaign, and the public councillor appearances, respectively.

Our advertising was complimented by a region-wide campaign throughout Canterbury, which saw the regional and territorial authorities combine to run three half page advertisements promoting the LTP in The Press newspaper.

4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1 Through face-to-face public engagements and meetings such as Rangiora High School and submissions from individuals independent of those engagements, a total of 82 submission forms have been completed which do not record all relevant name and/or address details.

These submissions have been included in the analysis of submissions. They are identified as Anonymous; Community College North Canterbury; and Woodend School submissions and the Council can still resolve to not consider them further.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submission Type</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community College North Canterbury</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend School</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>82</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Also, while a very small number of submissions were received a day or so after submissions technically closed these too have been included in the analysis of submissions in view of the changes made since the last LTP to mail delivery schedules.

4.2. There were four key proposals contained in the Draft Long Term Plan 2018-2028 Consultation Document (CD) the Council sought feedback on:

- Your Choice Kerbside Collection Services
- Multi-Use Sports Facility
- District Regeneration
- Community Facilities.

As with a number of the Council’s consultations, the feedback form provided for submitters to indicate their preferred option by making a conscious choice of the option they prefer from among two or three shown and to comment further should they wish. Many chose not to indicate reasons for their submission but they are not obliged to do so.

Water Management was also included in the CD for Council and staff to gain a better understanding of community thinking around managing drinking water quality; wastewater overflows; urban stormwater discharges; flooding; and our waterways.

Other matters the Council sought feedback on included proposed increases to fees and charges, establishing a Council Controlled Organisation for Waimakariri Public Art Advisory Trust, planning for a growing population, natural hazards and climate change, and changing government priorities, legislation and community expectations.

4.2 Overall, submissions regarding the four key proposals: Your Choice Kerbside Collection Services; Multi-Use Sports Facility; District Regeneration and Community Facilities were in favour of the Council’s preferred option (Option A) on how to proceed. A report with submitter comments and preferences of the four key topics is detailed in attachment (i) Trim No.180517054365. The table below summarises that data.

**Table: Key Proposals - Summary of Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Proposal</th>
<th>Option A</th>
<th>Option B</th>
<th>Option C</th>
<th>Total submission points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Your Choice Kerbside Collection</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Use Sports Facility</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Regeneration</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Facilities</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3 With 850 submissions received during the Special Consultative Procedure (SCP) process there were a number of other topics raised by submitters, some of those mentioned:

- Community Engagement
- Community Grants
- Corporate Accommodation
- District Development Strategy and Planning
- Electric Vehicle Charging Points
- Fees and Charges
- Garrymere Water Supply Scheme
- Governance
- Rates Affordability
- Roads and Footpaths
- Requests for Funding
- Speed Limits
- Water Management.

4.4 A report with council officer recommendations for all submission topics, to assist with Council deliberations, is provided in attachment (ii) Trim No.180517054337.

That being said, there are a number of submission topics that have separate reports providing responses and recommendations which will be presented during Draft Long Term Plan 2018-2028 Deliberations, some of these include:

- Community Facilities Provision (Trim No.180514052564)
- District Regeneration Programme (Circulated separately)
- Kerbside Collection Services (Trim No. 180515053012)
- Multi-Use Sports Facility (Trim No.180430046651)
- Multi-Use Sports Facility Operating Agreement (Trim No. 180516053790)
- Proposed Fees and Charges for Community Facilities. (Trim No.180514052641)
- Refuse and Recycling (Trim No. 180515053040)

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

5. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

5.1 Community views, including individuals, groups and organisations, were encouraged by way of a detailed and aligned media, advertising, digital and online promotional campaign designed to create awareness as to what the Long Term Plan was, promote the key issues within the Consultation Document, and stimulate feedback.

Community views were sought during the Draft Long Term Plan 2018-2028 submission period and hearings process.
6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1. Financial Implications
There may be financial implications in response to submissions and as an outcome of Council deliberations.

6.2. Community Implications
There may be community implications in response to submissions and as an outcome of Council deliberations.

6.3. Risk Management
The Draft Long Term Plan 2018-2028 is scheduled to be adopted by Council on Tuesday 19 June 2018. All submitters will receive a response to their submission detailing the Council’s decision as an outcome of deliberations.

6.4. Health and Safety
Not applicable.

7. CONTEXT

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

7.2. Legislation
Local Government Act 2002 Part 6 Planning, decision-making, and accountability Consultation section 83 special consultative procedure
Planning section 93 Long-term plan and section; 93A Use of special consultative procedure in relation to long-term plan; 93B Purpose of consultation document for long-term plan.

7.3. Community Outcomes

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

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

7.4. Delegations
The Mayor and Councillors have delegated authority to formulate the District’s strategic direction in conjunction with the community through the Long Term Planning process.
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KERBSIDE COLLECTION SERVICES

Option A: Council’s preference – Your choice collection service

Total number of submission points in support of Option A = 286

Submitter comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUB No.</th>
<th>Name/Organisation</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>James Girvan</td>
<td>This is one initiative that makes perfect sense.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Daniel Thompson</td>
<td>I think this is a better option than the current bags.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Tony Kean</td>
<td>We need options to suit people who take their own steps to reduce their waste such as composting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Ross &amp; Ellie Williamson</td>
<td>We favour the three bin service having seen it work so well in Christchurch. Why would the Council add costs by offering plastic bags for rubbish, (status quo) this would entail a separate truck from the bin pick up, adding to costs, plus keeping plastics going to landfill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Phillippa Rickerby</td>
<td>Services for rural areas, or a recycling centre at Cust/Oxford.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Barb Warren</td>
<td>If the Council wants to realise a more sustainable future it will have to encourage residents to change their habits and attitudes toward waste minimisation. Any initiative from Council that encourages a genuine ‘greener’ approach to waste is to be applauded. I also support this statement from your plan: &quot; Provision of a permanent education centre, and possibly a community garden-type area, will provide better opportunities for community education and will encourage the necessary change in attitudes.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Rhys and Alice</td>
<td>Environmental benefits - reduced landfill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Cathy &amp; David Price</td>
<td>And either reduce the cost of the rubbish bags which have collection included in the cost of the bag or collect it from pick up areas if you are not on the main roads. It is unfair to expect us to pay for collection when we have to drive over 20kms one way to drop of our rubbish bags.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Neil Wilkinson</td>
<td>I currently use another provider to take green waste and this would save this cost and be more efficient.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>May Young</td>
<td>Much more tidy. No concerns about bags being torn and rubbish strewn on the streets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Ian Sissons</td>
<td>I still think you will be making more revenue over winter re the organics bin. During the winter months lawns are not growing, so needs mowing less say every four weeks if that. Gardens also not doing much, so no extra cuttings or old plants in bins. Why should we pay for a service over winter that is not required as often as it is over Spring, Summer and Autumn? A fair way is to charge for only a monthly rate over winter, or get the bins chipped so it is a fairer options for those of us that will only use this organic bin occasionally. Remember a large percentage of your population are on fixed incomes and they do not increase at the same rate as you the council like to increase rates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB No.</td>
<td>Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Kelly Bint</td>
<td>We do not use a collection service so support a user pays system that encourages less land-fill rubbish and a considered approach to our own waste levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Mr Alex Vermuelen</td>
<td>Fix immediately.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Andrea Clinick</td>
<td>Been waiting for several years for change. Rubbish bags are environmentally unfriendly and we need to change our bad habits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Mr Luke Saunders</td>
<td>I like to have input, get varied and experienced opinions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Pete Johnson</td>
<td>Bit of a no brainer this one in my opinion. Great options for people to choose from. Let’s divert as much waste from landfill as we can.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Antony Oosthuysen</td>
<td>Please enter the 20th Century - bring in bins. Just do it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Tanya Whiteford</td>
<td>We don't get any service as rural delivery, but are happy to take stuff to recycling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Trevor Wright</td>
<td>This is a continuation of the 'user pays' choice like we have with the bags.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Nathan Punton</td>
<td>Example A is good. I do wonder how difficult and time consuming it will be for WDC to manage all the different 14 options proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I would like to see a 240L recycling, 140L rubbish and 80L organics that mirror the Christchurch City Council programme. We currently pay $282 a year to get our 240L rubbish emptied. We are unable to afford a separate organic bin, therefore our garden waste is just going to landfill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Colleen McDonald</td>
<td>Green waste bins would be great. The recycling system is working well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>Anita Ward</td>
<td>I hate using rubbish bags. They are messy and rip. Cats tear them up and they are heavy to carry out to the gate. We are definitely happy to pay for a red bin. This was the first thing we noticed when moving from Christchurch. I thought the bins were stolen. It was like going from a five star hotel to a one star.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>Peter Ward</td>
<td>Having moved to the Waimakariri from Christchurch after earthquake I cannot wait to have bins again. Rubbish bags are dangerous for a lot of waste and I am sick of making trips to the dump for green waste.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>Alexandra Ireland</td>
<td>As a family of four who recycles, composts food and garden waste we have one garbage bag per month. We would like to see the 'user pay' system rather than having to get more bins at a cost which we may hardly ever use. However it is more important that people dispose their garbage responsibly. We support the 'Your Choice' collection if this achieves that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>Stephanie Eldred</td>
<td>Option A would suit our needs more.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>Dr Clive Appleton</td>
<td>I agree with the Council's preference and that being able to have separate bins for green waste and general waste will be good. In fact it will be cheaper for me than the private bin collection I currently pay for. In fact this service should start as soon as possible, say by December 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
<td>John Watson</td>
<td>A no brainer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB No.</td>
<td>Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253</td>
<td>Ross Ditmer</td>
<td>I have never used the one standard service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269</td>
<td>Allen Kene</td>
<td>Wheelie bins plus public education to reduce waste going to landfill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271</td>
<td>Stef Fagan</td>
<td>We live in Oxford, we need a 'green bin' it is ridiculous we have to pay for dumping compost just to buy it again later on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280</td>
<td>Maura Loney</td>
<td>Please give us the three bins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282</td>
<td>Kaiapoi Co-operating Parish</td>
<td>For the Church, Hall and Minister's Residence we would like example 2 but with a 140L rubbish bin we only have one bin to share.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285</td>
<td>Tascha Lawry</td>
<td>N/A - Rural.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289</td>
<td>Esther Small</td>
<td>This is the most flexible choice to suit everyone’s needs. It will help reduce the rat and ant problem in Rangiora and encourage people to think about plastics and other recycling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297</td>
<td>John and Carole Houghton</td>
<td>Green bin would be very useful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td>Gail Ross</td>
<td>It is flexible and fair and should meet everybody's specific requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327</td>
<td>A Bashford</td>
<td>Green waste bin would be great.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>335</td>
<td>Stephen Power</td>
<td>User pays is the way to go I think.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>337</td>
<td>Tim Bloomfield</td>
<td>We need three bins like in Christchurch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>342</td>
<td>Eddy van Til</td>
<td>Considering we live on a lifestyle block, where refuse collection is not a Council provided facility, we already 'enjoy' a self-choice approach. Considering there is considerable disparity in pricing between the top and bottom options, the self-choice approach makes sense, though possibly a logistical nightmare.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>343</td>
<td>Debbie Booth</td>
<td>Great idea. In this day and age we need bins rather than bags. Much cleaner, safer and tidy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>344</td>
<td>Trish Keen</td>
<td>I would be absolutely stoked to see us move ahead with the three bin system as I hate seeing the rubbish strewn all over the place after cats and dogs have been on the loose. I also will find it cost neutral as I use an additional bin now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>345</td>
<td>Kelvin Ashby</td>
<td>There are sufficient options that everyone should be able to find one that suits them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>346</td>
<td>Thomas Bedford</td>
<td>My Wife and I wish to suggest a 5th option for smaller home owners, those in Retirement Villages and one person living alone in their own home. Would suggest that most people in these situations would no need 140 litre bins for rubbish and organics. The rates for this option should be $276 per year a savings of $45.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>351</td>
<td>Melanie Wildermoth</td>
<td>Bins better, we need to cut down on plastic bags also stops cats getting into the bags.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>353</td>
<td>Annette Williams</td>
<td>I feel it is better for our environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>357</td>
<td>Ray Freitag</td>
<td>Money well spent. Affects everybody.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>358</td>
<td>James A Ryan</td>
<td>I welcome this choice, however will wait until final service choices are made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>375</td>
<td>Toni Slemint</td>
<td>Would be great to include Loburn and other rural areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>381</td>
<td>Bill Byers</td>
<td>The addition of a Green Bin (Organics bin) would be acceptable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB No.</td>
<td>Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>408</td>
<td>Sarah Hosking</td>
<td>We need to get rid of plastic bags - better recycling and bins are well overdue. Also, we need better facilities for soft plastic recycling - make sure this can go into the bin that we can choose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>412</td>
<td>Jim Gerard</td>
<td>Need to ensure transition for those who already use a private operator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>419</td>
<td>Drucilla Kingi Patterson</td>
<td>Example 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>422</td>
<td>Jon Kiripatea</td>
<td>All 3 bins (red, green and yellow).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>423</td>
<td>Kim Kiripatea</td>
<td>We should have red and green bins also, and bi-yearly organics recycling/kerbside collection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>435</td>
<td>Glen McDonald</td>
<td>We are forever growing we need to keep up with Christchurch City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>461</td>
<td>Beccy &amp; Joe Creswick</td>
<td>Should be no option. Make it bins only, just like Christchurch City Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>472</td>
<td>G Thomas</td>
<td>Cost of rubbish bags.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>488</td>
<td>Gary Phillips</td>
<td>Want flexibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>489</td>
<td>Sian Phillips</td>
<td>Green waste would be great.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>494</td>
<td>Elaine H B Cole</td>
<td>Support this option because of flexibility and provision for organic waste.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>496</td>
<td>Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board</td>
<td>The Board supports the introduction of a two bin (recyclables and residual waste) waste collection for the proposed Waste Management and Minimisation Plan, and opposes the introduction of a Green Waste bin service. Supports the range of options being made available to households. The board seeks assurances that given that there is both choice and an opt-out provision that the Council will still actively seek to monitor and minimise costs. The Board further seeks assurances that the health and safety impact of retaining the black bag collections will be minimised (including trip hazards, content hazards for collectors, content spill and associated environmental contamination due to animal activities) and that all steps are taken to address environmental consequences associated with the continued use of plastic bags.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>497</td>
<td>Woodend-Sefton Community Board</td>
<td>The Board supports the Council in offering choice and consultation through the LTP process. The Board queries the arrangements for businesses especially new businesses and how this “commercial” waste can be minimised. The Board also urges strong action and enforcement of developer activities and associated waste “for example polystyrene and wall board. There are numerous instances of polystyrene pollution of green spaces, waterways and drainage channels situated near to both large and small building sites and developments. The Board suggests that penalty clauses be considered as a part of the consenting processes which are then strictly enforced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>498</td>
<td>Rangiora-Ashley Community Board</td>
<td>The Board supports the choices that are being presented in the Long Term Plan for consultation and feedback by those most directly affected. The Board remains concerned as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB No.</td>
<td>Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>499</td>
<td>Oxford-Ohoka Community Board</td>
<td>The Board supports the consultation via the LTP process and that relevant households may exercise choice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503</td>
<td>Duncan Lees</td>
<td>About time we had the choice for all options for recycling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>524</td>
<td>Rodney Butt</td>
<td>Extend kerbside collection areas especially recycling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>530</td>
<td>Stuart Smith</td>
<td>Happy how the system works.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>531</td>
<td>Rodger Welsh</td>
<td>Compostable - that bin would be too small for us. Personal preference is to use the Resource Centre to dispose of green material.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>535</td>
<td>Chris Garrick</td>
<td>Chance to opt out and continue to use independent contractors etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>541</td>
<td>Grant Stephens</td>
<td>I used to live in Christchurch and remember when we had plastic bags etc. and transferred to the new system. There was much talk that it was a waste of money and time. However, in the following years I personally saw our rubbish levels drop and recycling and green waste able to be used grow which was great. It comes at a cost but in the end is so much better that I think it would be a shame if the council did not approve it. I would like though for it to be the residents’ choice rather than the owner as we rent in Rangiora and I worry that even if it is approved we won’t get bins as it is cheaper for the owner to continue to make us pay for the bags. I would be happy to cover the rise in rates on our property through my rent if necessary but may not be given the option.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>548</td>
<td>Judith Schumacher</td>
<td>Looking forward to having three bins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550</td>
<td>Jacob LaValley</td>
<td>Strongly support having the option to choose as desired.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>552</td>
<td>Andrew Hegarty</td>
<td>Good options for individuals to choose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>558</td>
<td>Gillian Giller</td>
<td>The 'Your Choice' option provides flexibility for residents. They would have an opportunity to minimise their costs for an essential service. This option would also provide the District with the opportunity to minimise waste to landfill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>559</td>
<td>Nancy Sutherland</td>
<td>Allowing householders to choose which kerbside collection service they want enables each household to decide which method best suits it; for example, some households have little or no compostable material for collection as they compost on-site whereas others do not have composting facilities on their properties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>560</td>
<td>Linda Stewart</td>
<td>Option A in my view will work if the service offered is one choice only - a three bin system. It cannot offer a competitive price and still be tailor-made and be a competitive price cost to ratepayers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>562</td>
<td>Sherrienne Nation</td>
<td>I am all for the three bin selection, however I strongly oppose the multiple choice options. It should be everyone has the three bins or we don’t have them at all. We need to be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB No.</td>
<td>Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>563</td>
<td>Lesley Ottey</td>
<td>I don't need a green waste bin, I compost everything plus my neighbours and the street leaves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>602</td>
<td>K J Claxton</td>
<td>Don't bring it into rural lifestyle areas which at present don't have it. We don't want another (tax) rate burden.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>603</td>
<td>Jo Kane</td>
<td>Support council’s preference - your choice collection services, but question both the administration and ongoing operational costs to deliver these services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>605</td>
<td>Janet Collier</td>
<td>My only concern is that it could put people out of work who already collect rubbish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>616</td>
<td>Christopher Storm</td>
<td>I fully support the &quot;You choose&quot; rubbish plan 100%. Make it happen ASAP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>651</td>
<td>Woodend School</td>
<td>Extend to Ashley rural.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>667</td>
<td>Federated Farmers of New Zealand</td>
<td>Recommends That Council proceeds with this fair and progressive waste management proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>670</td>
<td>Evelyn Zuberbuhler</td>
<td>Crucial to reduce rubbish going into landfills. If we're serious about our environment then we need to ensure people are given options so that rubbish to landfill is reduced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>679</td>
<td>Jo George</td>
<td>Love if there was a 'Rubbish' bin like the recycled on, Green collection would be good, but Rubbish better.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>685</td>
<td>NP &amp; AE Gregory</td>
<td>This issue is dragging on too long, surely with the latest votes a decision can be made soon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>709</td>
<td>The Brook Bar</td>
<td>Can you please incorporate Threlkelds Road?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>721</td>
<td>Jesse Leen</td>
<td>Nice work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>725</td>
<td>Joan Lumber</td>
<td>Would be great to put out instead of getting bags out in morning to try and stop them being torn open by animals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>730</td>
<td>Jennie Marsh</td>
<td>We can’t see how 2 bins (example 2) @ $181 per year can go to 3 bins (example 1) @ $321 per year. Interesting calculations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>731</td>
<td>Tonya Bristow</td>
<td>Let’s get this going please, it is long overdue. Like that there are options for all people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>775</td>
<td>Glen &amp; Robyn Osborne</td>
<td>Currently only recycle why not waste/green too.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>804</td>
<td>Philip Beare</td>
<td>Services provided should be 'needs' based.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>833</td>
<td>Lisa Hetherington</td>
<td>Having previously lived in Christchurch and having a three bin system was much better than bags, cleaner and easier to use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>842</td>
<td>Mr B Fordyce</td>
<td>Extended to Ashley Rural.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>858</td>
<td>C J Young</td>
<td>Good to see choices.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
KERBSIDE COLLECTION SERVICES

Option B: No change - 1 standard service
Total number of submission points in support of Option B = 87

Submitter comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUB No.</th>
<th>Name/Organisation</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Kathryn Robertson</td>
<td>Having bins for general waste does not encourage people to recycle. However, if waste and compost bins are introduced, they should definitely be optional, so that people who compost at home and do not require more than the occasional rubbish bag do not have to pay for additional services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Sarah Shore</td>
<td>Localised collection depots for recycling for the many ratepayers who don’t receive a council collection service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Sandra Joy</td>
<td>Supernatants can’t afford any rate rise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Michael Bate</td>
<td>What we have works. Most cost effective. More important things to spend money on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Keighley Robertson</td>
<td>I don’t know anything to do with this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Liz Innes</td>
<td>I am happy with the service I currently get.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Bella Whaley</td>
<td>We don’t have this available to us so n/a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Linda Marion McKitterick</td>
<td>Do not change - it is not broken no need to fix it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>Alan &amp; Joan Orchard</td>
<td>Two pensioner’s in house so present service good.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Happy with the way it is.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>Suzanne Thurlow</td>
<td>There is a flexibility in how many bags are used. Therefore the cost can be less for a small household, regarding the number of bags used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Woodend Combined Friendship Club</td>
<td>Green waste is put in Village bins and moved to Council refuse centre by the Gardner. I only put out my bag 3/4 weeks as I have little household rubbish. Any other option I would be paying for something I don’t need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247</td>
<td>Jeff Rogers</td>
<td>I find the current service adequate and that I don’t have enough space for extra bins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>This suits me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>324</td>
<td>Pam Boyle</td>
<td>Don’t get it not fair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>411</td>
<td>Jos Baker</td>
<td>I’m a council rentals tenant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>414</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Happy the way it is.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>416</td>
<td>Prue Baines</td>
<td>By composting my household scraps my weekly rubbish fits into one supermarket plastic bag. I for one have no need or space to have more bins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>417</td>
<td>J &amp; P Hardy</td>
<td>Our very good and capable caretaker looks after our rubbish and recycling at River Town Villas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>424</td>
<td>Corbin Day</td>
<td>It’s good now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>469</td>
<td>Brenda Baynon</td>
<td>Recycling bin fortnightly works well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>473</td>
<td>Wendy Smith</td>
<td>Very happy with what we have now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>551</td>
<td>M Farr</td>
<td>It works well here in Oxford.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>553</td>
<td>Norma McLaren</td>
<td>Encourage residents to compost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>528</td>
<td>Garry Leech</td>
<td>Working well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB No.</td>
<td>Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>561</td>
<td>Lester Tidball</td>
<td>We are happy to do our own sorted recycling and take to the Transfer Station. Our Green Waste goes into our Worm Farm and we are happy to purchase bags when required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>586</td>
<td>Madeleine Burdon</td>
<td>This system suits me well as with composting and large gardens nearly everything is recycled. I would use my bin only bimonthly and use a rubbish bag maybe monthly. Maybe have more localised green waste facilities to encourage localised use and save on waste.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>Claire Chatterton</td>
<td>Avoids dumping waste. Same rule for all easier to manage. Environmental - goes where 'supposed to go to.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>632</td>
<td>Dianna Slater</td>
<td>We live rurally so take our rubbish to the tip and recycling to the tip.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>641</td>
<td>Grey Power North Canterbury Association (Inc.)</td>
<td>After thorough consultation between our organisation and Council staff, the view is unchanged for the reason that the financial pressure on mostly fixed incomes is unacceptable. The &quot;Your Choice options are too expensive to be tailored to requirement. Proposals should consider reducing the cost option to one size fits all. Only the bin sizes should be tailored between small or standard to suit single living and refuse?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>657</td>
<td>Trevor Doran</td>
<td>Fine as is.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>680</td>
<td>Thomas Glenn</td>
<td>Council are changing kerbside collections to once a fortnight. It should be the status quo. By changing to a fortnightly service means doubling the rates on collections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>692</td>
<td>S H Jackson</td>
<td>Please we now have high enough rates without adding more to them. I totally disagree having to pay more each year. A choice please.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>743</td>
<td>Nathan Hurley</td>
<td>Convenient for my family now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>808</td>
<td>Penny Horton</td>
<td>Happy with current service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>844</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Being a retired couple with very little rubbish we prefer to stay as we are.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>861</td>
<td>David Blackwell</td>
<td>Example 4. As previous submissions, we compost and recycle - only put out 1 bin every 6 weeks and 1 bag every 4 weeks. Council have recognised different households have different rubbish requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>863</td>
<td>Shirley Cairns</td>
<td>Option B rubbish collection at $86/year - people are on tight budgets already.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## KERBSIDE COLLECTION SERVICES

Submitter comments – No Option selected

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUB No.</th>
<th>Name/Organisation</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Jeremy Richards</td>
<td>I have no kerbside collection at this address and the plan does not include any provision for this in the next 10 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>Community College North Canterbury (Kristian)</td>
<td>We really need this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>Dr Rose Washbourne</td>
<td>Not applicable - no service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>Louise Brooks</td>
<td>Example 2 Fortnightly red and yellow bin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267</td>
<td>John Richardson</td>
<td>Not applicable. Any kind of collection service would be an improvement on what we have currently which is nothing. I transport all of our recycling and other refuse to the Transfer Station yet my rates are very high.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290</td>
<td>Desray Lithgow</td>
<td>There is no kerbside rubbish collection where we live at Okuku. Each house in our area arranges and pays for their own rubbish collection. This cost is 16.25 per fortnight, household paid, not rates paid. It is only available fortnightly, so really there is no choice out here for us unless one feels a monthly pick up is acceptable. Health wise, I don’t think so. There is no recycle collection. Each house organises and drops their own recycling in to the recycle centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298</td>
<td>Paul Markholm</td>
<td>3 bin. Smaller Recycling bin and bigger Organic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>David Cartwright</td>
<td>I am not in the Council’s collection area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315</td>
<td>Kandy Stranger</td>
<td>Doesn’t apply, no collection in Sefton.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320</td>
<td>Leeann Jones</td>
<td>I pay rates and live rural but don’t get any collection service, so feel this could be looked at.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>359</td>
<td>Chris Lawry</td>
<td>N/A. Rural.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>372</td>
<td>Sabrina Ilett</td>
<td>Doesn’t apply. Rural.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>376</td>
<td>Sally Pearson</td>
<td>We moved to the area (Loburn) and disappointed that we have no collection at the gate. Plus the bags do not compost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>585</td>
<td>Nick Jones</td>
<td>I have no collection service in a now residential built up area. Would be nice to get that service there, as the rates are the same.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>610</td>
<td>David Cottrell</td>
<td>N/A in my area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>622</td>
<td>Barry Woodham</td>
<td>Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**MULTI-USE SPORTS FACILITY**

**Option A – Council’s preference start now**

Total number of submission points in support of Option A = 639

### Submitter comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUB No.</th>
<th>Name/Organisation</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Simon Green</td>
<td>Absolutely must start ASAP. This will be a huge benefit to our community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Mike Cavanagh</td>
<td>Submission 20182028.8 by Mr: I would like to suggest the Sports Trust looks at developing an area inside the new centre for the likes of aerobic/dance/general fitness, or form a part of a wider group of organized activities for the active oldies in our community. Activities could include the above as well as a host of outdoor sports that are not well catered for in some organized way for this age group. Please refer to the full submission for further detail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Kathryn Robertson</td>
<td>Absolutely needed ASAP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Tony Kean</td>
<td>This facility is much needed now and should not be delayed any further. With continued district growth we need to be forward planning rather than lagging behind and having to play catch up when the facility is even more urgently required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Archery Combat Sports</td>
<td>As a potential user of this proposed facility I believe it is imperative it is built as soon as possible. I would like to run competitions and activities with Archery Tag all year round in North Canterbury but suitable indoor venues are currently not available for winter season. As the only dedicated and mobile operator of Archery Tag in Canterbury I have opportunities to bring groups from outside the region to events in Rangiora, such as corporate groups, stag dos, birthdays etc. with potential spill over to other local businesses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Phillipa Rickerby</td>
<td>Would be nice to include the Rangiora Smallbore Rifle Club in this plan. Rangiora is one of the biggest rifle clubs in the district more space for them would be appreciated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>McAlpines Limited</td>
<td>We as company, who employ over 200 people on our site in Rangiora, with these people coming from predominately the Waimakariri catchment area, believe that such a facility is very important to the region in that it provides a place where all ages can participate in sport and recreation to maintain a healthy and fit lifestyle which in turn greatly assists the well-being of our community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Keighley Robertson</td>
<td>The sooner the better.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>John Crawley</td>
<td>Will only get more expensive and more demand as the population continues to grow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Emma McCracken</td>
<td>Build the biggest and best you can now.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 44      | Richard Connelly                      | This stadium is really needed to support indoor sports in the region. Importantly it will provide more opportunity for the district youth, some of which will go to represent NZ in various sports. It will be possible to hold regional or even national events and if you’ve ever attended one of these events you
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUB No.</th>
<th>Name/Organisation</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>will see what a real buzz it is. These events will feed into the district, though the issue might be does Rangiora have enough resources e.g. accommodation to support these but maybe it will grow?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Neil Wilkinson</td>
<td>I agree but can see the difficulties with such a decision. We do need to cater for our active youth and older though so I support starting this now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Bella Whaley</td>
<td>Basketball is the only thing that gets my kids off the Xbox. This facility is needed now as population growth over last 10 years has caused massive overcrowding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Kelly Bint</td>
<td>No time like the present! We are an active family that love the outdoors and sports facilities are a no brainer for us. Build it and they'll come.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>With ever increasing population this will be an essential facility, especially for the youth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Evelyn Oliver</td>
<td>We need this facility for our whole community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Samantha Plows</td>
<td>Think it is a really good idea to bring in more sports tournaments and interested in sports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Millie Tinomanana</td>
<td>It will be great for Wamakariri sport and will bring town school on like Wednesday competition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>F B Walkyier</td>
<td>I support this project 100%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Luke Saunders</td>
<td>Seems good, worried about the cost though.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Cameron Scott</td>
<td>Starting now means we get it sooner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Pete Johnson</td>
<td>Just make sure this sticks to budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Michael Paul Girouard</td>
<td>Must have an elevated walking track for walkers, elderly, etc. Have seen these above the perimeter of the courts and highly utilised walkers/ joggers especially during adverse weather conditions. Very much needed indoor walking option that is not a treadmill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Jackson Oosthuysen</td>
<td>I would like to play basketball.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Emily Oosthuysen</td>
<td>I would like to play indoor netball now and when I grow up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Antony Oosthuysen</td>
<td>Build it already for the sake of our children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Rianna Oosthuysen</td>
<td>Netball will get great benefit and use out of this facility. Not just for premier but for all levels, our children need this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Lisa Rooney</td>
<td>Indoor sports facilities are lacking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Blake Duffell</td>
<td>Football indoor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Lily-Rose Turner</td>
<td>I would enjoy playing netball indoors on a rainy day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Malachi Rogerson</td>
<td>I want to play more basketball.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>What a real benefit to the community to be able to host large functions, e.g. flow shows/travel expos etc. as well as sporting fixtures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Oxford Area School</td>
<td>The sporting community of Waimakariri deserve a decent facility that will accommodate a range of sports and tournaments to be competitive against any area of NZ. Amazing what Ashburton have now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Graeme Smith</td>
<td>Given the involvement of Warren and Mahoney, both the Waimakariri facility and the stalled metro sports facility in Christchurch, what confidence can you give me that we have a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB No.</td>
<td>Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Colleen McDonald</td>
<td>The new sports facility is a great initiative. It's well thought out and management by NC Sport and Recreation makes good business sense.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>We have sporty kids that would benefit greatly from this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Woodend Combined Friendship Club</td>
<td>Needed for growing young population and health of community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>Community College North Canterbury</td>
<td>We would like to be started now so we could use it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>Community College North Canterbury</td>
<td>Start now so we can make the most of the facility with our youth instead of it being just for the future. Why not benefit both generations and future generations. Just go all out and get it done no expense spared. Refer to submission for further detail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>Community College North Canterbury</td>
<td>It would be very helpful towards people at the Community College because we have more places to go for fitness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>Community College North Canterbury</td>
<td>I think the youth of today really need this facility as the community would be able to use it any time they wish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>Community College North Canterbury</td>
<td>We really need this facility in our district. So that young people can use it and complete their sporting goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>Community College North Canterbury</td>
<td>We need a facility like this in our community, so people can achieve their sporting goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>Community College North Canterbury</td>
<td>Allows young children to fulfil their goals with sports or other types of activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>Community College North Canterbury</td>
<td>Will be able to give people a place to go and do activities for many years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>Community College North Canterbury</td>
<td>I think the Community College needs this so we don't have to go to a Park to do things.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>Community College North Canterbury</td>
<td>We really need this facility in our community as there is a lack of these types of facilities in North Canterbury.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>Community College North Canterbury</td>
<td>It will be good to start sooner. We need to get our teens off the streets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>Community College North Canterbury</td>
<td>Start now, we need this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>Community College North Canterbury</td>
<td>Yes please, we all think it is a good thing for the district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>Community College North Canterbury</td>
<td>A very good idea for us all in North Canterbury.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>Community College North Canterbury</td>
<td>A great idea and would benefit everyone a lot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>Community College North Canterbury</td>
<td>Love the idea and plans look great. We need a facility like this in our region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>Community College North Canterbury</td>
<td>This facility is very needed for our community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>Community College North Canterbury</td>
<td>Will help the community and nearby schools throughout Rangiora and North Canterbury.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB No.</td>
<td>Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>Community College North</td>
<td>Many goals will be achieved with this new facility in Rangiora.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>Community College North</td>
<td>We really need a multi-use sport facility in our community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>Community College North</td>
<td>I feel like we need a good facility for people to practice and to achieve their goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>Community College North</td>
<td>I think this is good for the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>Community College North</td>
<td>A great idea and good for the whole North Canterbury community in general.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>Community College North</td>
<td>There is a real need for a centre like this in North Canterbury.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>Community College North</td>
<td>Please help, we need a facility so we don’t need to keep going places. Having this as soon as possible would be great.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>Community College North</td>
<td>I think that the youth of today could really benefit from a facility like this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>Community College North</td>
<td>Finally we need a sports community for the young people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>Community College North</td>
<td>I agree with the proposed for the people of North Canterbury.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>Community College North</td>
<td>Multi-use sports facility for Rangiora and areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>Community College North</td>
<td>Very good idea for all North Canterbury people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>Community College North</td>
<td>It would be a great opportunity for our community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>Community College North</td>
<td>This project is well overdue we do not have anything like this that all North Canterbury can use as AMI is just for High School.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>Community College North</td>
<td>I have seen the plans and feel like this will be amazing for the residents of North Canterbury.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>Community College North</td>
<td>Good for all North Canterbury will get a lot of use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>Community College North</td>
<td>We really need this facility in this district so that people can achieve their sporting goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>Community College North</td>
<td>We really need this facility in our community so that people who want to do well in sport can achieve their goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>Community College North</td>
<td>We really need this facility in our district so people can complete their sports goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>Community College North</td>
<td>We really need this facility here at our college so that our sports goals can be completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>Community College North</td>
<td>Perfect for the young children that enjoy sports and fitness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>Community College North</td>
<td>We really need this facility in our community so people can achieve their goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>Community College North</td>
<td>We really need this facility in our community so the next generation can complete their life goals, e.g. basketball or weights.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB No.</td>
<td>Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>Community College North Canterbury (Matt Rawlin)</td>
<td>I feel like we need this facility in our community so that the younger generation can achieve their goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>Community College North Canterbury (Dimitri Caras)</td>
<td>We need a facility in our community so young people can use it and achieve their goals, stay in shape and have fun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>Don Robertson</td>
<td>With a growing population and increasing demand on existing facilities this is imperative that the complex is approved and started as soon as possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>Stuart Priddy</td>
<td>We need to be thinking about our young people now. They are the future of this area. We need to provide them with something that they can use for many years to come.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>Ian MacIntosh</td>
<td>Great for the District and community and the future. Will bring in sports events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>Jomp Res</td>
<td>Great for Community and District.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>Alexandra Foerstmann</td>
<td>I’m currently using the Pegasus Community Centre to run my Pilates and Stretch classes. The centre is very busy and I would like to use it more but it is booked out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>Anita Ward</td>
<td>We moved to Rangiora after the quakes. When we moved here I said to my husband when the kids are good enough to make rep teams we will move back to Christchurch because there are better facilities. We wouldn’t consider it if the standard of venues increased as we love it here. The kids take priority and we will put their needs first.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>Tini Lawry</td>
<td>I’m using the present facility once a week. Very important to have that for the community our size.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>Dr G Matthews</td>
<td>Much needed facility. Would be good to see some sort of climbing wall too.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>Peter Ward</td>
<td>So much population growth so we need to provide the facilities to keep sporting talent in north Canterbury. Well worth the cost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>Tarryn Towart</td>
<td>The community needs this facility. There is a serious lack of sporting options for our young people and this would improve it 100%. This would also encourage people to the community to use the facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>Claire Osgood</td>
<td>Rangiora would benefit as a whole community from having a sports facility like this. It would be great to see more sport options on offer for the community and to have more up to date facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>Alexandra Ireland</td>
<td>We need to build a vibrant district. Projects like this are very important for the health benefits of the community. The current sport centre opposite the High School is over-subscribed by different sport codes. I am impressed with the current proposed building which is future proof and caters for so many different sport options. (Wish Rangiora had been brave enough to build a bigger pool. We need to learn from our mistakes).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>Rebecca Ryan</td>
<td>I think that it would be extremely short sighted to defer or not offer this sporting facility to the many user groups in the district. We pay contributions for things like the Christchurch Museum, which is of benefit to such a small minority from our...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB No.</td>
<td>Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>district yet something like a sporting or potential rec and multipurpose space which would benefit local schools, sporting groups, community groups, Rangiora as a whole (through increased tournaments, festivals, expo use and the flow on benefit to local businesses and community) are not considered urgent/important? We are such a fast paced and growing district and yet, much like the pool, a short sighted minimalist approach is often taken and the facilities do not cater for the population who would use them. Please build this facility without delay.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>Kerry Jenkinson</td>
<td>The Council need to address the major shortfall in sporting facilities here in North Canterbury. This is already affecting participants in sports and will continue tenfold to affect children or new participants who want to try a sport but there are no facilities for them. Long term this will affect participation numbers, and everyone knows that participation in physical activity affects physical and mental wellbeing for all participants. A new Multi-use facility will be able to provide opportunities and benefits for all ages across the district through participation, volunteering, and spectating. Please do not further delay this development for the social, emotional and physical wellbeing of a huge majority of the ratepayers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>Stephanie Eldred</td>
<td>Option A - North Canterbury really needs a facility like this (and has for years); the sooner it gets started the sooner the community will be able to use it and make it start paying for itself. The nay-sayers will be surprised by how much they could make use of it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>Johnny Wilson</td>
<td>We need this facility done ASAP with the way North Canterbury is expanding. This will benefit our region in so many ways. E.g. *Growth and development of the now/future talents North Canterbury has to offer. *The hosting of Regional/National sports. *Opportunities of hosting big events which would bring a lot more revenue to the North Canterbury region. *Lead the way of how a small town can achieve big things. (Innovative and creative) *Just such a huge positive for North Canterbury.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>Rodney Malin</td>
<td>This is vital for the growth of sports for all in the Rangiora district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>Cameron Chalmers</td>
<td>The sooner the facility is built, the earlier mass participation in physical activity will happen. Participation in physical activity has been proven to be scientifically beneficial for all aspects of one's well-being. Why delay the construction of such a facility that would allow this to happen?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>Robyn Smith</td>
<td>We are getting left behind if we don't get this facility up and running ASAP. The current facilities at Rangiora High School were built when I was a child and are no longer fit for purpose. Our community has grown so much and our facilities need to grow to match it. Anything that encourages physical activity especially in young people should be developed. It is short</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB No.</td>
<td>Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>Suzy Mills</td>
<td>Long overdue. Our thriving community requires this for our sports clubs to keep them playing in our district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>Community College North Canterbury</td>
<td>We need one of these so much.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>Christine Baker</td>
<td>An adequate multi-purpose sports facility is long over-due for our district. Talk of a multi-use facility has been debated for years, if it isn't done now it will just become even less affordable. We have a growing population and one that is very involved in a variety of sports. I know of organisations that have not been able to apply to host regional or national tournaments in our district simply because we do not have adequate facilities. Our children are having to travel long distances to participate in sports because of this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>Julie Elliott</td>
<td>The proposed sports facility can only be an asset to the North Canterbury area, it is much needed and I am sure well supported. Please start this now do not leave it for another 10 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222</td>
<td>Graeme Henderson</td>
<td>North Canterbury sports facilities lacking -young people and old alike need model facilities to improve performance and keep off the streets. Number participants decline due to lack of facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223</td>
<td>Maria Thackwell</td>
<td>We need to keep our young people out here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224</td>
<td>Paul Starling</td>
<td>Waimakariri needs this facility now. A great asset for the whole community from the youngest to the oldest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226</td>
<td>S U Jeffcott</td>
<td>Our growing community is desperate for a facility like this. Less commuting for busy parents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227</td>
<td>Kay Plaskett</td>
<td>Definitely need a facility like this and also must provide adequate parking. Do not wait and deliberate as costs rises and it never gets done or results in rate payers paying more. Just do it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228</td>
<td>Peter Plaskett</td>
<td>Absolutely start now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229</td>
<td>Liam Connelly</td>
<td>It is 100% needed for the benefit of the community. We are severely low on indoor court space for a variety of sports. The cost is only going to go up if deferred.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230</td>
<td>Nick Erwood</td>
<td>There is currently a lack of facilities for the community. This is a good start towards creating new opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231</td>
<td>Jesse Rawlings</td>
<td>This facility will benefit the whole community opening more opportunities for everybody to participate in sport and rec. A positive addition to our community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td>Tanaya Jeffcott</td>
<td>Our growing community needs a facility like this. Will benefit many people from varied backgrounds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
<td>Kate Grundy</td>
<td>This is essential and needs to happen ASAP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239</td>
<td>Drew Hobbs</td>
<td>Needs to start now please.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
<td>John Watson</td>
<td>Again, a no brainer for the future well-being of the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252</td>
<td>Marion Archer</td>
<td>Sport and Recreation Clubs are the Hub of a Community life and are proven to make a significant contribution to society,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB No.</td>
<td>Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>these clubs and societies need a community facility to enable them to offer their people/members the opportunity to participate in various sporting activities, to bring people together to provide an opportunity for social interaction. By continuing to develop the area around Main Power Oval, the Hockey Turf and the Football grounds we will end up with a regional sport and recreation facility benefiting the residents of the Waimakariri district. Please refer to the submission for further detail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253</td>
<td>Ross Ditmer</td>
<td>Do not delay this project, the district needs a facility that can accommodate larger events and bring revenue to businesses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256</td>
<td>Tracey Howarth</td>
<td>The district desperately needs more facilities to cater for the growth within the region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>257</td>
<td>Rebecca Gold</td>
<td>This is definitely needed for the sporting community of North Canterbury. Currently there is a shortage of available indoor court space which is forcing many indoor teams outside for training and sometimes games. This facility would be a huge benefit and would help promote participation in sports by many young kids. Keeping kids fit and health and involved is a great thing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261</td>
<td>Vanessa Renai</td>
<td>North Canterbury desperately needs this facility, this would help in promoting many ball sports in the Waimakariri and further including Netball and Basketball, and would also give us the chance of hosting larger events in the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>Max Gills</td>
<td>Important. It is super crucial for the growing size of North Canterbury and the growing sports personnel. It would relieve the pressures of many constraints. This would mean we would be a leader in the industry, in our district and beyond. Don’t hesitate, and don’t make silly decisions. Make it work, not just an &quot;oh that will do&quot; approach. Think it through. This is your opportunity to make it a really good and efficient complex. From car parking all the way to facilities and the layout of things. Is there going to be realistic seating and space around courts for bags and the onlookers? Are the changing rooms realistic? Is there enough space to be comfortable? Is it going to be comfortable to host proper and major sporting events? Will there be enough room/flow and will it actually be of the correct requirements for official competitions? Short term fixes won’t help you here, think about what it will need to be doing in 5 to 10 years time. The Dudley Park Aquatic Centre suffers from the effects of short term thinking and nothing is resolved, just diverted and avoided for another time. The quality of your thinking and care will be reflected in the outcome of this wonderful project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 265    | Deborah Baggott   | I fully support the multi-use sports facility. As the population of the district grows, there is increasing demand on the existing facilities which in time would either need upgrading or replacing. It makes sense to provide a multi-use facility that can cater for a number of sporting group’s needs. The multi-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUB No.</th>
<th>Name/Organisation</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>use sports facility would bring major tournaments to the town creating revenue. I think the location is also a winner as it creates a sports hub in that part of the town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266</td>
<td>Hayley Fletcher</td>
<td>Fantastic and much needed initiative – our community will really benefit from the complex.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Do not defer - we've all seen what's happened in Christchurch with escalating costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269</td>
<td>Allen Kene</td>
<td>Hurry up and build it before we lose more people to teams/places in Christchurch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>Samantha Keetley</td>
<td>If we can secure the space for a communal centre then can we please also have meeting rooms on the side which can be of public use for hire so that not only sporty people can use this to their advantage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273</td>
<td>Ellie Richards</td>
<td>Start this project now. This would be an amazing facility to have available for our community. It would benefit generations to come and be a real asset for developing sporting qualities in our younger people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274</td>
<td>Waimakariri Youth Council</td>
<td>This is a great way to invest into the future growth of the district, but how will we make it useful for all people (especially young people). For example, we have heard concerns from young people in Oxford about how they will be able to access this facility, and whether it will even be useful for them as they’re too far to easily get there on their own. More public transport options could be a really good way of making great services and facilities like this accessible and useful for the wider district. Transport is a huge issue for young people especially in the more rural areas of the district and we think Council should seriously consider investing into this area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275</td>
<td>Steve Chandler</td>
<td>Facility needs to cater for aging population activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>276</td>
<td>Chelsea Anderson</td>
<td>We need this in Waimakariri, there is nothing like it and with our growth and the amount of young people we need this for them. It will bring to town other families who will shop on Rangiora while at tournaments and assist our local economy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280</td>
<td>Maura Loney</td>
<td>We need the sports facility and owned by the ratepayers not privately.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289</td>
<td>Esther Small</td>
<td>Rangiora’s big enough for it now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290</td>
<td>Desray Lithgow</td>
<td>Yes, we agree with getting underway now. Make it visionary, not just functioning for the time being. As the area grows the multi-use sports facility needs to be able to cater for that growth, with sufficient parking and sufficient space. We do not agree with the council renting the facility from a private company for exorbitant rent every year. If it is deferred the construction costs will only rise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td>Howard &amp; Lynette Fowler</td>
<td>Gym facility/fitness centre would be welcome in this part of Rangiora with East Belt gym moving to Flaxton Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297</td>
<td>John &amp; Carole Houghton</td>
<td>Much needed sports facilities, build now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>Scott Kennett</td>
<td>Looks great for Rangiora and the wider region as a fantastic opportunity to enhance sport by centralising to one location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB No.</td>
<td>Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>promoting greater membership for sports and clubs. With more sport/physical activities available conveniently to benefit the health and well-being of the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>Marianne Benson</td>
<td>Multi-use Sports facility is very important in our area, It is urgent we need this for our growing sports population and up and coming juniors players of sports. 1. We don't have enough for our Junior players for Basketball and tennis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>David Cartwright</td>
<td>The question is can the district afford to build this multi-use sports facility? I submit that the district cannot afford not to. In the late 1970s and early 1980s we also saw a need of an indoor sports and recreation facility and were fully supportive of the community, Councils and the High School coming together to build The Rangiora Recreation Centre which is now known as the Rangiora Fitness Centre. We have all seen the benefits the community has derived from this facility over the past 33 years. It is now time for this facility to be updated to provide for the communities current and future needs. I recall that when the Blenheim Council built their Recreation Centre some years ago, a billboard on the main road proclaimed 'let's keep our kids on the court and keep them out of court'. This again should be part of our motivation for supporting the Council in their efforts in building this facility. The evidence is clear. The more our youth are involved in sporting and other physical activities the less inclined they are to become involved in anti-social activities. I further suggest the Council is and should be concerned with the overall physical and mental health of the community. The activities that will be catered for if the proposed facility will greatly add to the overall health and lifestyle of all members of our community. To those who oppose this facility I ask them to reflect on the quality of life we enjoy in the Waimakariri District. We daily read and hear in the media of other areas of New Zealand where residents are barricaded in their homes too frightened to go out in case they are attacked or their homes are being burgled by gangs of marauding youths. Here in the Waimakariri District one can still walk the streets at any time of the day or night with little fear of being assaulted or attacked in any way along with a lower crime rate than other parts of the country. What do you think the reason for this is? Why is it that none of the gangs have set up their headquarters in the Waimakariri District and terrorised the community with their criminal activities. Effective Policing would be a contributing factor but partly also I suggest it is because the majority of our youth are involved in healthy activities and do not have the inclination to want to join these gangs. For this way and quality of life to continue we need to continue to provide the facilities in order that everyone in the community obtains the benefits derived from the associated activities therein. As a parent and now grandparent I have seen first-hand the benefits of having our...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB No.</td>
<td>Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>youth involved with any sporting activity. These activities are forming healthy habits which will last a lifetime. To those who complain about the cost I suggest that a less than $2 per week increase on our rates is a very small price to pay for us all to continue to enjoy the security and quality of life that we currently enjoy in the Waimakariri District. I therefore urge the Council to continue to plan and build this Multi-Use Sports Facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>Leanne Chapman</td>
<td>We desperately need a new facility so we can grow our sports, encourage our youth to engage in sport, attract more events to our region thus bringing more income to the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>DM &amp; AD Smith Investments Ltd</td>
<td>Via a recent newspaper/media article advising that WDC is considering building a new indoor sports facility at Coldstream Road that will cost $27 to $30m all funded by 'debt'. DASI offer an alternative option of a design and build lease agreement similar to what DASI is doing with the new North Canterbury Sport &amp; Recreation Trust gymnasium at Flaxton Road, Rangiora. Please refer to submission for further detail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311</td>
<td>Lisa Reidie</td>
<td>Huge social and economic benefit to the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>319</td>
<td>Kylie Jones</td>
<td>Very much needed for a number of different sports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322</td>
<td>Richard Edgecombe</td>
<td>We need more sports facilities, now and not later.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>323</td>
<td>Linda Loffhagen</td>
<td>We are in need of a facility to cater for a wide range of sports in North Canterbury.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>324</td>
<td>Pam Boyle</td>
<td>We need these facilities. Our kids need them. The district needs them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>325</td>
<td>Sonya Keates</td>
<td>With the growing population we need to get this started ASAP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327</td>
<td>A Bashford</td>
<td>So long as there is plenty of parking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>333</td>
<td>Korfball Canterbury</td>
<td>Korfball is the world’s only truly mixed team sport. Male and female players always play with and against each other. In other respects, the game is in the same sporting family as netball and basketball. We are a growing sport in Canterbury. We have various opportunities to grow the sport in Waimakariri District, including excellent relationships with Rangiora High School and Rangiora Borough School. As elsewhere in Canterbury, we are constrained by the availability of indoor court space in the district. The proposed multi-use sports facility would present several options for us to accelerate the growth of our sport within the district. We support the Council progressing this initiative as quickly as possible, and commend the Council for engaging with a sports focused community organisation, the North Canterbury Sports Trust, as a partner in the delivery of the facility. Well done, and please proceed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>334</td>
<td>K Taylor</td>
<td>I think it’s a great idea. No point deferring as price will only skyrocket.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>337</td>
<td>Tim Bloomfield</td>
<td>Community is rapidly increasing, the youth need more places to train and compete.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>338</td>
<td>Kathleen Johnson</td>
<td>We have a lot more children playing sports and North Canterbury is a growing place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB No.</td>
<td>Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>342</td>
<td>Eddy van Til</td>
<td>We need to develop facilities now for the future and not wait for the future to make us respond. The AMI / High School facility required some foresight at the time and has now been well-outstretched, &amp; time for the huge high school to gain stronger use. The multi-sports centre, along with associated tennis courts and hockey turf/s, need to start ASAP, to offer opportunity, occupation and potential for the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>347</td>
<td>Richard Dann</td>
<td>This is a fantastic idea and would be an immense asset for Waimakariri. As a parent who has had 3 children come through the basketball leagues I know that the current standard of courts is not good. It forces the schools to reduce the number of teams and increase team size which is not ideal. And they are often playing in very poor local school courts that are not built for basketball or spectators. I also play basketball and indoor netball and the current facilities are not good, basketball has actually stopped being played at an adult level in NC I believe because there was no appropriate courts available. There are many opportunities for other recreational sports in this facility and it would be a fantastic thing to build.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350</td>
<td>Ashley Tennis Club</td>
<td>Should this project not receive Waimakariri District Council (WDC) approval following the consultation process then we believe WDC should favour the submission made by the Rangiora and Southbrook Tennis Clubs to provide a 10 court Tennis Facility as a stand-alone project. North Canterbury Tennis needs this facility to not only survive but to grow through development of Junior Tennis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>358</td>
<td>James A Ryan</td>
<td>As an older resident concern over rate increases. However great facility for residents, and young people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>360</td>
<td>Roselyn Drummond</td>
<td>To have all sports in one area less travelling great for the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>361</td>
<td>Tania Barnes</td>
<td>I think sports are the backbone of our youths’ growth outside of school. I think the benefits will outweigh any negatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>362</td>
<td>G Taylor</td>
<td>Multi-use sports facility would be beneficial for Rangiora.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>363</td>
<td>Michelle Gill</td>
<td>Much needed in the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>365</td>
<td>Rachel Rennie</td>
<td>Waimakariri area really need this resource ASAP and the cost is only going to go up. Please future proof this, so it has space to grow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>371</td>
<td>Bess White</td>
<td>We need the facility for our current children and the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>374</td>
<td>Charlotte Airey</td>
<td>Very much needed in this area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>375</td>
<td>Toni Slemint</td>
<td>Much needed in the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>378</td>
<td>Jennie Ward</td>
<td>Would be great to have some good basketball and netball courts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>379</td>
<td>Kerry Twose</td>
<td>The district is growing and definitely needs the facilities. Better or more sports opportunities for up and coming sportsman. We’re losing them to Christchurch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>382</td>
<td>Rangiora Promotions</td>
<td>Rangiora Promotions supports this initiative to begin now on the basis that it is accessible to various sporting codes,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB No.</td>
<td>Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>community groups, for functions and with meeting rooms, as outlined in the Draft Long Term Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>384</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>We need this now, get the kids off the PlayStation and in the gym regardless what sport they play.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>386</td>
<td>Waimakariri Football Club</td>
<td>Rangiora and surrounding district is growing continually and there is a desperate need for an indoor sports facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>388</td>
<td>Greg Matthews</td>
<td>Desperately short of indoor facilities, huge community benefit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>390</td>
<td>Catherine Parr</td>
<td>Fantastic it will be great for the region and should promote sport for all ages. Economically it will be fantastic for the region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>391</td>
<td>James McRobb</td>
<td>The District is missing out on many national basketball tournaments work big money to business community - big economic benefits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>392</td>
<td>Patricia Williamson</td>
<td>Great for the community and my children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>Gary Powell</td>
<td>These facilities are good for everyone involved, family's will benefit from this enormously.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402</td>
<td>Nicola Trolove</td>
<td>This facility would enable our district to host regional sports events such as representative tennis for which at present we have to use multiple locations around the district. This facility would also provide more people an opportunities to be physically active, with areas for new exercise classes. I also think it would encourage a more diverse range of local and visiting Expos and Events that keep people of all ages engaged and participating in our community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>403</td>
<td>Nicky Simpson</td>
<td>The need for court space, especially indoors, is already a greater than the number of courts available. This is not only a problem for netball but other sports also. There is already a need for more courts than that to cater for our current netball community, not to mention if we want to attract national tournaments or showcase games in North Canterbury. National Tournaments and showcase events encourage more sport participation by inspiring and encouraging sport, are a great way to attract visitors to the region, showcase our community and foster community cohesion. We need at least four courts now. Expected increases in population growth for our region would indicate that the need for the facilities will grow over time. When you factor in a two-and-a-half-year construction period, the facility is three netball seasons away before completion. With numbers growing over this period we will have even greater need by the time it is completed. Delaying construction would be detrimental to regional development and the community well-being.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>404</td>
<td>Waine Simpson</td>
<td>Submission 20182028.404 by Mr: Local sport is suffering due to lack of facilities. Would enable the ability to host tournaments - good for local economy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406</td>
<td>Rangiora and Southbrook Tennis Club</td>
<td>This submission is to request the Waimakariri District Council (WDC) to include in the LTP the provision for a tennis court complex in Coldstream Road comprising 10 tennis courts (6 with lighting), a club house and outdoor area. In essence,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB No.</td>
<td>Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>407</td>
<td>Jim &amp; Ann Martin</td>
<td>RTC and the STC propose to sell their respective club land and assets and, with the support of WDC, relocate to a new tennis complex in Coldstream Road on land owned by the WDC and designated for the sports hub. Reduction in space. Missed opportunity to grow and develop the game.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>409</td>
<td>Mary Gerard</td>
<td>I strongly support a Tennis Complex being part of the Sports Hub.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410</td>
<td>Linda Pocock</td>
<td>If there is a large capacity area (covered) suitable for a range of functions besides sport it could bring major events to the town - c.f. Dunedin criticised for waste but now hosting big Ed Sherrin event. Defer and cost will only escalate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>412</td>
<td>Jim Gerard</td>
<td>Absolute priority for the District.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>417</td>
<td>J &amp; P Hardy</td>
<td>As soon as possible for all fit and able people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>419</td>
<td>Drucilla Kingi Patterson</td>
<td>Urgent needed extra courts 15 years ago $34.7 million.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>420</td>
<td>Steve Lewis</td>
<td>Needed to start this years ago.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>421</td>
<td>Craig Shearer</td>
<td>Growing community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>422</td>
<td>Jon Kiripatea</td>
<td>A new sports facility is much needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>423</td>
<td>Kim Kiripatea</td>
<td>A multi-use sports facility makes perfect sense for our growing community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>426</td>
<td>Megan Macefield</td>
<td>Long overdue and very much needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>427</td>
<td>Sarah Esler</td>
<td>Because it is much needed now for a positive growing community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>428</td>
<td>Megan Hamilton</td>
<td>It would be great for the community and surrounding areas and in line with other sports facilities in the country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>429</td>
<td>Lachie Macfarlane</td>
<td>North Canterbury lacks a high quality sports facility, which is meaning people in the area are having less of an opportunity to play sports at a high level or are having to travel a long way to get this opportunity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>430</td>
<td>J Comer</td>
<td>For the kids of the area to use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>431</td>
<td>Amy Hallmark</td>
<td>For all people of all ages to use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432</td>
<td>Jackson Lewis</td>
<td>It's important for local people to have a facility where they can participate in sports. We are a growing community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>433</td>
<td>Haley Dunn</td>
<td>We don't have enough sports facilities in North Canterbury.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>434</td>
<td>Jackson Gwalkin</td>
<td>So tournaments can be played easier.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>435</td>
<td>Glen McDonald</td>
<td>North Canterbury badly needs this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>436</td>
<td>Matthew Gould</td>
<td>Much needed for growing community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>438</td>
<td>Carisa Hocking</td>
<td>Would be a great asset for all schools in the area and wider community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>439</td>
<td>Janine Thompson</td>
<td>Great for Woodend and region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>440</td>
<td>Philippa Lewis</td>
<td>Well overdue in such a growing community. I have had the opportunity to be at tournaments in other towns (Blenheim, Westport, Greymouth and Ashburton) they have amazing facilities. Would be incredible to have something so awesome in Rangiora. The extra income this would bring to the community would help our area grow event more.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>441</td>
<td>Eddie Bassett</td>
<td>Great for all North Canterbury people young and old.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>442</td>
<td>Kay Bassett</td>
<td>We need it ASAP for all the children in North Canterbury.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>443</td>
<td>James Leydon</td>
<td>Needed for future generations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB No.</td>
<td>Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>444</td>
<td>Sarah Lewis</td>
<td>Growing community, need to keep up with other towns our size.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>445</td>
<td>Dean Lewis</td>
<td>Great for all people in North Canterbury start ASAP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>448</td>
<td>Allen Dvorak</td>
<td>Build it like Ashburton's - fabulous for the kids in the region and it will bring support from the fans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>449</td>
<td>Marie Dvorak</td>
<td>Needed now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>450</td>
<td>Sue Dodge</td>
<td>We need somewhere for our kids to play basketball ASAP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>451</td>
<td>Nigel Ridden</td>
<td>Be good for kids to have somewhere to play and learn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>452</td>
<td>Sarah Lawton</td>
<td>Make use of the space and give the kids somewhere suitable to play their games.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>453</td>
<td>Kelly Rol</td>
<td>Much needed for the space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>454</td>
<td>Jackson Tainui</td>
<td>Much needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>459</td>
<td>Kristen Haigh</td>
<td>Keep the youth off the streets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>460</td>
<td>Jessica Topp</td>
<td>Many sporting codes will use this facility and is needed now - growing population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>462</td>
<td>Jane Cutbush</td>
<td>Waimakariri needs a multi-use sports facility to start completion now. Do not delay as the community needs a facility that can cater to numerous sporting and leisure communities. It is a joke that Waimakariri does not have a complex to cater for everyone's needs. My three children play sport and due to lack of facilities we often have to fit in wherever is available to use and we pay huge fees for hiring court spaces. We play for North Canterbury Basketball and we would love a home base to be proud of. The entire district will benefit from having this facility so please do not delay with political issues but please think of the people who have to travel into town to use facilities that are unavailable in our own home town. It would be something the entire district would be proud of.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>464</td>
<td>Andrea Fifield</td>
<td>Population growth has led to current facilities not being inadequate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>469</td>
<td>Brenda Baynon</td>
<td>With the increased population we will be needed this facility ASAP. Anything which encourages and promotes fitness should be a priority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>472</td>
<td>G Thomas</td>
<td>Really need bigger sports facility for our young people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>473</td>
<td>Wendy Smith</td>
<td>Urgently needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>475</td>
<td>Kirsty Robinson</td>
<td>It's really important to have great sports facilities now, particularly for schools to be able to use for district sports. Helps to encourage kids to be healthy and active.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>478</td>
<td>Gesine Putama</td>
<td>Great to have the facilities as the wider community is growing. Great place for everyone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>479</td>
<td>Karen Sewell</td>
<td>Due to lack of current facilities something has to be done sooner rather than later.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>480</td>
<td>Matt Sewell</td>
<td>Required soon as possible due to the increase in North Canterbury population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>482</td>
<td>Kirstie Holmes</td>
<td>This facility is urgently required - most of the sports codes that will use it either have not current space or are running out of space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB No.</td>
<td>Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>483</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Facility urgently required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>484</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Required ASAP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>486</td>
<td>Robyn Thompson</td>
<td>Would be great for Arcom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>487</td>
<td>Kylie Schaare</td>
<td>Basketball facilities are not big enough in North Canterbury for the population of the sport, need better sports facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>488</td>
<td>Gary Phillips</td>
<td>Desperately needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>489</td>
<td>Sian Phillips</td>
<td>Kids sport is growing every year and the facilities currently available are already at capacity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>490</td>
<td>Amy Carr</td>
<td>Needed now for the younger children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>491</td>
<td>Leisa Johnson</td>
<td>ASAP - for future generations of our kids sports, and North Canterbury is growing at a great rate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>497</td>
<td>Woodend-Sefton Community Board</td>
<td>The Board strongly supports the principle of such a facility and the benefits that it would bring to the district. However, the Board urges the Council to consider more innovative funding options other than to be fully funded by ratepayers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>498</td>
<td>Rangiora-Ashley Community Board</td>
<td>The Board strongly supports the principle of such a facility and the benefits that it would bring to the district. The Board notes that it is a building to meet future needs and a life expectancy of over 50 years which is to be commended. However members are also mindful of the significant capital cost and the additional $90 per annum rates burden particularly for those on fixed incomes. The Board seeks assurance that costs will be tightly controlled and that all major items have been fully accounted for and that there will be no deviation from the estimated cost and that any and all steps will be taken to further drive down construction costs whilst ensuring a fully functional sports facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>499</td>
<td>Oxford-Ohoka Community Board</td>
<td>The Board supports the principle of such a facility and the benefits that it would bring to the district, but is extremely mindful of the impact of the proposed rate increase on those with fixed or low incomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>Rangiora High School</td>
<td>Rangiora High School (RHS) is writing to support the proposed Multi Use Sports Complex. This development is long overdue and therefore we support the Waimakariri District Council’s preference to start work on this project now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502</td>
<td>Jenita Grabowski</td>
<td>The district has grown immensely and needs a multi-use sports facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503</td>
<td>Duncan Lees</td>
<td>A growing community needs modern facilities and the current facilities just don’t cut it anymore.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>505</td>
<td>Judy Doody</td>
<td>Important for the growing population especially the amount of young people that now live in the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>506</td>
<td>Wayne Doody</td>
<td>This is a facility for the whole community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>508</td>
<td>Iain Doody</td>
<td>This is an important facility not just for sport but the community as a whole, to delay this by 10 years would mean a generation miss an opportunity to enjoy this facility whether it be a 5 year old or an 80 year old. I have heard people say that we have lots of gyms, these belong to the schools and MoE not the community. Also if we want to attract events, sports, community festivals we need this facility. Please make the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB No.</td>
<td>Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>513</td>
<td>Canterbury Country Cricket Association Inc.</td>
<td>The growth of the district in recent years has been huge and a sports facility such as being proposed is an absolute necessity. For the district to continue to thrive it needs to provide its young people, and some not so young, with an outlet for their sporting endeavours. Many indoor sports are being restricted by the lack of local facilities. From a cricket point of view we have experienced huge growth in playing numbers in recent years and the provision of another good quality grass wicket block adjoining Mainpower Oval, as proposed, can’t come quickly enough. If that part of the proposal can be implemented in the next season or two it would almost guarantee the districts involvement in the International Cricket Council Women’s World Cup to be hosted in New Zealand in the 2020/21 season.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>515</td>
<td>Gail Power</td>
<td>We are in desperate need of more sports facilities and it is hugely important to be able to offer various sports to not only the children but all in our community. Lack of this kind of facility is hugely reducing options for our local sports administrators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>516</td>
<td>Catherine Batchelor</td>
<td>As a ratepayer I am fully committed to my investment in to this facility and agree should be built now as this is well overdue and is much needed for the community, sporting, social and economic benefits it will provide. I want to live in a society that provides and values these benefits through the provision of indoor sporting and community use facilities and the flow on effects it provides to all people who live in this district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>519</td>
<td>Margot Korhonen</td>
<td>A facility like this would benefit the whole region and is a great opportunity to future proof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>523</td>
<td>Pauline Garrick</td>
<td>I believe this is a much needed asset for the area. Having an array of sports in the one area brings the community together and gives a good vibe. Seeing various sports being played encourages other people to want to participate. Plus having that many tennis courts together promotes tournaments being held in Rangiora.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>524</td>
<td>Rodney Butt</td>
<td>This would be great. Basketball is a growing sport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>525</td>
<td>Janel Murray</td>
<td>Great facility to have in the growing North Canterbury area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>526</td>
<td>Chloe Whyte</td>
<td>All of the kids that have been given opportunities to play basketball should also have the best facilities to play and enjoy the game.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>527</td>
<td>Jo Richards</td>
<td>Growing population means more facilities needed, especially to ensure children stay in sport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>529</td>
<td>Joseph Matthews</td>
<td>Because often sports facilities are fully booked up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>530</td>
<td>Stuart Smith</td>
<td>Not have to travel as much to Christchurch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>531</td>
<td>Rodger Welsh</td>
<td>Absolutely - multi sport facility encourages growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>532</td>
<td>Helen Matthews</td>
<td>From my experience playing an indoor sport. There isn’t enough quality facilities in North Canterbury so I have to go</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB No.</td>
<td>Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>533</td>
<td>Alice Matthews</td>
<td>Into Christchurch and I know other people playing other sports have the same problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>535</td>
<td>Chris Garrick</td>
<td>Because basketball players need a new facility and so does netball and others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>541</td>
<td>Grant Stephens</td>
<td>There is a shortage of indoor space for sports in the region for club sports. Need for a facility to be able to hold National Tournaments in the area, possibility to have international teams visit for some sports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>542</td>
<td>Waimakariri United Football Club</td>
<td>Put simply two points - 1) If you make it - they will come! If you don’t, they will go! 2) If you leave it to long (2028) it will be too late. By 2028 hopefully it will be getting so much use and doing so well that the addition of more courts will be required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>544</td>
<td>Wendy Howe</td>
<td>Because for 12 years I have fought every year for court space for badminton, and this year it won’t happen as school is redoing gym and school gyms always give school events priority over outside sports needs so makes it very hard to plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>545</td>
<td>Maureen Matthews</td>
<td>Great facility for the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>546</td>
<td>Nicola Supyk</td>
<td>Need this for sport and fitness in Rangiora.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>547</td>
<td>Pat Smith</td>
<td>Already well overdue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>548</td>
<td>Judith Schumacher</td>
<td>It would be fantastic to have this facility as my boys would love it for futsal/basketball plus others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>549</td>
<td>Lesley Ottey</td>
<td>Would be fantastic for my grandchildren to have these facilities to be local and not have to travel to town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550</td>
<td>Ryder Bloomfield</td>
<td>Rapid growth happening already have difficulty getting court time need more facilities now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>551</td>
<td>Trevor Elliott</td>
<td>This is a crucial part of sporting infrastructure. Currently kids play on small courts and ones that often double as school halls and have slippery dangerous floors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>552</td>
<td>Fernside Tennis Club</td>
<td>Having a Multi-Use Sports Facility along with a centralised North Canterbury tennis facility would support the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB No.</td>
<td>Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>588</td>
<td>Rachel Moir</td>
<td>Canterbury needs these facilities and we need them now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>589</td>
<td>Simon Moir</td>
<td>It would be great for the community. Just get on with it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>594</td>
<td>Merlyn Whitlow</td>
<td>Much needed facility for the area. Great for bringing like-minded people together especially our young folk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>Claire Chatterton</td>
<td>Need it now. Growing region and facilities too stretched. In fact, go a step further and future proof and make bigger. Proactive not reactive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>609</td>
<td>Zoe Cosgrove</td>
<td>This is so necessary for the region. North Canterbury, in particular, Rangiora is booming and we desperately need this now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>613</td>
<td>Rangiora Gymnastics Club</td>
<td>We are in favour of Waimakariri District Council (WDC) progressing with this facility immediately, and would like consideration to be made for the provision of a Gymnastics Facility for Rangiora Gymnastics Club (RGC) to occupy to be included within the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>614</td>
<td>Jill Curry</td>
<td>Much needed facility for the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>Cust Tennis Club</td>
<td>Having a centralised Multi-Use facility will only benefit the community as a whole, it will boost the growth of many sports involved including Tennis, it will bring more opportunities through various events/tournaments, this, in turn will bring more visitors and income to the area. Cust Tennis Club strongly supports the start of this exciting project in 2018 (option A).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>Woodend School</td>
<td>Let’s get the ball rolling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>624</td>
<td>Woodend School</td>
<td>Because the area is growing rapidly and a larger multi-purpose facility will better suit the area than what we have currently.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>629</td>
<td>Ben &amp; Sarah Davidson</td>
<td>Strongly support to provide more and improved facilities to our growing population. Sport and recreation key to health and well-being.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>645</td>
<td>Elizabeth Brocherie</td>
<td>Our community is in great need to have tennis courts available club/clubs, representative and public use. This will encourage growth with visible and appropriate access for our district and beyond.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>651</td>
<td>Woodend School</td>
<td>Growing needs for a growing area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>653</td>
<td>Sam Watters</td>
<td>Needed for all sports to allow our sports community to grow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>660</td>
<td>Dr Kate Grundy</td>
<td>Absolutely vital that this is done with urgency. Growing demand is evident and healthy communities need decent future-proofed facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>661</td>
<td>Jakob Eder</td>
<td>We need this ASAP as the current ones are too small and crowded due to them being used so much.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>669</td>
<td>Fernside Tennis Club</td>
<td>Fernside Tennis Club (FTC) strongly supports the planning and budgeting for a Multi-Use Sports Facility for the people of the Waimakariri District, with development commencing in 2018 (Option A). Having a Multi-Use Sports Facility along with a centralised North Canterbury tennis facility would support the growth of sport, including tennis, in the region and FTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB No.</td>
<td>Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>671</td>
<td>Flooring Xtra</td>
<td>Gives kids something to do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>679</td>
<td>Jo George</td>
<td>Start ASAP. Not only do we need it, but so does our neighbour city. To host international teams of various sports would be awesome. Let’s showcase Rangiora.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>690</td>
<td>Erin Hyde</td>
<td>Increase participation and access to sports locally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>691</td>
<td>S Iles</td>
<td>Growing area - facilities are needed now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>692</td>
<td>S H Jackson</td>
<td>A suitable sports centre would be an asset to our district for young and old. There are a lot more young families in the district now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>695</td>
<td>Janice Adams</td>
<td>There is a need to cater for the sporting teams at present, and this need will only grow with the rapidly increasing population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>696</td>
<td>Jenni Haack</td>
<td>The sooner it is up the better, there is already limited court space and with mega going what is going to happen?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>708</td>
<td>Keiron McCord</td>
<td>Our family would benefit from this facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>712</td>
<td>Kath Kenny</td>
<td>As a resident and ratepayer of the Waimakariri District I object most strongly to the proposal to invest $37 million in a stadium. With such a high proportion of pensioners in Waimakariri. The exorbitant increase in rates would be a huge imposition on so many ratepayers. The W.D.C. must stick to offering essential services and maintenance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>719</td>
<td>Belinda Leen</td>
<td>I fully support this facility to be built as soon as possible. Being an active family within the NCBA this facility is well overdue in this area especially with basketball's growth over the last few years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>721</td>
<td>Jesse Leen</td>
<td>Make another facility. More facilities, more basketball courts and more fitness training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>722</td>
<td>A Simpson</td>
<td>To promote sports and activities in North Canterbury.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>723</td>
<td>Eddie Leeson</td>
<td>This would be a fantastic asset for North Canterbury.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>725</td>
<td>Joan Lumber</td>
<td>This is needed our grandchildren need this. The sooner it starts the sooner it’s finished for all the community benefit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>731</td>
<td>Tonya Bristow</td>
<td>Build it asap please. Much needed and long overdue. Can’t wait for an indoor netball facility for our young children to stay warmer in winter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>739</td>
<td>Katie Ross</td>
<td>More netball and basketball courts indoor needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>741</td>
<td>Di Ross</td>
<td>Desperately need indoor netball courts and basketball courts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>743</td>
<td>Nathan Hurley</td>
<td>Growing community needs such facilities to support and enhance wellbeing now and into the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>744</td>
<td>Alex Ross</td>
<td>More basketball courts and indoor netball courts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>747</td>
<td>Kymm Robinson</td>
<td>Minimal indoor facilities for netball, Ohoka gym not correct size, New Life gym bad flooring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>749</td>
<td>Greg Robinson</td>
<td>North Canterbury is being left behind with youth and children sporting facility. This is a desperate requirement to invest in our future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750</td>
<td>Haley Newton</td>
<td>Yes please.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>752</td>
<td>Matt Newton</td>
<td>Unsure why it's taken this long, well overdue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB No.</td>
<td>Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>755</td>
<td>Woodend Community Association</td>
<td>We agree with the Council's preference to start building the Multi-use Sports Facility now. We do, however, have concerns that this will be fully funded by debt and the increase per annum this will have on rates. With this in mind we ask: (a) Does the Council possess any noncore assets which it could sell to help fund the project? (b) Has the Council considered seeking private or corporate investors to fund the project?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>757</td>
<td>Rangiora Shoe Lines</td>
<td>So beneficial for Rangiora for population growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>758</td>
<td>Rangiora Shoe Lines</td>
<td>Not enough facilities for all the different sports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>764</td>
<td>Rosie Olliver</td>
<td>Urgent need for more council facilities that the whole growing community has access to. This facility will be used by all ages and keep people engaged in their own community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>773</td>
<td>Marc &amp; Rachel Palmer</td>
<td>Because we need the best sporting facilities for our North Canterbury area to service our growing population. We will be sending our kids to high school in Rangiora another reason we prefer the best facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>776</td>
<td>Alayna Smith</td>
<td>I agree to the four court because it would benefit my son's sports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>779</td>
<td>Anna Waldron</td>
<td>Most definitely, with a rapidly growing community and also being used by smaller towns and villages in the greater area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>780</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>There is desperate need for this in North Canterbury. Children in sports vs roaming the streets. Children who can't play because training is in town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>782</td>
<td>Tony Loffhagen</td>
<td>We have no facilities and the ones we have were built when I was at primary school. Get it done!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>783</td>
<td>Brenda Martin</td>
<td>With a growing number of children entering sport how could you not think this is a positive spend that can ensure our children are consistently active.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>785</td>
<td>Taneisha Nutira</td>
<td>There is such an influx of sports participation in the North Canterbury region and not enough space to do them all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>787</td>
<td>Brenda Sharpe</td>
<td>Facility is urgently required - our community is waiting for this. Feed the need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>788</td>
<td>Stuart Russell</td>
<td>Needing facilities to cater for growing district and future growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>789</td>
<td>Brooke Palmer</td>
<td>We need one soon. Sport is increasing a lot in North Canterbury. We haven't got enough courts for everyone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>791</td>
<td>Sam Crossley</td>
<td>We need it now. I do several different sports 4 times a week and have to go into town. This could save a lot of petrol and time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>792</td>
<td>B J Brown</td>
<td>For our youth today.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>795</td>
<td>Catherine George</td>
<td>Basketball, and other sports need a home and this would provide one. Add it to our existing facilities, the hockey turf, Mainpower oval, Dudley Park etc. and Rangiora has some compelling sports facilities which will attract events and people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>799</td>
<td>Elsie McRobb</td>
<td>We need a facility now, we have been waiting for too long and we are missing out on training because of the lack of space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB No.</td>
<td>Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>801</td>
<td>Gordon Wong</td>
<td>It is essential that we have this multi-use sports facility. There are so many organisations that are desperate for a modern facility to conduct their sport/activity. We need this now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>802</td>
<td>Rebecca Forbes</td>
<td>Waimakariri is growing, kids need facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>804</td>
<td>Philip Beare</td>
<td>The Waimakariri community desperately needs a Council owned facility for the well-being of its residents. The present situation is wholly inadequate requiring participants to travel outside the district which can be very restrictive. As a senior I support the ‘start now’ proposition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>806</td>
<td>Holly Monopoli</td>
<td>We really need a gym to train in. Travelling far is always an issue. We don’t have enough practices and if we get a new facility it would be a lot easier to get to.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>807</td>
<td>Peter Macefield</td>
<td>Desperately needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>808</td>
<td>Penny Horton</td>
<td>Don’t wait kids need the facility now. District growth hasn’t been reflected in sporting facilities. We are running out of space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>809</td>
<td>Jacqui Witt</td>
<td>We are desperate for new facilities. What is planned will be fantastic for our district and all the young people and users.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>810</td>
<td>Pauline Newport-Cromarty</td>
<td>At present indoor facilities are limited in the Rangiora area. Would be fantastic if we could have a multi-sport facility where we could hold tournaments instead of having to spread teams across two to three venues. Great that it can be used for many sporting codes/conferences/awards nights etc. I can see the facility getting very high usage. What a great facility for our growing community and area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>812</td>
<td>Mitchell James</td>
<td>Urgently needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>813</td>
<td>Mitch James</td>
<td>Given the increased Rangiora population and growing school roles, this type of complex is needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>814</td>
<td>Jenna Ormiston</td>
<td>Please provide seating for people to sit down and water games.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>815</td>
<td>Melanie Marryatt</td>
<td>Yes, we need a multi-use facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>816</td>
<td>Jessica Evers</td>
<td>For the amount of students that we encourage to play sports we need the facilities to get/keep our children active and off technology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>819</td>
<td>Mecca Hampton-James</td>
<td>Well overdue. Important facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>820</td>
<td>Kate Hassall</td>
<td>We need an indoor facility for many sports, netball, basketball etc. It would be fantastic to have it ASAP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>821</td>
<td>Kate Wau</td>
<td>Good to encourage kids to take up sport (kids in sport stay out of court). Population explosion next 10 years, we need more sports for kids in the area. Also good revenue for cafes etc. for the opposition coming to town. Will spend money. We need a forward thinking Council to implement this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>827</td>
<td>Kylie Steele</td>
<td>This facility is needed as Waimakariri is growing continuously and our children need sports facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>828</td>
<td>Mary Meethan</td>
<td>Basketball is becoming more and more popular. Not all schools have the facilities. This will allow sharing of community facilities and allow tournaments be held locally instead of in Town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB No.</td>
<td>Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>829</td>
<td>Lauren Whittaker</td>
<td>Please do not delay this process any more. My parents waste so much petrol to travel into town (Christchurch) for training. Let's do this now please.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>830</td>
<td>Marie Beare</td>
<td>We are way overdue for this facility. More and more young people are moving into Rangiora and are looking for multi-use sports facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>831</td>
<td>Leanne Payne</td>
<td>Overly needed, basketball is such a hugely followed sport and growing constantly, this is needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>832</td>
<td>Maisie Brown</td>
<td>Convenience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>833</td>
<td>Lisa Hetherington</td>
<td>The children of Rangiora need sporting facilities to keep them involved in the community and keep fit. We also need a facility that will help benefit the whole community by bringing events to the town. So many options would be available with a multiuse venue. Ashburton is fully booked in July school holidays with a Highland Dance competition and Basketball on at the same time. Along with sport we could attract dancing, gym, roller derby etc. competitions. The Council is happy to let big box retail into our community at the expense of small local companies so now they need to look at bringing people to North Canterbury to support local businesses and a multi-use venue would be ideal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>842</td>
<td>B Fordyce</td>
<td>Growing needs for a growing area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>843</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Waimakariri District Council (WDC) recreational facilities have always been lacking. Were always 'fixed' in a hotch potch' style. A big effort should be made to do a large multi-purpose building - no head in the sand attitude.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>845</td>
<td>Jillian May</td>
<td>So many sports people in the North Canterbury area (most needed).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>846</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Investigate private buildings and Council leasing and back over a period of time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>849</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>With the continued growth of Rangiora we desperately need this for our town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>854</td>
<td>Energy N Motion Massage</td>
<td>This sports facility will attract a lot of tournaments to the area which will help the entire community. Plus allow a lot more teams and sports clubs to operate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>855</td>
<td>Cartage Solutions Ltd</td>
<td>This is a great addition to the community to keep young and old active and local.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MULTI-USE SPORTS FACILITY
Option B – Defer until 2028
Total number of submission points in support of Option B = 40

Submitter comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUB No.</th>
<th>Name/Organisation</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Barb Warren</td>
<td>Delay the $27.85 million for an indoor sport facility and instead make improving traffic flow and congestion a key capital project for the Waimakariri District Council, as per your locations already outlined in your plan. Also include improving in the short term the Old Waimakariri Bridge which is in appalling condition and the outdated Ashley River bridge on State Highway 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Andrea Clinick</td>
<td>Our street needs re-sealing. I do not think Kaiapoi residents will want to travel to Rangiora every time they want to do sports. I have a pool here and exercise if I want. Small percentage use equals large outlay. I don't want to pay again and again. Have fixed income. Went to meeting about LTP at Kaiapoi Library. Did not realise hobby group from Trust would be there. Even Waimakariri District Council people seemed to be in favour. Nobody except myself and my husband against proposal. Feel it is a done deal and we are being 'consulted' as a 'smoke screen'. Growth at any cost. Hope Kaiapoi Councillors vote 'no' as they have said in media.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Phillip Ivan Redmond</td>
<td>The multi-use facility has an impact on rate increases which is unaffordable at the present time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>Alan &amp; Joan Orchard</td>
<td>Do not want rate increase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Nathan Punton</td>
<td>I think the amount the rates will increase by is not proportional to the amount of people that will use the facility. It would be good to explore a private/public partnership or whether it could be shared with the Ministry of Education. I will not benefit from the facility and I believe many people in the community won't either.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Jeremy Richards</td>
<td>I see no pressing need for this facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>Stewart Milne</td>
<td>The increase in rates of $91 per rate payer is significant given a large proportion may not use the facilities. Other cost savings in the LTP should be considered (e.g. is the extra resource for the Business Services Manager really necessary as $100k is extremely generous pay for that). These is no scope in the LTP for increased pressure on existing facilities with a large population growth in the district. What is the councils plans for Dudley Pool for example as this facility is very busy at peak times and that will only increase with the large subdivisions to the west of Rangiora.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>Dr Rose Washbourne</td>
<td>At this point in time, with Christchurch building similar facilities only 20 minutes away, there should be no sports facility built. A facility that addresses the 'wants' of the community as opposed to the 'needs' is something that should be funded by the users - not the ratepayers. An actual need of...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB No.</td>
<td>Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>Sonny Whitelaw</td>
<td>I would personally never make use of the facilities in Rangiora. While I accept this is a shared community cost, it would mean me paying a share for a non-critical service I will never use, while at the same time, those who will benefit do not have to pay for a share of the cost of critical infrastructure to me: water.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>Cheryl York</td>
<td>Too much money. The community needs to fundraise to offset these costs. Council needs to better manage the collect rates and operate accordingly some rate payers cannot afford to have their rates going up so much year after year. This is not sustainable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247</td>
<td>Jeff Rogers</td>
<td>We can't afford it - it's as simple as that our rates are high enough. The council should pay off the debt outstanding first. As a pensioner I would find it hard to pay extra rates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>343</td>
<td>Debbie Booth</td>
<td>Too much money to add the extra rates on for our community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>357</td>
<td>Ray Freitag</td>
<td>Too costly for little effect. Able to be built for a third of $27 million. Even the leasing option is too much. Infrastructure before pleasure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>381</td>
<td>Bill Byers</td>
<td>Now is not the time to develop a Multi-use sports facility. At this time such a facility is a want and not a need and the first priority should be given to the District Regeneration and increased maintenance to roading/footpaths particularly in the older parts of Rangiora.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>408</td>
<td>Sarah Hosking</td>
<td>We have enough of these types of facilities – let’s reduce existing debt and see what the community wants in 2028.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>494</td>
<td>Elaine H B Cole</td>
<td>Only plus in Councils choice is that Waimakariri District Council owns land. Not equitable to be located in Rangiroa. Would prefer that further investigation of private partnership model mentioned in news media.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>511</td>
<td>Mark Kenny</td>
<td>The proposed Multi-use sports facility seems to be surrounded by misinformation and in my view a degree of empire building...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
on the part of the Sports trust and agendas in the council which is of great concern to me. The facility listed in the draft plan feedback form as the only option, has an estimated cost of $30 Million. I attended a Woodend Sefton Board meeting where this facility was discussed, I attended because I was worried about cost over runs and the ability of the centre to run at a profit because I had heard there was the potential for a $1 million short fall in operating costs each year. The question was raised at the meeting and the council representative assured everyone present that the facility will cover all its costs including mortgage repayments. He stated that the $30 million in borrowing would be fully repaid by the end of the 30 year term. I have since been told that the loan will not be repaid and the loan will be interest only over the term. I still don’t know which is correct but this is the sort of misinformation being circulated, if the council representative was incorrect the Woodend Sefton Board was misled and the process needs to start again. I am also deeply concerned that the offer to have a facility built for free then leased has not been fully promoted and discussed. The saving in capital expenditure alone is a saving to the rate payer and again from what I understand the cost of leasing will be far less than the expected mortgage repayments. My personal understanding is that the council may be letting personalities get involved in sensible business and financial decisions. This option should be the preferred option. I saw concept plans for the location where the lease option venue is proposed and other than the financial benefits mentioned above, having a facility with Motels, Restaurant, Bar and Museum etc. would give North Canterbury a truly professional venue catering to short and longer term visitors. As opposed to a park at the end of East Belt. Also the handling of the feedback forms has been heavily biased by the Sports Trust and I am sure a number of forms will be received with the start now option ticked. The Trust set up a display in the High School gym foyer with feedback forms with pleas to support the Coldstream Road option and illustrations of the plans. It’s just wrong, members, sports families were encouraged to fill out a form and put it in the box. There was no signage of costings or the other lease option. This needs to be about providing the best for North Canterbury in the most cost efficient way. One of the reasons I believe the Sports trust is putting so much emphasis on the Coldstream Road option is that they are currently of all things having a building built and leased back to them for a new gym near the lease option location. Having another facility so close would possibly interfere with their proposed plans. A sports facility is not about empire building it is about North Canterbury. Also part of my motivation comes from the possible effect the Coldstream option will have on rates for
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUB No.</th>
<th>Name/Organisation</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the retired. I know this is only a part of the rates but with a mother who could potentially face rates costing over 100 a week in the next 10 years the need to be fiscally responsible for the whole community is imperative. Thank you for the opportunity to submit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>521</td>
<td>Greer Smith</td>
<td>I don’t believe it is a need right now to have this. We are an older populated town and to make them pay for something they may not use. I think if we have time we can find a better way to get this in the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>551</td>
<td>Norma McLaren</td>
<td>There seems to be enough gyms and courts now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>552</td>
<td>Andrew Hegarty</td>
<td>Cheaper options need to be looked at.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>558</td>
<td>Gillian Giller</td>
<td>The Council's preference to start now on a Sports Facility would place a disproportionate cost onto the District's population. This facility is a nice-to-have rather than essential item. Cost projections in the LTP indicate high levels of ratepayer funding are required. This non-essential facility should not be started until it is affordable for the population at the start of the project. At present it is not affordable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>559</td>
<td>Nancy Sutherland</td>
<td>Although I support the concept of some indoor sports courts I have reservations about the cost of over $27M for the current proposal, and in particular the impact of that cost on low income ratepayers. For this and the following reasons I suggest that the project be deferred. Although the proposal for the indoor courts complex has been 'in the public arena' for some time now, changing circumstances may mean that it would be prudent to conserve funds for future upgrades of the 3-waters and measures to accommodate the effects of climate change. The draft LTP notes that legislative changes (e.g. the Drinking Water Standards and stormwater discharge requirements) may result in the Council having to spend large sums on upgrading the 3-waters to meet higher standards. The requirement that territorial authorities must have particular regard to climate change effects may also result in expenditure that is currently not budgeted for. Given that rates are the primary source of the Council’s income these costs will fall on ratepayers - and there is a limit to what ratepayers can afford. Additionally, the proposed courts will be one of a number of sports facilities in Waimakariri provided by the Council, all of which are presumably wholly or partly capital funded by ratepayers, with users paying some or all of the operating costs. While there is some public benefit in sporting activities there is also a large degree of private benefit and it is arguable that the sporting codes that will benefit from the provision of sports venues should contribute a greater proportion to the capital costs of construction. Also, although the proposal for the indoor courts complex is predicated on the operating costs being met through hire fees if these are insufficient to meet ongoing costs any shortfall will presumably have to be met through rates. Given the proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB No.</td>
<td>Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td>location it seems unlikely that the courts will be a major resource for schools such as the Rangiora High School, and the sports codes that will use the facility are unlikely to attract large numbers of senior citizens, who are predicted to make up nearly 25% of Waimakariri residents in the coming decade. I canvassed some of my fellow over-65s on which of the listed sports they would participate in but basketball, futsal, roller derby, etc. did not feature as their preferred activities. In fact, some of these activities could be seen as posing a health risk to ageing bodies. There was some interest in indoor bowls and exercise classes but there are already venues where these activities can be enjoyed. There is also the possible issue of the impact of the provision of facilities such as a gym and fitness centre on the viability of commercial enterprises that also provide these services. This may have been considered in the business case for the indoor courts but if not, then it needs to be.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>586</td>
<td>Madeleine Burdon</td>
<td>I believe we have significant debt levels as a Council, plus projected rates increases for single income households is significant. I believe we have quality facilities now, lots of choice and don’t need to have everything ‘done at the same time’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>656</td>
<td>Ken Turpin</td>
<td>The council must inform every ratepayer by way of letter as to the $91 increase to their rates. A number of rate payers i have spoken to know nothing about the $91 increase. Media reports i have read and a council update written by Wendy Doody is almost telling us you have made to go ahead with the building. No way. A rate payer vote would be a good idea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>730</td>
<td>Jennie Marsh</td>
<td>Defer to 2023 - we don’t believe that this project is far in excess of what is needed and suggest a revised facility. Who is paying for this - the whole district or Rangiora town? As in upgrades.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>847</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Or take a serious look at the Southbrook proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>858</td>
<td>C J Young</td>
<td>Sport clubs should be involved in some fundraising for this facility because I don’t see myself ever being involved. A percentage of people involved in the sports should be assessed against the districts total population. I am involved with conferences/ seminars for 500 and the organisation dismissed the Lincoln center as it wasn’t conductive t our needs- this facility looks somewhat similar to Lincoln.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>860</td>
<td>Garry Cattermole</td>
<td>A multi-use sports facility would be great to have however building this facility at this time will create financial pressure on a lot of ratepayers. We need to clear some debt and get back to basics re stormwater, roading etc. before embarking on a further great to have but can’t really afford facilities. By deferring it until 2028 will give our ratepayers a little breathing space also would create time for the users of this complex time to fundraise a good portion of the costs of building this complex, the same as what was done for the covered pools in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB No.</td>
<td>Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the district. Kaiapoi spent over ten years fundraising and the council is talking building this facility in two to three years, this is not enough time to fundraise millions of dollars. I fail to see the difference between this facility and a covered pool. There needs to be one rule for all.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### MULTI-USE SPORTS FACILITY

**Option C – No facility reduced levels of service**

Total number of submission points in support of Option C = 55

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUB No.</th>
<th>Name/Organisation</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hazel Taylor</td>
<td>I want to say I do not agree with the expenditure of the proposed Sports Facility for a second and it is very expensive, which would mean a rate rise. These places are necessary I admit but should be user pays. Many long term ratepayers are elderly and though we appreciate greatly a rate reduction each year - the rates are still high and most of us would not use the facility. Refer to full submission for further detail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>James Girvan</td>
<td>Great idea and great for anyone who lives in that area, but totally useless for Oxford. Granted, we all live in the same district, but I object to subsidising and continually paying for a facility that has very little relevance to myself or the residents here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Daniel Thompson</td>
<td>I believe the facility only benefits a small portion of the ratepayers, and I think the benefits are overstated and the cost under-estimated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Jane Cochrane</td>
<td>Can’t see why we need to have this when Christchurch is going to be building a sports facility and there has been an upgrade to netball courts and new hockey facilities, there is already a sports facility in Rangiora. Myself, and many other people would not use it, especially Oxford people as we have a gym and school sports teams use the facilities in Oxford and Rangiora. I am really against such huge increases in my rates as are many others. Rates have been rising steadily and more than double what they were 15 years ago. For a number of us in Oxford area we are facing a reasonable rise with the new well going in onto of the yearly increase. We are already struggling to find the extra cash to cover rates and it comes out of our food and clothing for many which hits families hard. Wages do not go up at the same rate and living costs continue to go up too. If you must build a new sports facility, find other ways to do it and make it user pays for the facility upkeep as they are the ones using it. We already have a number of things on our rates that we never use and never will. Please do not put this facility on people’s rates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Michael Bate</td>
<td>Much more emphasis needs to be placed on council core services such as waterways, sewage, roading and stormwater.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Rhys &amp; Alice</td>
<td>The cost of the proposed sports facility is huge. There are many indoor courts in the North Canterbury region, and there are many physical activities that people can partake in that do not involve such a facility. It must only be a small percentage of the population that would use the facilities (which don’t seem particularly multi-use)? The personal cost to all ratepayers is not reasonable. One would think that there are more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB No.</td>
<td>Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>essential issues in the district that council could be putting their focus into.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Cathy &amp; David Price</td>
<td>There are more important things to spend money on, I really do not want another thing I have to pay for in my over-priced rural rates considering we already get no services for our contribution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Liz Innes</td>
<td>I live in Oxford and have no use for this facility. There are already various fitness centres in the CBD which people have easy access to. We have all weather sport surfaces in Coldstream road and sports fields that are being used. Rates in Oxford have gone up 100% in 8 years, I do not want my rates going up for something that is not needed. What is the ratio of people who would use this as opposed to people who will not use this facility?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Ian Sissons</td>
<td>I will not be using this facility, neither will my children or grandchildren. Why should we that live outside of Rangiora help fund a project that has no cost benefit for us? Let those sporting organisations that will use it seek help from their national sporting bodies, do fundraising, like a lot of smaller clubs do or seek funding from lotto and the numerous other trusts that give money away. Also set a charge on the use of this place and also a door charge for those that want to come and use it to watch little Tommy play basketball. I can see only about 10% of the population benefiting from such a monolith. Also I bet there are a few Councillors or staff that would like such a thing so they can say they help the area get it. All good for their egos. I did the rates calculator and saw how much my rates would be with the other options added on. Remember those on fixed income will have to go without other essential items to help pay for such a project that I or others will never use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Linda Marion McKitterick</td>
<td>We the community do not need it. Plenty close by.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Trevor Wright</td>
<td>If some need this it should be 'user pays' like the kerbside collection. It is not a facility which most would use, or appreciate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>A Warren</td>
<td>The cost is excessive for the benefit. The money could be spent over the district in a far more effective way. Team sports are not the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Karen Johnson</td>
<td>Too expensive on rates. Build commercially and charge 'users'. Will not benefit large population of ratepayers and will cause hardship for elderly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>Adrian Davies</td>
<td>Are such hugely expensive facilities really required and is such expenditure justified. As a rate payer is it also justified to increase rates for such a project?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>Gerard Power &amp; Olive Ualesi</td>
<td>It's not that I want no facility. What I want is to have the facility not fully funded by the ratepayer. Can the Council sell some land to help fund it, fundraising, or other options?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>Suzanne Thurlow</td>
<td>Full use can be better made of existing facilities, especially in schools after hours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB No.</td>
<td>Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Only through fund raising and grants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Not needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>Dr Clive Appleton</td>
<td>There is no need to burden the rate payers with a facility that is a want not a need. All sports can survive with outdoor facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>Lorraine Richardson</td>
<td>The funding options for the sport facility are too limited. The sports codes that are going to benefit should be finding funding through different avenues as they benefit from the facility. If this building goes ahead the most expensive part of each ratepayers bill is going to be a sport stadium, does that sound like infrastructure? I am not against a stadium as such but I am certainly against the funding proposal of this facility. A comparison - the township of Waiau lost their swimming pool in the 2016 earthquake. By the end of 2017 they had raised enough money $2 million for a new one. If a population of under 2000 can raise this amount, in a year, without ratepayers then Waimakariri residents could easily raise $20 million without the ratepayers being saddled with the debt. The planning is also short sighted as if we have another major natural disaster then rates will have to go up to cover repairs. How high do the rates have to go before they are too expensive for the people in the lower economic bracket? For some rate payers the choice of staying in the district will be taken away from them - example - my income is just on $30000, too high for a rebate but I will still be spending $3000 on rates, 10% of my income. I have lived in Kaiapoi for 40 years, I am not against improvement but I am against funding structures that could be funded by other means or be downgraded and built within the districts economic means. I do not want to be pushed out of the Waimak district because I can't afford to pay my rates because of a sports centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>Adelle Mahoney</td>
<td>Over past 13 years our rates have risen by something like 120%, something we are struggling to keep up with. This facility would be used by small percentage of rate payers but paid for by all. If these things cannot be user-pays or self-sufficient they shouldn’t be built.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>Donald Faulkes</td>
<td>Don't get too fancy. $182 a year extra on my rates is not wanted for another sports facility that will serve only a few people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285</td>
<td>Tascha Lawry</td>
<td>100% against. We already have East Belt and Flaxton Road facilities. Only used by small portion of community but paid for by all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>There are enough sports facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298</td>
<td>Paul Markholm</td>
<td>If those sportsman require another facility, I suggest they start fundraising. Just like us other people that are involved in community projects. We raise the money even though the community benefits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td>Gail Ross</td>
<td>At the information day I was amazed to find that the consultation on this had been conducted primarily with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB No.</td>
<td>Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sporting organisations - none of which were likely to turn down the prospect of a new Sports Facility. What you are proposing to do is raise the rates significantly for quarter of a century to pay for it. The least the Council could do is survey all ratepayers before proceeding. I would be willing to pay this increase for the next 25 years if it was for a facility for everyone - like a much needed after hours medical centre, which could be leased back to practitioners. The council is badly out of touch with public opinion about the sports facility and would do well to rethink its position.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>344</td>
<td>Trish Keen</td>
<td>I’m not sure this would be a reduced level of service if we keep our current facilities up to date and fresh. This is definitely a want not a need and certainly wouldn’t provide value to a majority of our community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>345</td>
<td>Kelvin Ashby</td>
<td>Absolutely not required and a ridiculous burden for ratepayers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>348</td>
<td>Mike Grove-Merritt</td>
<td>We have been offered to have it built by a contractor and lease back why waste 27million dollars when you don’t have to, also will it be as financially unviable as Dudley pool which we also have to subsidise and were not fully consulted on. Stop wasting our money.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>351</td>
<td>Melanie Wildermoth</td>
<td>Only small amount of people in community would use it and the cost is huge on people’s rates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>356</td>
<td>John Forrest</td>
<td>Only helps a few vocal people in community but paid for by all who can’t always afford it. User pays. Big drain on community finances for elite few.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>359</td>
<td>Chris Lawry</td>
<td>No use to us, can’t see its value for the community as there are already facilities available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>496</td>
<td>Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board</td>
<td>The majority of members oppose the proposal for the District Indoor Sports facility to be located at Coldstream Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>528</td>
<td>Garry Leech</td>
<td>No funding by ratepayers. User pays, fund raise and grants. Unreasonable to add to rates. User pays all the way. Fund raising, Grants, Charitable Trusts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>553</td>
<td>M Farr</td>
<td>It will be good for a very small group of the population at a very big cost for all the non-users including people who have so little to spare now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>560</td>
<td>Linda Stewart</td>
<td>No option given to support the private/public option recently announced in the Northern Outlook. Who will be made aware of this option? I feel very concerned that ratepayers will not be provided choice by not making an effort to advise them there is a choice. I strongly support the public/private option offer to build this stadium at Southbrook. It is a cost effective option that allow the council to focus its available spending on critical needs such as waste water, drinking water and flood management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>561</td>
<td>Lester Tidball</td>
<td>A voting paper should be sent out to all Ratepayers in the Waimakariri District Council area outlining all the options and the costings. There is concern about the deficits listed on page 306 DLTP 2018-2028. Would not the new option of a Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB No.</td>
<td>Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Contractor supplying, building and then leasing back to the Council be a better option for Ratepayers allowing Council to free up any surplus money for other major infrastructural works?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>562</td>
<td>Sherrianne Nation</td>
<td>I do not believe that this building should cost as much as the council is proposing. There are many indoor courts across NZ that have been constructed for far less money. I would be more supportive if the costs were less or there were more options to choose from, for example an indoor courts facility with more of a reduced service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>602</td>
<td>K J Claxton</td>
<td>Older rate payers are on fixed incomes and cannot afford all these non-essential services which benefit a few. Basics - keep rates down.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>603</td>
<td>Jo Kane</td>
<td>Costs of $91 per property throughout the Waimakariri a huge ongoing burden for ratepayers. Consideration must and should be given to looking at facilities already available in the community, including schools, established sports clubs and Council owned facilities e.g. Attached to swimming pools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>616</td>
<td>Christopher Storm</td>
<td>I don’t support the sports complex if it means you have to take a massive loan to build it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>632</td>
<td>Dianna Slater</td>
<td>Facilities built should benefit (in my opinion) the vast majority of residents and be available to the vast majority not just available to a small minority, unless it is a minority not already catered for. There are a great many sports facilities available in the district. Facilities should cater and benefit the majority or under catered for minorities. There are so many sporting facilities available, no more needed for an elite few.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>670</td>
<td>Evelyn Zuberbuhler</td>
<td>Only 20 minutes away there will be a brand new $36.8 million new sports hub being built. This project has a $1.6 million shortfall. Maybe sharing this facility could be an option.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>680</td>
<td>Thomas Glenn</td>
<td>Completely over the top. We are well endowed with this type of service and adding $91 to everyone’s rates per annum, is definite council penny pinch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>697</td>
<td>Jenny Slater</td>
<td>Already plenty facilities, spend budget on the people who need it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>714</td>
<td>Terry Kenny</td>
<td>Being a resident and ratepayer I was shocked to learn that the Waimakariri District Council is proposing to invest $37 million in a sports stadium. If the Mayor and Councillors realised, that in the near future, it is estimated that only approx. 10% of ratepayers would utilize such a stadium. The huge imposition of the resultant rates increase would be a killer for so many of your residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>861</td>
<td>David Blackwell</td>
<td>And put funding back into core infrastructure improvements. The recent 4th option of a private developer building an indoor complex at Southbrook should be seriously looked at.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# MULTI-USE SPORTS FACILITY

Submitter comments – No Option selected

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUB No.</th>
<th>Name/Organisation</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>Community College North Canterbury (Kristian)</td>
<td>We really need this facility to help people complete their sports goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>Karen Livingstone</td>
<td>Needs to be multi use. Like idea of private build leased to council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245</td>
<td>Jenner Litchtwark</td>
<td>A one-lane bridge on Downs Road and a rubbish collection outside of towns is way more important to those of us in the rural areas than yet another grand sports centre. Not everybody plays sport but everybody needs to get rid of rubbish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>335</td>
<td>Stephen Power</td>
<td>I prefer the lease option that has been offered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401</td>
<td>Julie McCartney</td>
<td>This is a hard one, I can see that it would be good for the district and my immediate family would use it, however the extra cost in rates to the whole district (elderly especially) is the down side. Is there any other way to do it that is not quite so costly? Potentially the lease option that was noted in the local paper?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>411</td>
<td>Jos Baker</td>
<td>No Council Multi-Use Facility. Amalgamate with the alternate system. Which can be available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>416</td>
<td>Prue Baines</td>
<td>Council to pursue public/private proposition at Southbrook because it saves our council financial resources and keeps our rates lower.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>605</td>
<td>Janet Collier</td>
<td>I personally do not consider this essential but if it is needed then alternate means of funding should be looked at. I consider it far too expensive to be left to ratepayers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>641</td>
<td>Grey Power North Canterbury Association</td>
<td>1. Our ratepayer members feel the financial burden is too oppressive on their income. Most are on fixed incomes. They are mindful of other very important water related expenses that will need to be met. 2. They would be paying a long term increase in their rates for a facility they will not be able to use. In effect the initial proposal is not a multi-use stadium as it only provides for ball sports and should not be touted as such. 3. There are other options to meet the ball sports users that could be revised with minimum financial burden including the recent news that Rangiora High School is redeveloping its stadium for these activities. 4. They feel that in addition to the planned increased cost of refuse collection the increase in rates will be excessive financial burden.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>667</td>
<td>Federated Farmers of New Zealand</td>
<td>Recommends That Council utilises a UAGC to pay for the construction of this facility. That Council considers other options, like a PPP or a joint venture with another Council, to finance the project, and utilise user fees and charges to pay for the running costs and maintenance of this new facility. That Council undertakes full consultation with its residents to ascertain general interest in building this facility. That Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB No.</td>
<td>Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>844</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>We were involved with raising the money for the High School sports facility. With nearly twice as many people now the same system should be used. That way if you can afford to pay or want to use it you can pay. User pay worked for the swimming pool. Let this be done by private developers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>863</td>
<td>Shirley Cairns</td>
<td>Build the Multi Sport Complex on the Kaiapoi East Red Zone land - Regeneration Plans show car parking spaces and new roading already. Incorporate the $3,337,400 sports field costs into the new building to help budgeted costs for this building. You have more land here than the proposed site in Rangiora. So not to being built in Rangiora.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>871</td>
<td>Pegasus Residents Group</td>
<td>We see the proposed facility as an ambitious project. On the one hand we applaud the provision of facilities which will encourage physical activity in the local population. Some of the sports it will cater for would seem to be relatively minor in terms of number of participants, but we note that the facility will be flexible enough to accommodate future sports as preferences change over time. On the other hand, the fact that it will be fully funded by debt means it will have a meaningful impact on the elderly and others on fixed incomes, i.e. an increase of about 3.5% per annum in average rates to pay for the facility. Whilst we are not opposed to the facility in principle, we pose the following questions; (a) Has the council surveyed the proportion of the local population likely to use the facility? (b) Does the council possess any noncore assets which it could sell to help fund the project? (c) Has the council considered seeking private or corporate investors to fund the project?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**DISTRICT REGENERATION**

Option A – Council’s preference *spread the spend over 10 years*

Total number of submission points in support of Option A = 295

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUB No.</th>
<th>Name/Organisation</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Kathryn Robertson</td>
<td>Will cost more if delayed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Tony Kean</td>
<td>Deferring will only incur additional costs later on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Phillippa Rickerby</td>
<td>Focus on the sports centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Barb Warren</td>
<td>I would like the councillors to consider giving the proposed Heritage and Mahinga Kai and Recreation and Ecological linkages precedence over the BMX tracks and dog park. Waimakariri has significant mana whenua history throughout the region which has gone largely ignored. This unique characteristic of the region is also of interest to the many tourists who pass through the area, and thereby enhances the cultural diversity of the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Neil Wilkinson</td>
<td>Why wait?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Ian Sissons</td>
<td>Yes to this as there still are roads and other infrastructure that need fixing or rebuilding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Kelly Bint</td>
<td>Let’s not make life more difficult for future generations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Alex Vermuelen</td>
<td>Whatever works best.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Andrea Clinick</td>
<td>The earthquakes have cost everybody a lot. Time to re-group and then carry on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Pete Johnson</td>
<td>Spend now for long term benefits for the region, especially now we are getting back on our feet after the EQ's.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Trevor Wright</td>
<td>I presume this is under the heading of ‘Earthquake Recovery and Regeneration’? (p.170).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Woodend Combined Friendship Club</td>
<td>Start now. Things only get more expensive. Servicing debt is a drain on finances, so needs careful management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>Mr Peter Ward</td>
<td>We need to keep investing in this now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>Stephanie Eldred</td>
<td>The cost will only increase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>Julie Elliott</td>
<td>If the work is deferred it will only cost more, spreading the cost over the next 10 years helps everyone budget and as this is a facility, which will be here in 50 years time, spreading the cost is no problem in my opinion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>Dr Rose Washbourne</td>
<td>Environment is important to every ratepayer so every ratepayer should be contributing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>Dr Clive Appleton</td>
<td>Agree but this should be done sensibly so that there are no budget blow outs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253</td>
<td>Ross Ditmer</td>
<td>It will never be cheaper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275</td>
<td>Steve Chandler</td>
<td>Best option for growing district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280</td>
<td>Maura Loney</td>
<td>Need to get the work done.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290</td>
<td>Desray Lithgow</td>
<td>Regeneration uplifts community spirits. It has physical and mental health benefits. Thoughtful regeneration will bring more people into the community, and the spin on effects into the local economy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>David Cartwright</td>
<td>Makes sense.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>342</td>
<td>Mr Eddy van Til</td>
<td>The sooner these land areas become used for community activities, the sooner the local people can recover emotionally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB No.</td>
<td>Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>344</td>
<td>Trish Keen</td>
<td>I am all for the Regeneration works however, when designing public spaces, I believe ALL public should be taken into consideration. I note that there is no disabled access to the new riverside spaces and I don't believe this right or fair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>381</td>
<td>Bill Byers</td>
<td>Needs to be a first charge on Council rates to reinstate the facilities where the need is still there for regeneration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>386</td>
<td>Waimakariri Football Club</td>
<td>Ratepayers can afford the cost over 10 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>408</td>
<td>Sarah Hosking</td>
<td>Very important to create community greenspaces - gardens and natural areas, wetlands etc. to benefit the people and the land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>416</td>
<td>Prue Baines</td>
<td>Prudent spending required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>417</td>
<td>J &amp; P Hardy</td>
<td>Could be cheaper now than 10 years later.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>488</td>
<td>Gary Phillips</td>
<td>Need asap that is affordable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>489</td>
<td>Sian Phillips</td>
<td>Seems feasible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>497</td>
<td>Woodend-Sefton Community Board</td>
<td>The Board is supportive but notes that there is little information on the substance of what is proposed within the Draft LTP Consultation document to identify how such a significant allocation of funds will be used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>498</td>
<td>Rangiora-Ashley Community Board</td>
<td>The Board is supportive of the Regeneration projects and time frame.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>499</td>
<td>Oxford-Ohoka Community Board</td>
<td>The Board is supportive of the proposals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503</td>
<td>Duncan Lees</td>
<td>Allows costs to spread for all rate payers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>521</td>
<td>Greer Smith</td>
<td>I am loving the work being done, but would defiantly be against it if it is not shown we are catering for all people. Looking at the Kaiapoi river bank I see the first side already done has no wheelchair access down to the side of the river. I would like to see the other side receive a ramp all the way down to the river side so these people can also join in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>522</td>
<td>Sarah Smith</td>
<td>Please, please make sure all the district regeneration makes our district accessible for all uses. Let us be an inclusive district for all. The current river bank plan in Kaiapoi does not allow this, this is not acceptable to anyone and shouldn't be acceptable to our council. We are a community with many differences and all our facilities should now be accessible for all. We should not be putting in obstacles we should be removing them. Families are important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>530</td>
<td>Stuart Smith</td>
<td>Keep rate rises to a minimum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>531</td>
<td>Rodger Welsh</td>
<td>To defer is to reduce participation to commercial - asap is to show a progressive council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>535</td>
<td>Chris Garrick</td>
<td>There is a need now, deferral just adds costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>559</td>
<td>Nancy Sutherland</td>
<td>There doesn't appear to be any good reason to defer the work programme. To state the obvious, the residents of Kaiapoi, Pines and Kairaki have experienced very significant upheavals and loss of facilities. Despite the work already completed (and currently underway) in Kaiapoi, for example, the town still has</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
an 'orphan child' feel and needs considerable TLC to bring the township and environs up to the standard the residents deserve. This should be done as quickly as possible. While it is true that Rangiora needed much less work to restore it to pre-quake levels there is a currently a marked difference in the attractions and availability and standard of facilities between Kaiapoi and Rangiora. It would be preferable for the regeneration work programme to be accelerated - this could be achieved without increasing the rates burden by deferring the construction of the proposed indoor sports facility at Rangiora.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUB No.</th>
<th>Name/Organisation</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>560</td>
<td>Linda Stewart</td>
<td>Spreading the costs over the 10 year period provides better fiscal management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>562</td>
<td>Sherrianne Nation</td>
<td>Would be great to see the red zone areas completed and tidied up. Unfortunately some of these areas still look pretty terrible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>563</td>
<td>Lesley Ottey</td>
<td>Because we can’t keep putting things off.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>586</td>
<td>Madeleine Burdon</td>
<td>I think very important to sustain momentum with the recovery and regeneration - important that people know they 'matter' and have not been forgotten especially within their local government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>605</td>
<td>Janet Collier</td>
<td>This work is important after the devastation of the earthquakes as it makes people feel better to see things getting back to normal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>632</td>
<td>Dianna Slater</td>
<td>It is good to keep the district continually improving and evolving for all residents benefit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>651</td>
<td>Woodend School</td>
<td>Deferring only makes it harder later.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>679</td>
<td>Jo George</td>
<td>Small steps to build better foundations and leave open the ability to adapt to situations and changes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>721</td>
<td>Jesse Leen</td>
<td>Nice work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>730</td>
<td>Jennie Marsh</td>
<td>I think this space in Kaiapoi needs something done about it asap. Dog park $200,000? Needed - however how much was spent on the Pegasus Carpark. $200,000 sounds excessive for a few fences and facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>731</td>
<td>Tonya Bristow</td>
<td>Spread the cost, sensible idea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>743</td>
<td>Nathan Hurley</td>
<td>Plan ahead now, don’t wait and get nowhere.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>772</td>
<td>Fiona P Roberts</td>
<td>It will enhance Kaiapoi and coastal park and encourage community pride.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>804</td>
<td>Philip Beare</td>
<td>Spread the work over 10 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>842</td>
<td>B Fordyce</td>
<td>Deferring only makes it harder later.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>861</td>
<td>David Blackwell</td>
<td>Was funding for this regeneration work not provided from earthquake recovery funds?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>871</td>
<td>Pegasus Residents Group</td>
<td>We acknowledge the need for the regeneration of Kaiapoi to assist the recovery from the earthquake, and therefore support Option A. Has the council considered seeking commercial sponsorship or naming rights for the BMX track or dog park?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### DISTRICT REGENERATION

**Option B – Defer the work programme**  
Total number of submission points in support of Option B = 47

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUB No.</th>
<th>Name/Organisation</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>James Girvan</td>
<td>Your Key Capital Projects list shows all the projects planned. These are all located in the East of the region. Rangiora, Kaiapoi, Woodend and Pegasus. Not one mention of Oxford. Yet again we are paying the council excessive rates that seem to only improve other areas of the district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Daniel Thompson</td>
<td>To keep rates down.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Michael Paul Girouard</td>
<td>Too vague to vote for.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>Suzanne Thurlow</td>
<td>Apart from road improvements, the other items could be seen as 'frills'. I would far rather contribute to Okuku residents having safe water supply than a dog park on the other side of my district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Jeremy Richards</td>
<td>Again, I see no pressing need for this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>Community College North Canterbury</td>
<td>Just get it done so we can use it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>Sonny Whitelaw</td>
<td>One again, this cost is to be borne by ratepayers outside the area, most of whom will never have reason to use or benefit from regeneration of this area. And once again, I accept to a point that as a member of the broader community, I should contribute to my community's overall well-being. However, as stated on Page 29: &quot;The Council is also undertaking flood and ground water modelling incorporating potential sea-level and groundwater level rises of about 1 metre.&quot; During development of the last LTP, sea level rise and the overall risk multiplier impacts of climate change were not seriously considered. As a coastal geomorphologist who has researched and reported on the vulnerability of this coastal area to rising sea levels, I applaud the Council’s decision to model impacts up to a 1m rise in sea levels. The science underpinning the predictions of sea level rise is becoming increasingly robust, as too is the capability of complex modelling. Meanwhile, it would be fiscally prudent to limit the budget to be expended on areas prone to not just flooding but inundation and coastal retreat, to relatively inexpensive assets such as tracks and parks, with ecological links that may serve as a short-term buffer against rising sea levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>Cheryl York</td>
<td>Until it is affordable within the current rate collection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247</td>
<td>Jeff Rogers</td>
<td>A cost we can’t afford. As said rates, are getting unaffordable to us pensioners as it is.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298</td>
<td>Paul Markholm</td>
<td>Some regeneration is necessary, However, not at the cost of basics like Sewer, Water and Roading.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>343</td>
<td>Debbie Booth</td>
<td>Too much being spent on this. Yes spread over time, but do not spend as much as $20 million on this. It can be done for less. Not as flash, but still a great thing to be done.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB No.</td>
<td>Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>345</td>
<td>Kelvin Ashby</td>
<td>It would be better to spend half as much over the next 10 years so that the rates increase is also half as much.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>358</td>
<td>James A Ryan</td>
<td>As a Kaiapoi resident I appreciate our library and open spaces plus good walkways. I do not think that residents do not make use of them enough.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>528</td>
<td>Garry Leech</td>
<td>Keep rates increases to CPI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>644</td>
<td>C Pocock</td>
<td>Or at least defer/cancel mahinga kai especially the effects on whitebait and river fish populations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>680</td>
<td>Thomas Glenn</td>
<td>This council is all about thieving from the ratepayers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISTRICT REGENERATION
Submitter comments – No Option selected

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUB No.</th>
<th>Name/Organisation</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>419</td>
<td>Drucilla Kingi Patterson</td>
<td>BMX urgent kids had already waited too long $310,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>496</td>
<td>Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board</td>
<td>The Board does not support the inclusion of the Memorial Garden in the Regeneration work programme. Opposes the current programme of works, but supports the programme being accelerated to be completed over 5 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>596</td>
<td>Brent Cairns</td>
<td>Regarding Regeneration work plan, it would seem there has been no allowance made for roading and footpath upgrade bordering the food forest. Meadow Street, Oram Place, Cass Street. The footpaths/roading in this area are in a terrible condition and need to be addressed. During the public engagement process there was talk that in 25 years more sports fields would be required. Sports clubs would consider it a step backwards if they were to move to the Kaiapoi East sports area, as there are only toilets and changing area. Develop only the softball diamonds, moving them to the new Jones Street. Stop any plans for any additional sports fields. Failure to take into account the number of people who visit these areas foraging for food and fruit. The people come from throughout Canterbury... could be developed into a Kaiapoi tourist destination. Turning this area into sports fields would benefit a few and is a step backward, with underwhelming facilities to support it, detrimental to the future of Kaiapoi as a destination. Ecological links in the regeneration areas must/should be planted in fruit trees to benefit local residents. Stop any plans for any additional sports fields.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>602</td>
<td>K J Claxton</td>
<td>You must get the best value for rate payers. I don’t think you do this at present. Contractors think of Councils as cash cows. We want value for our dollar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>603</td>
<td>Jo Kane</td>
<td>Although an opportunity exists for this area due to the earthquakes the affordability of the projects must be considered alongside core council delivery and the already signalled rate increases. The ongoing operational requirements of these areas also need to be considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>616</td>
<td>Christopher Storm</td>
<td>I do support the district regeneration, let’s make our empty sections damaged from the earthquake usable again.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>637</td>
<td>Martin Pinkham</td>
<td>The programme should be accelerated to be completed over 5 years and the Memorial Gardens component removed from the programme. These amendments will significantly reduce the cost of the Regeneration programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>662</td>
<td>Environment Canterbury</td>
<td>Environment Canterbury supports Council’s programme of work to deliver regeneration in the residential red zone, which is significant for both the continued recovery of the district and development of a stronger, more resilient Greater Christchurch. Environment Canterbury will continue to work with Council as a strategic partner to help achieve sustainable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB No.</td>
<td>Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>667</td>
<td><strong>Federated Farmers of New Zealand</strong></td>
<td>Suggests that the Council funds the regeneration programme from a mix of targeted rates, user pays, central government funding and a lower UAGC, instead of wholly relying on a UAGC. That Council provides some certainty or clarity on how long this rate will run for. That Council provides a better breakdown on costs; for example, road improvements, stormwater and motor caravan park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>839</td>
<td><strong>Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga</strong></td>
<td>Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga expressed an interest in any commercial development in the Kaiapoi Red Zone areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>844</td>
<td><strong>Anonymous</strong></td>
<td>Green space - rural and private lease without building major structures. If someone wants to regenerate for building sell it to them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>863</td>
<td><strong>Shirley Cairns</strong></td>
<td>Put the Red Zone sport fields in Woodend, Ravenswood or Pegasus that way people will be visiting and shopping in these areas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## COMMUNITY FACILITIES

**Option A – Council’s preference plan and budget for facilities**

Total number of submission points in support of Option A = 306

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUB No.</th>
<th>Name/Organisation</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Kathryn Robertson</td>
<td>Will cost more if delayed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Barb Warren</td>
<td>I support the extension of the public library.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Rhys &amp; Alice</td>
<td>Education, provided by libraries as educational spaces, is good. It would be good to see the Rangiora library become more up to date and have a better collection of books and more educational activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Neil Wilkinson</td>
<td>I see no point in waiting - get started and spread the load.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Kelly Bint</td>
<td>Just get on with it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Please improve air conditioning in library. On a very warm day it can be even warmer in the library.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Alex Vermueelen</td>
<td>I don’t believe that one library can satisfy the community’s non-sporting needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Andrea Clinick</td>
<td>Library for Pegasus/Woodend/Ravenswood? Can this be deferred? Every new subdivision doesn’t need this facility. Rangiora and Kaiapoi Libraries are available and Rangiora Library is supposed to be upgraded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Luke Saunders</td>
<td>Change is good.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Pete Johnson</td>
<td>Not sure about needing to almost double the size of Rangiora Library. I understand the need to future proof facilities, but I have been in there at different times through the week and it is never what I would call &quot;busy&quot; or crowded. Some expansion would be good though.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Antony Oosthuysen</td>
<td>Get on with entering the 20th Century.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Trevor Wright</td>
<td>The rates are already a challenge for the payers on superannuation, so the budget should be set as low as common sense allows.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Nathan Punton</td>
<td>Don’t think it is necessary to extend Rangiora Library. I see merit in providing a library space for Woodend - given the projected number of population increase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>Suzanne Thurlow</td>
<td>Education is more important than anything else.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Woodend Combined Friendship Club</td>
<td>This plan has merit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Jeremy Richards</td>
<td>I agree that this facility could, and should, be expanded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>Alexandra Ireland</td>
<td>Like the sport centre, libraries are an important part of a vibrant community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>Stephanie Eldred</td>
<td>The more facilities that are provided in our area means that more people will be able to work, live and play in the same area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>Dr Rose Washbourne</td>
<td>As long as the Council keeps ego and inflated expectations out of the equation, then a sensible and careful approach to community facilities that do no over-stress the finances of the ratepayer is appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB No.</td>
<td>Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>Dr Clive Appleton</td>
<td>Submission 20182028.209 by: Perhaps as the Rangiora library extension is developed there is consideration for Council staff accommodation so that it gives flexibility for the upgrade of the civic service centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>Karen Livingstone</td>
<td>Submission 20182028.212 by Ms: Library way too small, is getting busier every day as a community hub. Need more room to accommodate more books and space for social engagement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>Cheryl York</td>
<td>Submission 20182028.213 by Ms: Within the rates collected only. Why does the council want facilities instantly? It’s time to get back to basics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253</td>
<td>Ross Ditmer</td>
<td>Submission 20182028.253 by Mr: Now is the time to grow. Do not make the mistake like the new Rangiora pool that is only big enough for our community now and won't cope once we grow some more.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274</td>
<td>Waimakariri Youth Council</td>
<td>Submission 20182028.274 by: Upgrading and maintaining our community facilities is incredibly important from a youth perspective and from a wider community perspective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275</td>
<td>Steve Chandler</td>
<td>Submission 20182028.275 by Mr: Need good facilities targeted for the demographics for an expanding population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278</td>
<td>Ronel Stephens</td>
<td>Submission 20182028.278 by Mrs: I would like to comment on the future usage of the Pegasus Community Centre. I wish to be involved with establishing community groups which requires a separate room which holds a maximum of 20 people. This is because the nature of these groups requires a degree of privacy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279</td>
<td>Roger Rule</td>
<td>Submission 20182028.279 by Mr: The current Pegasus Community Centre does not support the needs of the community. (Refer below) It is imperative that mental and emotional needs in our town are addressed. Provision of an appropriate separate room in the community centre would be most helpful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280</td>
<td>Maura Loney</td>
<td>Submission 20182028.280 by Keep our community strong and together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290</td>
<td>Desray Lithgow</td>
<td>Submission 20182028.290 by Mrs: Community facilities are the hub of the community. Libraries etc, help communities, providing local information, a hub to meet, and a non denominational, non judgemental, technologically up to date service that raises a communities moral and assists with the learning process. Always budget for these types of things.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>324</td>
<td>Pam Boyle</td>
<td>Submission 20182028.324 by Mrs: Our community is growing so fast - born and bred here nearly 50 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>342</td>
<td>Eddy van Til</td>
<td>Submission 20182028.342 by Mr: One of the main purposes of the Council’s existence is all about providing facilities for the general good, by pooling of funds and developing goals for their constituents. If it is going to provide roading and sporting facilities, then such proposals as extending &amp; developing libraries, or space for community activity, are just as important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB No.</td>
<td>Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>344</td>
<td>Trish Keen</td>
<td>Some facilities - I support the extension of the Rangiora Library, however maybe not quite to the extent mentioned in the draft plan. The Library is a communal space and needs to be upbeat and open, however maybe an extension of smaller size and refurbishment would suffice. I don't particularly agree or disagree with the proposal to build a new Library in the Ravenswood area but maybe deferral is a good option at the moment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>386</td>
<td>Waimakariri Football Club</td>
<td>Need to plan grow and budget accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>Gary Powell</td>
<td>Organised approach but make the decision and get to it. Please not too many committees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>408</td>
<td>Sarah Hosking</td>
<td>The improved Library sounds really great but does it need to be so large?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>412</td>
<td>Jim Gerard</td>
<td>Prudent approach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>416</td>
<td>Prue Baines</td>
<td>Public feedback required for each project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>417</td>
<td>J &amp; P Hardy</td>
<td>Plan and budget for facilities, must be ongoing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>422</td>
<td>Jon Kiripatea</td>
<td>Great idea much needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>423</td>
<td>Kim Kiripatea</td>
<td>With the current growing population, more community facilities are needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>472</td>
<td>G Thomas</td>
<td>Rangiora is getting bigger and needs community facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>476</td>
<td>Angela Coutts</td>
<td>Community is growing it needs more facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>489</td>
<td>Sian Phillips</td>
<td>Facilities are needed now. We have to plan for it ASAP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>498</td>
<td>Rangiora-Ashley Community Board</td>
<td>Rangiora Library Extension The Board is supportive in principle with the proposal to extend the Library but seeks assurances that trends in usage/ nature of services available as influenced by technology and customer needs/demographics will be re-assessed prior to any final decision being made. Woodend/Pegasus Community Centre This is supported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>499</td>
<td>Oxford-Ohoka Community Board</td>
<td>The Board supports the proposal for facilities in the Woodend/Pegasus area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503</td>
<td>Duncan Lees</td>
<td>We need to look after those facilities we do have for the current and future residents of Waimakariri district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>529</td>
<td>Joseph Matthews</td>
<td>Yes so it is done with the least amount of cost possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>530</td>
<td>Stuart Smith</td>
<td>Will take time to organise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>531</td>
<td>Rodger Welsh</td>
<td>To defer or reduce is 'chopping wood with a blunt axe.' Prepare cost structures show the community a pro-active stance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>535</td>
<td>Chris Garrick</td>
<td>Need to at least maintain current level. The District has grown significantly over the last 5 years and Council facilities have not kept up with demand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>559</td>
<td>Nancy Sutherland</td>
<td>I note that libraries are classed as a core service in the Local Government Act 2002 so it is appropriate to ensure that they are properly funded before other non-core activities are undertaken. The Waimakariri public libraries (and their staff) are incredibly valuable in providing educational, recreational and community resources. The high usage (i.e. 460,000 visitors to the Rangiora and Kaiapoi libraries in 2016/17) demonstrates how important these facilities are. The Rangiora library, however, needs an upgrade with, among other things,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB No.</td>
<td>Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>better staff facilities. Given that once the Ravenswood development comes on stream the area (Woodend, Kaiapoi and Pegasus) will have the combined population of a small town there will be a need for library facilities to be located in the area. The more services there are in the area the less reason there will be for residents to travel to Rangiora and Kaiapoi, thus reducing traffic pressures on the access roads to these towns.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>562</td>
<td>Sherrianne Nation</td>
<td>I agree with improving the services at the Rangiora library, specifically providing more meeting spaces for the community and staff. It would also be nice to bring the library into line with the modern spaces like the Kaiapoi and Oxford libraries. I do not support a satellite library in Woodend as this would be a great expense when people already travel to our fantastic libraries in Kaiapoi and Rangiora.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>563</td>
<td>Lesley Ottey</td>
<td>Just get on with things please this faffing around is not helping anyone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>586</td>
<td>Madeleine Burdon</td>
<td>Absolutely necessary especially for the Eastern side of the District. Also Libraries are a real hub so the extension is important to sustain the services and future demand. And very importantly, a community facility is long overdue especially in Rangiora.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>602</td>
<td>K J Claxton</td>
<td>Essential and existing facilities should be maintained and expanded where necessary, but I do question new ones that benefit a few. Keep in mind the fixed income older rate payers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>605</td>
<td>Janet Collier</td>
<td>These facilities are for the use of the very young to the old and can be used by all the community if they so choose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>670</td>
<td>Evelyn Zuberbuhler</td>
<td>The library is a facility for everyone so a great idea to increase the size of the Rangiora Library and build a space for the other communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>679</td>
<td>Jo George</td>
<td>Plan, take the lead, communicate, gather data look to be investing in people and place. Initiate shared and open information to plan and develop. Share the knowledge, educate and update.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>730</td>
<td>Jennie Marsh</td>
<td>Library and Community space for Woodend - library not necessary, increase library at Rangiora if necessary. Purpose built community space for Pegasus could be on the 10 year plan - adequate at the moment. NB. rentals for community groups should be left as they are. Better fully used that 1/2 used. Any extra costs should be met by the council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>731</td>
<td>Tonya Bristow</td>
<td>Be great to see a youth hub open as well in the future. Also for the pool to get a bit bigger and get more facilities as Caroline Bay has. Very hard to have all ages in that one small pool. Waterslide would be a great addition to Rangiora Pool.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>743</td>
<td>Nathan Hurley</td>
<td>Plan ahead now, don’t wait and get nowhere.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>755</td>
<td>Woodend Community Association</td>
<td>Regarding the new facility at Woodend/Pegasus, we would like it noted that WCA have made a submission to Mayor David Ayers with regard to setting land aside in Ravenswood</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
for community facilities to help support the projected growth in Woodend. We draw attention to this request again which addresses the requirement for a social centre for our growing community, along with sports facilities, library and swimming pool to cater for Woodend and the wider community of Pegasus and Waikuku. We would request the new facility is given priority over the expansion of Rangiora Library.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUB No.</th>
<th>Name/Organisation</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>804</td>
<td>Philip Beare</td>
<td>Plan based on residents requirements. Budget based on fiscal responsibilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>808</td>
<td>Penny Horton</td>
<td>Listen to what rate payers want.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMMUNITY FACILITIES
Option B – Defer after 2028
Total number of submission points in support of Option B = 29

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUB No.</th>
<th>Name/Organisation</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Phillipa Rickerby</td>
<td>The facilities in Waimakariri are fine could be improved at a later date, better to focus on one project at a time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Ian Sissons</td>
<td>In your plan you say it is to rebuild the Rangiora library. Why should I have to pay for this as I do not live in Rangiora, but Kaiapoi and we have a lovely new library that rate payers here help with. Let those that live in the area that you target for community facilities pay for theirs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>343</td>
<td>Debbie Booth</td>
<td>Pegasus/Ravenswood/Woodend does not need a Library. Great to extend the Rangiora one, but I believe those other areas could use the Rangiora or Kaiapoi Library.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>345</td>
<td>Kelvin Ashby</td>
<td>Library facilities are adequate for at least another 10 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>349</td>
<td>Charmaine McGregor</td>
<td>I object to the proposed increase to Community Venues hire fees especially for those businesses or organisations that are promoting services that contribute to the community health and well-being.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>358</td>
<td>James A Ryan</td>
<td>Let us concentrate on priority spending and scale down on non-essential projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>381</td>
<td>Bill Byers</td>
<td>Maintenance/Regeneration should be the priorities before any fresh Capital Works. Just remember needs before wants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>510</td>
<td>Rochelle &amp; Joe Faimalo</td>
<td>I also believe Pegasus needs a purpose built community centre or the one that is there extended to include the shops next door and upstairs also. I have on a number of occasions wanted to run youth events, workshops and other classes in the evenings and have been unable to do so as it is booked out every evening of the week. It would also be great to see a facility that has capacity to hold more people. As the Pegasus community grows I see this as an important asset. People move to Pegasus and live in Pegasus for the strong community it has. We need to continue to grow as the community grows and continue to provide the appropriate facilities for the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>521</td>
<td>Greer Smith</td>
<td>I don’t believe the Rangiora library needs to be made bigger a revamp could be done but not needed to be bigger.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>644</td>
<td>C Pocock</td>
<td>Developments at Woodend/Pegasus need to take account of likely sea level rises.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMMUNITY FACILITIES
Option C – No change reduced levels of service
Total number of submission points in support of Option C = 24

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUB No.</th>
<th>Name/Organisation</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>James Girvan</td>
<td>These facilities will reduce over time naturally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Daniel Thompson</td>
<td>These facilities should be able to support themselves on their current rates and fees, rather than charging what is effectively a levy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Liz Innes</td>
<td>How many people use these facilities? What is the ratio of people using them compared to people not using them?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Karen Johnson</td>
<td>Everything is accessible online now, very few young people I have met use a library. Just need internet hotspots, reduce libraries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247</td>
<td>Jeff Rogers</td>
<td>We already have good community facilities. Let’s just use them as they are and cut the costs. Enough is enough of the Councils spend - spend policy and putting up our rates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298</td>
<td>Paul Markholm</td>
<td>With the failing of other services, like roading being in a bad state, I see no need to provide high cost facilities for very few ratepayers. It’s a matter of priorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>496</td>
<td>Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board</td>
<td>The Board opposes the proposed extension of the Rangiora Library at this stage given the lack of information provided as to rationale. Supports the proposed Library and Community Space at Woodend / Pegasus and notes that the “trigger” population has been reached for Pegasus and that any community space for Woodend should only be considered when its own “trigger” point has been reached.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>528</td>
<td>Garry Leech</td>
<td>Concentrate on core services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>560</td>
<td>Linda Stewart</td>
<td>I believe this needs an independent assessment due to the locations and numbers of smaller settlements. It is a proven fact that people will regularly use one significant recreation facility. Therefore I am strongly opposed to another aquatic facility being built at Pegasus for this reason. Build one significant facility not unlike EA Networks in Ashburton - noting their population is half of Waimakariri with a slower population growth forecast.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>680</td>
<td>Thomas Glenn</td>
<td>A combination of all options is how I see this farcical council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB No.</td>
<td>Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>Sonny Whitelaw</td>
<td>Again, this cost is also to be borne by ratepayers outside Pegasus/Woodend areas, both of which will be increasingly prone to flooding and inundation over the coming decades. I accept that this comment will be rejected, but feel it needs to be made as a matter of public record.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>497</td>
<td>Woodend-Sefton Community Board</td>
<td>The Board urges immediate action to enable a larger permanent community centre to be established at Pegasus and notes that the “trigger threshold” has been reached already. The Board supports the retention of the current Woodend Community Centre but does not support the proposal for a Library and Community centre to be located at Woodend/Pegasus and urges that this be placed at Ravenswood and that a suitable site is earmarked even at this early stage in readiness for the expansion of the development and population “trigger” for release of the LTP funding. The Board requests that this Ravenswood Hub should also take the form of a “mini service centre” as in Oxford and the Ruataniwha Kaiapoi Civic Centre. The Board notes that there are currently significant issues with the heating and ventilation systems at the Rangiora Library and that these need urgent attention for the comfort of all users and staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>603</td>
<td>Jo Kane</td>
<td>The level of service in this area is too high for the projected population. I question the need for a library for Woodend/Pegasus. The capacity for ratepayers to pay not only for the capital costs but ongoing maintenance and operational costs. There are smarter ways to deliver some of these services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>616</td>
<td>Christopher Storm</td>
<td>I do support the upgrade to the community facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>667</td>
<td>Federated Farmers of New Zealand</td>
<td>Suggest that the Council uses a UAGC and targeted rate to fund these projects, and adopt user pays for ongoing, operational costs. That the Council provides a more detailed explanation about renting its land to community groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>844</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>I agree on having a library for Woodend/Pegasus and soon Ravenswood, but why extend Rangiora Library at $7.2 million? I use this library regularly and never see the overcrowding. Adding a library/community centre in Woodend is going to take pressure off Rangiora library anyway.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 871     | Pegasus Residents Group                    | This topic is of great importance to us in Pegasus. As has been acknowledged in reports to your council, Pegasus is the only town in the Waimakariri district that does not have community facilities that meet the proposed level of service (as per Community Facilities Development report dated November 2017) We do not believe the suggestion of a library/community facility at Ravenswood or Pegasus was the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUB No.</th>
<th>Name/Organisation</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>correct way to deliver this issue to the district. We see two separate issues here: Pegasus needs a permanent community facility regardless of where the library goes and that doesn’t seem to be acknowledged in the information that has been included in the Draft Long Term Plan. We see this as a significant oversight.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. SUMMARY

1.1 This report is seeking a decision from Council for the LTP on the development of a multi-use sports facility at Coldstream Road.

1.2 The Council’s proposal is to build the facility for $27.85 million with the completion due in late 2020. The capital cost would be loan funded with a 25 year loan. The rate effect of the Facility is assessed as being $91 per rateable property per year.

1.3 This proposal updates the earlier provision contained in the 2015-25 LTP which provided for $23 million facility to be built in 2020-2022. At that time it was estimated to cost ratepayers $108 per annum over a 25 year period.

1.4 The changes that have occurred since the last LTP are that further design and costing work has been undertaken. The Council signalled that it wished the facility to be brought forward, given the issues with the Rangiora High School facility and the lack of facilities available for the community. The increase in the cost estimate is an increase of $4.875 million, and the estimated cost per ratepayer has decreased from $108 to $91 per ratepayer, mainly due to a higher number of ratepayers underpinning the 2018-28 LTP.

1.5 DM and AD Smith Investments Limited presented an option to build and lease a facility at Flaxton Road. The proposal is to lease the facility to the Council for up to 35 years for an annual lease payment initially of $1,422,800. In subsequent conversations with Daniel Smith he indicated the lease term, site layout and building configuration could be altered if that is something the Council wished to pursue.

1.6 The financial analysis undertaken shows that the option of leasing the facility results over the life of the project is a higher cost to the Council than if it owned the facility itself. In Net Present Value terms ownership is $12.675 million cheaper than leasing the facility. All sensitivity testing using different discount rates does not alter the outcome and ownership is the lowest whole-of-life cost.

1.7 The Council has developed its LTP including the facility being loan funded. The Council will be able to secure loan funding at good interest rates, based on its AA credit rating. As outlined in the Draft LTP the Council will remain within its borrowing policy limits.
1.8. The other issue that Council will consider is the affordability of the proposal for the community. The Council when it adopted its Draft LTP considered the affordability of the LTP and by adopting the Draft LTP exercised its judgement that the overall programme, being the ‘Council’s Proposal’ to the community, considering all matters, was affordable.

1.9. Submissions received from those concerned about rates affordability tended to represent those on fixed incomes and lower wages. The Rates Rebate scheme is available to low-income earning ratepayers and approximately 2,000 ratepayers in the District apply and most secure in excess of $600 rates rebate. Typically rates, after the rates rebate can account for up to 10% of disposable income of those receiving Guaranteed Retirement Income. Retired residents on fixed incomes are seen as those most affected by rate increases, as they are sometimes considered “asset rich and cash poor”.

1.10. Trying to objectively assess the affordability of rates is difficult. Some would argue PAYE is a lot less affordable but like rates is part and parcel of citizenship/property ownership and should be seen in total with more or lesser benefit from services received across a basket of services ‘evening out’ over time.

1.11. As a District, Waimakariri has a high decile rating and a comparatively high median income. According to LGNZ’s assessment, the District’s average rates as a percentage of median household income is the fourth lowest in the country, at about 4.5%, while the national average across all Councils is around 7%.

1.12. Ultimately, the matter of affordability is a judgement to be made by the Council.

Attachments:

   i. Coldstream Road Master Plan Indoor Multi Use Facility (Trim 170816088145)
   ii. Letter from Daniel Smith (Trim 180510051350)
   iii. Location Analysis (Trim 180510051375)

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180430046651

(b) Notes the submissions to the Draft LTP on the multi-use indoor court facility

(c) Notes the letter of offer from DM and AD Smith Investments Ltd for an alternative proposal at Flaxton Road.

(d) Declines the proposal from DM and AD Smith Investments Ltd because the long-term cost of leasing will be greater than through Council ownership by around $12.575 million.

(e) Approves the Master Plan for the layout of the Council owned land at Coldstream Road. (Trim 170816088145).

(f) Agrees to proceed with the development of the Multi Use Sports Facility at Coldstream Road for a total project cost of $27.85 million with the construction of the facility being completed around September 2020.

(g) Requests staff to submit a report on procurement of professional services for the detailed design of the facility to the July Council meeting.

(h) Notes that the rate effect of the facility is an increase of $91.00 per property per annum.

(i) Circulates the resolution and the report to the Community Boards.
3. BACKGROUND

3.1 The potential to develop a multi-use indoor court facility has been under discussion with Council since 2013 with an Indoor Court Feasibility Study being completed in 2014.

3.2 This proposal updates the earlier provision contained in the 2015-25 LTP which provided for $23 million facility to be built in 2020-2022. At that time it was estimated to cost ratepayers $108 per annum over a 25 year period.

3.3 The Council has had various working parties and external advice on the size and composition of a multi-use sports facility, and this culminated in a decision in January 2018 to include a provision of $27.85 million in the Draft LTP and to seek the views of the community.

3.4 Design and construction of the facility will take approximately three years with building completion signalled for September 2020.

4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

4.1. Alternative Proposal

4.1.1. Following recent media articles on the proposed multi-sport facility at Coldstream Road Daniel Smith submitted an alternative proposal for the consideration of Council.

4.1.2. The proposal is to supply a completed building ready for occupancy with the following:
   • 4860m2 of courts
   • 1820m2 of supporting buildings, administration, toilets showers etc
   • 250 car parks.

4.1.3. The annual rental would be $1,422,800 (excl GST) plus outgoings of rates, insurances and services (power, water and phone).

4.1.4. The lease would need to be a minimum first term of 15 years with two rights of renewal of 10 years on “normal” Auckland Law Society Deed of Lease terms, although a longer term could be negotiated.
   • The building would be a design and building which would consist of:
     • Concrete floors and foundation
     • Structural steel, long span portal frames
     • Insulated PIR panel roof system,
     • Concrete wall panels to 3m high around the building perimeter
     • Insulated wall panels from 3m – 6m high
     • Double glazed windows

Building components/design

4.1.5. The Council spent some time working with key stakeholders and an Advisor from Visitor Solutions to develop a functional design brief for an indoor court facility for the District.

4.1.6. That Functional Design Brief was the basis of the design for the architects (Warren and Mahoney) to develop a concept design for a multi-use sports facility at Coldstream Road.
4.1.7. There are some key differences with the space allowances in the proposal compared with those in the Warren and Mahoney design which are directly from the Functional Design Brief.

4.1.8. The total size of Daniel Smith proposal is the same square meter-age (6057m²) as the Warren and Mahoney design but the composition of the areas is different:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>W&amp;M m²</th>
<th>D Smith m²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Court</td>
<td>3444</td>
<td>4860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting spaces – admin, toilets showers etc</td>
<td>2613</td>
<td>1820</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1.9. The following table details the areas allowed for in the Functional Design Brief and the Warren and Mahoney concept design:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Works</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Courts (4 no.)</td>
<td>3,444 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Fitness Areas</td>
<td>800 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing Areas</td>
<td>409 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports House</td>
<td>195 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reception, Foyer &amp; Entrance</td>
<td>252 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Management Area</td>
<td>58 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allied Health</td>
<td>107 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Use Rooms</td>
<td>154 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage</td>
<td>215 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulation</td>
<td>250 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant</td>
<td>37 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Wall Thickness</td>
<td>136 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,613 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6,057 m²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1.10. From the information supplied from it is not possible to assess which areas are provided for in the 1820m² and if it is decided to further develop this proposal the areas assigned to each function would need to be determined.

4.1.11. Flooring: The proposal specifies concrete floors whereas the concept design allows for wooden floors in the indoor court area. While the proposal could be modified to incorporate wooden floors it would have cost implications that would most likely be reflected an adjusted level of rental payable.

4.1.12. Ceiling height: The ceiling height in the proposal of 6m is too low for netball/basketball and would need to be 8.5m for the indoor court area and a range of 3.5m to 5.5m for the other areas. Increasing the ceiling height will increase the build cost which will be most likely be reflected in an adjusted level of rental.

4.1.13. Fit-out: In a subsequent meeting with Daniel Smith, the Mayor and the Chief Executive it was confirmed that the interior arrangement in the proposal is indicative. If it is decided to proceed further with the proposal Staff would work with D Smith to achieve an internal arrangement that would be workable for users.

4.1.14. Future expansion: A requirement of the Functional Design Brief was to include the potential for future expansion. On the proposed plan from D Smith it does not appear that there would be room to add further indoor courts if needed but there is the potential to reconfigure the site plan to enable future expansion.
4.1.15. **HVAC**: The proposal does not contain any information on any HVAC systems that may be included.

4.1.16. **Spectator seating**: The proposal does not reference the provision for spectator seating in the indoor court space.

4.1.17. **Car parking**: The Flaxton Road site provides for 250 car parks. The actual number needed will be a matter to be considered as part of a resource consent process which will include a traffic assessment. There is very limited potential for the absorption of overflow car parking when tournaments are being held at the facility.

4.1.18. By way of comparison the Coldstream Road concept has provision of 200 car parks in stage 1 which is complemented by the existing 100 in existence in front of hockey turf plus provision for further 144 parks beside the tennis facility. If there is a major tournament, there is the potential to utilise other adjacent car parking potentially available at Maria Andrews and Mainpower Oval.

### Location Analysis

4.1.19. Part of the work undertaken by the Indoor Court Working Party and reported to Council, was a location analysis of various sites. Now that the Flaxton Road site has been suggested, Staff have analysed the site using the same matrix as applied to other sites.

4.1.20. Under the matrix Flaxton Road gets a score of 83.76% which is second to Coldstream Road site which has a score of 95.73%.

4.1.21. The key scoring differences in comparison with Coldstream Road relate to less proximity to other sporting facilities, less proximity to a high school and less ranking for long term control of the land. Coldstream land is free simple owned by the Council and Flaxton Road is in private ownership with a lease to the Council.

4.1.22. The spreadsheet showing the analysis is attached to this report. Note that as staff have not been able to engage with user groups in terms of preference for location we have assigned the same score to Flaxton as used for Coldstream.

### Cost implications of potential modifications

4.1.23. In order for the proposed facility to be functional for the community there would need to be modifications/clarifications to the specifications relating to:

- The type of flooring (wooden rather than concrete)
- The ceiling height of the indoor court space
- The square metres allocated to each activity
- HVAC – no reference to any provision and standards of performance
- Spectator seating – no reference to provision of spectator seating

4.1.24. It is most probable that addressing the points above will add to the capital cost of the project. Any increase to the capital cost may well lead to an adjustment of the annual rental payable.

4.1.25. The proposal specified an annual rental of $1,422,800 plus outgoings. The proposal has been analysed (see section 6.1 below) on the basis of that figure but if this proposal is pursued further then that figure may well increase.

### Community Views

4.1.26. The views of key stakeholders and other sporting groups have not been sought on this proposal. While some submitters have commented on the alternative offer, as it was reported in the media, Council has not consulted on the proposal.
4.1.27. The views of the wider community have not been sought and given the level of response to the Coldstream Road proposal, it is probable that there will be a lot of people who would like to have an opportunity to voice their opinion on the Flaxton Road proposal.

4.1.28. It is suggested that if Council would like to continue to investigate this proposal that staff work with Mr Smith to develop a concept that meets the requirements of the brief, ascertain the impact on the rent proposal and then undertake a special consultative process with the Community.

4.1.29. The new proposal is significantly different than what was consulted on in the Draft LTP.

4.1.30. The key areas of significance are: ownership, location, impact on rates and potentially functionality.

4.1.31. There has not been any engagement with the North Canterbury Sports and Recreation Trust as likely operators of the facility.

4.1.32. If the Council wishes to pursue this option then there will need to be a special consultation process with the Community as furthering this option will result in the need for an amended LTP.

Financial Implications

4.1.33. Staff have analysed the proposal based on the lease payment of $1,422,800 per annum. It should be noted that, as mentioned above, this figure may increase once the plans are refined.

4.1.34. The Auckland Law Society Rental agreement does also allow for rent increases during the term of a lease.

4.1.35. The best option of considering the merits of the proposal to lease versus Council ownership is to undertake a Net Present Value (NPV) Analysis. The analysis assumes the same approach will be taken to operating the facility, whether it is owned or leased, and therefore has not been included in the analysis.

4.1.36. A NPV assessment compares the current value of all the lease payments over the term of the lease (which needs to equate the estimated life of the complex, which is 50 years), against the net present value of the 25 year loan and interest repayments (under the ownership model).

4.1.37. The NPV analysis also requires us to consider the fact that at the end of 25 years, under the Council ownership model, we have a facility that still has a further 25 years of life left in it. In the absence of a market for such buildings, we estimate the value to be that of the facility’s depreciated replacement cost, and this is then discounted back to back to its present value.

4.1.38. The NPV analysis has been calculated using a discount factor of 5%, which is the cost of borrowing the Council has factored into its LTP. We have also undertaken sensitivity analysis based on 4.2%, which is our current cost of weighted-average cost of borrowing, and 7% which assumes a higher rate.

4.1.39. The key parameters and assumptions used in the NPV analysis are:

- A lease payment of $1,422,800 in the first year, and inflation adjusted by 2% per annum thereafter, over a lease term of 50 years.
- The value of the building at the end of 25 years being halfway through its economic life and valued at 50% of the estimated cost to construct of $27.85 million, thereby having a value of $13,925,000 at that time.
- Under an ownership model funding the building using a loan with 25 year term, using a table mortgage repayment schedule with an interest rate of
5% and annual interest and principal payments of $1,953,700 per annum for each of the 25 years of the loan’s term.

- Using a discount rate of 5% which is the borrowing rate assumption contained within the LTP (with sensitivity analysis undertaken with discount rates of 4.2% and 7%).

4.1.40. The NPV analysis shows the following results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discount Rate</th>
<th>Lease Option Cost</th>
<th>Ownership Option Cost</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>$25,855,879</td>
<td>$20,369,782</td>
<td>$5,486,096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>$36,294,845</td>
<td>$23,619,062</td>
<td>$12,675,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.20%</td>
<td>$42,422,020</td>
<td>$25,107,900</td>
<td>$17,314,120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1.41. The NPV analysis shows that the whole of life cost of owning the facility is $12.675 million cheaper than the Council leasing the facility.

4.1.42. The sensitivity analysis shows, that with different discount rates, it is still cheaper to own than lease.

4.1.43. It is worth noting that even if the lease payments are not inflation adjusted by 2% per annum, it is still cheaper to own than lease. Further, if the lease term was only 35 years, as outlined in the proposal, it would still be cheaper to own the facility.

4.1.44. By funding the facility by loan the Council will be required to make a total payments over the term of the loan of about $49 million (or a NPV of $27.5 million), assuming a 5% interest rate, compared to making lease payments totalling approximately $120 million over 50 years (or a NPV of $36.3 million).

Options

4.1.45. Option One – Decline

a) This is the preferred option as the proposal would cost the community more for the building over its life.

b) The actual rental cost will almost certainly increase once the building is configured to meet the requirements of the facility – particularly in relation to ceiling height, HVAC and configuration of the spaces.

c) There is also a risk that the North Canterbury Sport and Recreation Trust will not be able to operate the facility on the same basis as is currently planned for Coldstream Road site.

4.1.46. Option Two – Further investigate

a) Under this option the Council would register interest with D Smith and then work through the design details to align with the functional design brief specifications.

b) There would also be a need to have a special consultation process as this option would result in an amendment to the LTP.

Draft LTP Consultation
4.2. The consultation material, while allowing for general comments did reference three options:

1. Start now;
2. Defer until 2028 or
3. Do not proceed with the build.

4.3. The following table summarises the submissions received:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Submissions</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Start now</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defer until 2028</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No facility – reduced levels of service</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total submissions received</td>
<td>731</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4. Those in support generally acknowledged the importance of the facility for a variety of sporting opportunities to be provided in the District, many also referenced the importance of having such a facility availability in the District.

4.5. Those who opposed the building or sought to have it deferred generally expressed concerns about affordability of rates and the potential lack of use by older residents.

4.6. The views of each of the Community Boards are summarised below in Section 5 below.

4.7. Concept design

4.7.1. There were no substantive suggestions received for alterations to the concept plan either verbally or in any of the written suggestions. Some further suggestions for use did emerge such as small-bore rifle shooting and that could be potentially accommodated, with sufficient safeguards, in the proposed building. (Currently small-bore rifle shooting operates in Cust Community Centre with no issues). It is proposed that all usage arrangements would be the responsibility of the North Canterbury Sport and Recreation Trust (the Trust) as operators of the facility.

4.7.2. If the Council decides to continue with the project, the Trust will be involved in the detailed design process which will address all of the specific operational needs.

4.7.3. The QS Estimate was prepared on the basis of the concept design which allows for 6,057 sq metres of building as per the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Works</th>
<th>m²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Courts (4 no.)</td>
<td>3,444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Fitness Areas</td>
<td>800 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing Areas</td>
<td>409 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports House</td>
<td>195 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reception, Foyer &amp; Entranceway</td>
<td>252 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Management Area</td>
<td>58 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allied Health</td>
<td>107 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Use Rooms</td>
<td>154 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage</td>
<td>215 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulation</td>
<td>250 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant</td>
<td>37 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Wall Thickness</td>
<td>136 m²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.7.4. There were no submissions that would require any change to those areas.
4.8. Timing for the project

4.8.1. The following table outlines the likely timing of the key stages of the programme with an estimated project completion of 30 September 2020.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commence design</td>
<td>01 July 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete design</td>
<td>31 January 2019 (7 months)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement for construction complete</td>
<td>30 March 2019 (2 months)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction complete</td>
<td>30 September 2020 (18 months)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.8.2. Note that after construction is completed there will be additional time required to complete the fit out before the facility can open for the community to use.

4.9. Site layout plan

4.9.1. Included with the consultation was a site layout plan which also provides for a new tennis centre.

4.9.2. There were no negative comments on the site layout and it is recommended that the Council adopt the concept plan to guide future development at the Coldstream Road site.

4.9.3. If the indoor facility is supported by Council, staff will work with the Rangiora and Tennis Clubs on furthering the development of the tennis complex as indicated on the layout plan. An early stage of that development will be the development of a Heads of Agreement between Rangiora and Southbrook Tennis Clubs and the Council on the respective commitments and responsibilities of each party.

4.9.4. If the facility is not supported by Council there will need to be a further report to Council on the implications of proceeding with the tennis development at Coldstream Road.

4.10. Project Management

4.10.1. If the Council supports the continuation of the project there will be a report to Council on the next stages of the project and the associated project management structure.

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

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. Groups and Organisations
The following are comments on the Multi Use Facility in the submissions from the Community Boards:

Oxford-Ohoka Community Board
The Board supports the principle of such a facility and the benefits that it would bring to the district, but is extremely mindful of the impact of the proposed rate increase on those with fixed or low incomes.

Rangiora-Ashley Community Board
The Board strongly supports the principle of such a facility and the benefits that it would bring to the district. The Board notes that it is a building to meet future needs and a life expectancy of over 50 years which is to be commended.

However members are also mindful of the significant capital cost and the additional $90 per annum rates burden particularly for those on fixed incomes.
The Board seeks assurance that costs will be tightly controlled and all major items have been fully accounted for and that there will be no deviation from the estimated cost and that any and all steps will be taken to further drive down construction costs whilst ensuring a fully function sports facility.

The Board seeks assurance that the facility will be first and foremost for our District’s use and that there will be appropriate arrangements in place to ensure that this remains the case and that our own communities and residents needs are not impeded by the popularity of the facility and usage by non-District residents and associated sports and other groups.

The Board would wish to be advised what these measures will be as it is critical that the facility is seen as a District first in terms of patronage. It is of concern that such a facility could become popular for regional tournaments and other wider events compromising opportunities. One member suggesting some form of differential charging be considered for district residents as opposed to the wider area.

**Woodend-Sefton Community Board**

The Board strongly supports the principle of such a facility and the benefits that it would bring to the district. However, the Board urges the Council to consider more innovative funding options other than to be fully funded by ratepayers.

Members regard the $23 million as too high to fall solely on rate payers and also query whether a more realistic design should be considered. One which achieves full sporting functionality but with minimal design aesthetics.

Members noted a number of potential and realistic scenarios that could be pursued including seeking partners for its construction in whole or in part. Members noted ‘big box’ companies moving into the district together with successful community focused existing businesses such as those offering Retirement complexes, Mainpower or similar as potential contributors.

Many such community facilities receive large donations that are then recognised in some way within the building. Naming of a room or acknowledged on the ‘opening plaque’. It is not clear whether any other options have been explored and the outcome of these.

The Board urges strong engagement with Environment Canterbury as regards the critical need for public transport – now and even more so in the future - if the facility is built.

The board has consistently lobbied ECan for a Bus service connecting Woodend/ Pegasus/Waikuku with the wider area including Rangiora. If ECan are either unwilling or unable to recognise the critical need for public transport within the District and these critical interconnections, perhaps the Council itself should consider a local arrangement and contract to stimulate usage and offer the services that are clearly needed and currently lacking.

The Board also notes that further complementary sports and recreation facilities remain a high priority and necessity for other local areas such as Pegasus and Oxford.

**Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board**

The majority of members oppose the proposal for the District Indoor Sports facility to be located at Coldstream Road. There are concerns as to the cost per household to fund this or any other such facility solely by the Council - especially for those on fixed incomes.

The Board would also urge innovation in the development of alternative funding models for the facility including partnership arrangements or some form of donation from the larger multi nationals or other businesses as occurs for other community venues in New Zealand. Such an approach might engender further support from the Board for the proposal and also alleviate the cost burden on ratepayers.

It is also unclear as to how younger and older people will be able to access the facility given the lack of public transport to the location.
5.2. **Wider Community**

The following table summarises the 731 submissions received in the options that were specified in the Draft LTP consultation material:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Submissions</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Start now</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defer until 2028</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No facility – reduced levels of service</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**

6.1.1. The Council’s proposal is to build the facility for $27.85 million with the completion due in late 2020. The capital cost would be loan funded with a 25 year loan. Loan servicing costs would be funded as part of the Community Parks and Reserves, Buildings and Grants Rate. The rate effect of the Facility is assessed as being $91 per rateable property per year.

6.1.2. This proposal updates the earlier provision contained in the 2015-25 LTP which provided for $23 million facility to be built in 2020-2022. At that time it was estimated to cost ratepayers $108 per annum over a 25 year period.

6.1.3. Therefore the proposal for the Facility is not a new proposal, but an update of the provision contained in the 2015-25 LTP. The changes that have occurred since the last LTP are that that further design and costing work has been undertaken. The Council signalled that it wished the facility to be brought forward, given the issues with the Rangiora High School facility and the lack of facilities available for the community. The increase in the cost estimate is an increase of $4.875 million, and the estimated cost per ratepayer has decreased from $108 to $91 per ratepayer, due to a higher population base.

6.1.4. As outlined in section 4.1.41 in this report the option of leasing the facility results in a higher cost to the Council than if it owned the facility itself. The NPV analysis shows it is more favourable to own than lease the facility. In Net Present Value terms ownership is $12.675 million cheaper than leasing the facility. All sensitivity testing using different discount rates does not alter the outcome and ownership is the lowest whole-of-life cost.

6.1.5. The only scenario where leasing would be considered is where the Council required the facility, but was unable to secure loan funding and was prepared to pay the premium associated with leasing the facility. The Council has developed its LTP including the facility being loan funded, and the Council will be able to secure the loan funding at good interest rates, based on its AA credit rating. The Council will remain within its borrowing policy limits.

6.1.6. The recent Standard and Poor’s assessment reconfirmed the Council’s AA credit rating, with a negative outlook. The reason for the negative outlook was that the agency was concerned about the size of the Council’s capital programme in the first two years of its LTP and should it seek to materially increase its spend from that forecast then that could see the possibility of a downgrade. If that did occur and the Council’s credit rating was downgraded to AA- it may add between 0.05% and 0.10% to its cost of borrowing. The Council’s current weighted average cost of borrowing is about 4.20%.

6.1.7. The other issue that Council will consider is the affordability of the proposal for the community. The Council when it adopted its Draft LTP considered the affordability of the LTP, and by adopting the Draft LTP exercised its judgement that the proposal, taking all matters into account, was affordable.
6.1.8. Submissions received from those concerned about rates affordability tended to represent those on fixed incomes and other low income earners. The Rates Rebate scheme is available to low-income earning ratepayers and approximately 2,000 ratepayers in the District apply and most secure in excess of $600 rates rebate. Typically rates, after the rates rebate, can account for up to 10% of disposable income of those receiving Guaranteed Retirement Income without any other sources of income.

6.1.9. Retired residents on fixed incomes are seen as those most affected by rate increases, as they are sometimes considered “asset rich and cash poor”. Currently, 17.6 percent of people in Waimakariri District are aged 65 years and over, compared with 14.9 percent of the total New Zealand population.

6.1.10. As a District, Waimakariri has a high decile rating and a comparatively high median income. According to LGNZ’s assessment, the District’s average rates as a percentage of median household income is the fourth lowest in the country, at about 4.5%, while the national average across all Councils is around 7%.

6.1.11. Ultimately, the matter of affordability is a judgement to be made by the Council.

6.2. Community Implications

6.2.1. The submissions received from the Community in support of the facility include a range of comments about the need for such a complex to cater for the increasing range of sports and exercise activities for all age ranges. There are also comments about the availability of public transport. If the Council decides to proceed with the facility there will be a need to engage with ECAN about potential alteration of the bus routes to facilitate access to Coldstream Road.

6.2.2. The submissions relating to deferral or not to build at all are mostly centred on affordability and the impact of cost on low income ratepayers. There are also some suggestions that deferral will create an opportunity for fundraising for the cost of the facility.

6.3. Risk Management

6.3.1. The following key risks have been identified for this project:

   i. Cost overrun – This will be minimised by working closely with the Quantity Surveyor through the Project Control Group and also minimising variations to the contract and avoiding scope creep. Note that all of the Community Facilities Capital Projects have been completed within budget.

   ii. Project delays – This is a risk to any project and the contract is most likely to include penalty payments for weather related delays. Such claims will be monitored through the Project Control Group and administered by the Project Control Group.

   iii. Design not suitable – This risk has been minimised by the engagement of the Trust in the concept design and the detailed design will be overseen by a design team.

   iv. Staged development of site – the development of the concept plan for the site will minimise the risk of developments occurring in the wrong space and a site layout will be surveyed prior to any development to ensure that developments take place in the appropriate location. The site will be managed by one Council appointed Project Manager.

6.4. Health and Safety

6.4.1. The tender documentation for construction will have appropriate requirements for Health and Safety during construction and this will be monitored by the Project Control Group.
6.4.2. Operational health and safety will be a factor considered by the Design Team during the development of the detailed design.

6.4.3. Once the building is operational, Health and Safety will be the responsibility of the operator: North Canterbury Sport and Recreation Trust.

7. CONTEXT

7.1. Policy
This matter is a matter of significance in terms of the Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy. The provision of an indoor court facility has been the subject of several reports to Council. Key reports considered by Council include:

- Multi Use Sports Facility January 2018 (Trim 180118003759)
- Contract 17-20: Indoor Court Architectural Services May 2017 (Trim 170519050621)
- Indoor Court Design and Location, February 2017 (Trim 170127007516)
- Indoor Court Functional Design Brief, September 2016 (Trim 160825086360)
- Indoor Court Project Steering Group August 2015 (Trim 150730113868)
- LTP Provision for an Indoor Court Facility May 2015 (Trim 150508074259)
- Draft LTP: Options for Provision of an Indoor Court Facility January 2015 (Trim 150115005057)
- Indoor Court Feasibility Study February 2014 (Trim 140205011156)

7.2. Legislation

- Reserves Act 1977
- Resource Management Act 1991 (Note a Resource Consent will be required)
- Building Act 2004

7.3. Community Outcomes
The accessibility of community and recreation facilities meets the changing needs of our community.

7.4. Delegations

- The Council needs to decide on this facility as part of the LTP.
Via a recent newspaper / media article advising that WDC is considering building a new indoor sports facility at Coldstream Road that will cost $27 to $30m all funded by ‘debt’ DASI offer an alternative option of a design and build lease agreement similar to what DASI is doing with the new North Canterbury Sport & Recreation Trust gymnasium at Flaxton Road, Rangiora.

It is my understanding that the proposed project at Coldstream Road will provide the following:
- an indoor 4 court gymnasium building of approximately 81m x 60m = 4860m²
- with associated showers, toilets, changing rooms, storage and meeting rooms approximately 25m x 70m = 1820m²
- with approximately 250 car parks along with access, paving and landscaping

I believe this sports facility would be utilised by all Waimakariri residents. Locating the sports building between Rangiora and Kaiapoi with main road access would be of benefit I suggest utilising the DASI owned 40000m² of business 6 zoned land at the corner of Flaxton and Fernside Roads, Rangiora. This new building could also be a multiple use facility for indoor conventions / trade shows and would be supported with the additional facilities of a 60 to 100 room hotel building with restaurants, bar and entertainment along with privately owned physiotherapy, health and medical businesses.

A first up very indicative layout plan is detailed on attachment A1 of which shows a north west facing building with a footprint of 6680m². This could accommodate 4 courts = 4860m² plus 1820m² of additional supporting space like meeting rooms, showers and toilets.

On the basis of DASI supplying a completed building ready for occupancy with the following:
- 4860m² of courts
- 1820m² of supporting buildings, admin, toilets, showers etc
- and 250 car parks

The annual rental would be $1,422,800 (exclusive of GST) plus outgoing rates, insurances and services i.e. power, water, phone

The lease would need to be on a minimum first term of 15 years with two rights of renewal of 10 years on ‘normal’ Auckland Law Society Deed of Lease terms.

...cont'd
The building DASI offer is a design and build of which would consist of the following:
- concrete floors and foundation
- structural steel, long span portal frames
- insulated PIR panel roof system
- concrete wall panels to 3m high around the building perimeter
- with insulated wall panels from 3 to 6m high
- with double glazed windows

All at a reasonable cost build with proven quality long life products utilised to build a visually attractive building fit for purpose.

Indicative programme would be as follows:
- From letter of 'interest' to issue of concept drawings 3 months
- Negotiations to an agreed building design architectural look 3 months
- Issue of detailed design, drawings specifications and obtaining the building consent 6 months
- Construction 12 months

I have extensive past experience of completing design, build and lease back of commercial building (with approximately $50 million of buildings completed over the past 10 years). I have engineering and architectural consultants available to complete all the design and engineering work over the next 6 months along with a team of builders to construct this gym / sport building.

DM & AD Smith Investments Ltd have the financial capacity to fund / take on a project like this.

I am available to discuss in more detail and I await WDC’s response.

Daniel Smith
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Kaiapoi Red Zone</th>
<th>Mandeville Domain</th>
<th>Gladstone Park</th>
<th>Coldstream Road</th>
<th>Redlynch Road</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demographics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessibility</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walkability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyclability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drivability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centrality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sports Hub / Precinct</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other complementary users</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key user groups identify with location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Availability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space for future proofing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The level of opportunity cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adjacent Land Users</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nearby complementary facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonable distance from residential property</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Ownership</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does Council own the land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car parking assessed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport Routes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Whole of Life Costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any site specific factors impacting an either Op or Cap Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Weighted Score</strong></td>
<td>157</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage (against maximum total score)</td>
<td>79.49%</td>
<td>70.09%</td>
<td>71.79%</td>
<td>95.73%</td>
<td>83.76%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank Order</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TRAM 1893.035.0775
I am not aware of the total land available so for fairness have assumed there is
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT FOR DECISION

FILE NO and TRIM NO: RES-07-08/180516053790

REPORT TO: Council

DATE OF MEETING: 29 May 2018

FROM: Craig Sargison, Manager Community and Recreation

SUBJECT: MULTI USE SPORTS FACILITY OPERATING AGREEMENT

SIGNED BY:

Department Manager

Chief Executive

1. SUMMARY

1.1 This report is seeking approval from the Council on the principles of an operating agreement for the Multi Use Sports Facility at Coldstream Road with North Canterbury Sport and Recreation Trust (the Trust).

1.2 The basis of the proposed agreement is that the Trust will have a lease of the facility and be responsible for all aspects of the operation of the facility and the Council will be responsible for the exterior maintenance of the building.

1.3 The Trust will pay the Council an annual lease and the Council will not have any operating expenses apart from local authority rates and insurance.

1.4 Council approval is sought for Staff to work with the Trust to develop a formal agreement for the approval of Council prior to the award of a construction contract for the facility.

Attachments:

i. Key Terms of proposed agreement (TRIM 180516053807)

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180516053790

(b) Approves that the Multi Use Sports Facility will be operated by the North Canterbury Sport and Recreation Trust.

(c) Notes the key terms of the proposed agreement with the Trust.

(d) Approves staff negotiating a formal agreement for the operation of the Multi Use Sports Facility at Coldstream Road with the Trust for the consideration of Council.

(e) Notes that the agreement will be prepared for Council's consideration prior to the Council awarding a contract for the construction of the Multi Use Sports Facility.
3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1 As outlined in the January 2018 report to Council the concept is that the Multi Use Sports Facility would be operated by the North Canterbury Sport and Recreation Trust (the Trust) under a formal operating agreement with the Council.

3.2 The Draft LTP Consultation Document included the following reference to the operation of the proposed Facility: "We will work with the North Canterbury Sport and Recreation Trust on the development of a Heads of Agreement for the management and operation of the facility, with no ongoing operational costs to the Council."

4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1 There were no concerns expressed during the submission process about the proposed facility being operated by the Trust.

4.2 **Fee setting**

4.2.1 Under the operating model the Trust would be responsible for setting the fees for users of the facility. However, the agreement could include some parameters for the Trust to consider in setting fees.

4.2.2 It would be inappropriate for Council to have any influence on the level of charges for the use of the fitness facilities, as this would be purely a commercial operation.

4.2.3 The principles that the Council may want to be considered as part of fee setting are:

- Community, and sporting groups prosper and deliver services to their members and the wider community.
- The use of the indoor courts is maximised.
- The usage charges are affordable (particularly for youth) and are not a barrier to participation.
- When the facility is used for commercial gain the community receives a fair return.
- The cost of supplying the services and the market conditions

4.2.4 The Council could, as part of the agreement, require the Trust to establish a price schedule in liaison with the Council that is consistent with the above principles.

4.3 **Formal Agreement**

4.3.1 As outlined in the January 2018 report to Council the concept is that the facility would be operated by the North Canterbury Sport and Recreation Trust under a formal operating agreement with the Council.

4.3.2 The basis of agreement will be that the Trust will lease the whole facility from the Council.

4.3.3 The Facility has several different areas, principally the indoor courts and associated changing facilities, the fitness area, concession offices for allied health and a sports administration office.

4.3.4 The concept is that the Trust will pay a commercial rental for all of the areas dedicated to the core business of the Trust – the fitness centre and premises for allied health professionals which equates to around 1300 metres plus some circulation space.
4.3.5. The Trust will then operate the balance of the facility and retain all revenue earned, including naming rights and other sponsorship funding.

4.3.6. The Trust would meet all of the operating costs for the facility and pay an annual contribution to the Council in the range of $200,000 - $230,000.

4.3.7. It is too early to predict an opening date but realistically the earliest will probably be some time in November 2020.

4.3.8. After the opening it will take some time for usage patterns and usage levels of the indoor court facility to stabilise.

4.3.9. Accordingly, it is anticipated that in Year 1 (2020/21) the Council will subsidise the operation of the indoor court component of the facility by a contribution of 50% of the annual rental sum (pro rata), 25% of the sum in 2021/22 with no operational subsidy in 2022/23.

4.3.10. Note that the final figures will be agreed for Council’s consideration prior to the Council entering into a contract for the construction of the facility.

4.3.11. The intended term of the Agreement is ten (10) years with two rights of renewals of five (5) years each, (total term of twenty (20) years). Such renewals will be subject to the consent of Council.

4.3.12. Rent will be:
   - CPI adjusted annually (subject to the market rent reviews below) at the discretion of Council.
   - Subject to a market rent review every three years [and on renewals]. Such review will take into consideration the nature and use of the Facility along with the commercial viability of the Trust to pay more rent.

4.3.13. Other key points that will be addressed in the formal agreement are attached as Appendix 1.

4.3.14. Note that a full agreement will be completed for the consideration of Council, prior to the Council approving a contract for the construction of the facility.

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

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. Groups and Organisations
   5.1.1. The proposal was consulted on in the Draft LTP and there were no substantive submissions on the proposed operation of the facility.

5.2. Wider Community
   5.2.1. The proposal was consulted on in the Draft LTP and there were no substantive submissions on the proposed operation of the facility.

6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1. Financial Implications
   6.1.1. The project cost of $27.85 million is based on providing for cost escalation that will occur between June 2018 and the estimated completion date of September 2020.

   6.1.2. Operating costs will be the responsibility of the Trust and in addition the Trust will pay the Council $200,000 to $230,000 per annum (excl GST).
6.1.3. The Trust will contribute $1 million towards the fit out of the building which will include retractable seating for 500 spectators, basketball/netball hoops, indoor court divider screens, fixed seating around the perimeter of the courts and will be responsible for the supply of all equipment necessary to operate the fitness centre.

6.2. Community Implications

6.2.1. The Trust is mindful of the desires of various groups to use the Facility and is also aware of the opportunities the Facility can provide for the District.

6.3. Risk Management

6.3.1. The final agreement will mitigate operational risks to the Council.

6.4. Health and Safety

6.4.1. Operational health and safety of the Facility will be the responsibility of the Trust.

7. CONTEXT

7.1. Policy

This matter is a matter of significance in terms of the Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy. The provision of an indoor court facility has been the subject of several reports to Council. Key reports considered by Council include:

- Multi Use Sports Facility January 2018 (Trim 180118003759)
- Contract 17-20: Indoor Court Architectural Services May 2017 (Trim 170519050621)
- Indoor Court Design and Location, February 2017 (Trim 170127007516)
- Indoor Court Functional Design Brief, September 2016 (Trim 160825086360)
- Indoor Court Project Steering Group August 2015 (Trim 150730113868)
- LTP Provision for an Indoor Court Facility May 2015 (Trim 150508074259)
- Draft LTP: Options for Provision of an Indoor Court Facility January 2015 (Trim 150115005057)
- Indoor Court Feasibility Study February 2014 (Trim 140205011156)

7.2. Legislation

- Reserves Act 1977
- Resource Management Act 1991 (Note a Resource Consent will be required)
- Building Act 2004

7.3. Community Outcomes

The accessibility of community and recreation facilities meets the changing needs of our community.

7.4. Delegations

- The Council needs to decide on this facility as part of the LTP.
MULTI USE SPORTS FACILITY FORMAL AGREEMENT

KEY ITEMS THAT WILL BE INCLUDED

1.1.1. As outlined in the January 2018 report to Council the concept is that the Facility would be operated by the North Canterbury Sport and Recreation Trust (“the Trust”) under a formal operating agreement with the Council.

1.1.2. The Trust would meet all of the operating costs for the Facility and pay an annual contribution to the Council of between $200,000-$300,000. Note that this will be incrementally applied with year 1 payment of 50%; Year 2 of 75% and Year 3 100%.

1.1.3. If the Council decides to commit to the Facility a Heads of Agreement document (“the Agreement”) will be developed for Council approval.

1.1.4. The key components of the Agreement will include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Waimakariri District Council will:</th>
<th>North Canterbury Sport and Recreation Trust will:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Be responsible for the construction of the Facility including (but not limited to) the tendering, design, project management and construction of the Facility and will retain ownership of the Facility.</td>
<td>• Contribute $1million towards the fit out of the facility which will include retractable seating for 500 spectators, basketball/netball hoops, indoor court divider screens, fixed seating around the perimeter of the courts. These assets will remain in the ownership of the Trust and accordingly the maintenance and replacement of these assets will be the responsibility of the Trust.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide any funds sourced from the Rata Foundation to the Council, to be applied firstly towards the $1million contribution above and then to be applied to, or in defrayment of, construction costs of the Facility.</td>
<td>• Be responsible for routine maintenance of the interior of the building which shall include internal painting/plastering, HVAC maintenance, and repair and replacement in respect of damage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Be responsible for maintenance of the exterior of the building, carparks and all external landscaping and grounds maintenance.</td>
<td>• Be responsible for the supply and maintenance of all office furniture and fitness equipment (which shall be over and above the fit out contribution noted above).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Be responsible for replacement of building including structure, flooring, building systems, Building Warrant of Fitness etc.</td>
<td>• Be responsible for the building insurance and rates for the building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Be responsible for the building insurance and rates for the building.</td>
<td>• Be responsible for contents insurance, and Public Liability insurance, to indemnify the Council and the Trust taking into consideration the operation and use of the Facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Be entitled to free use of the Facility as and when required within parameters to be specified in the Agreement.</td>
<td>• Be responsible for operating costs for utilities, cleaning, provisioning and associated consumables.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Be entitled to licence the office space within the Facility subject to the consent of the Council. All revenue received by the Trust in relation to such licensing will be retained by the Trust.</td>
<td>• Be entitled to the daily operation of the building including all bookings for the Facility. For the avoidance of doubt bookings made by the Trust shall be between the Trust and the booking party, and shall not create or impose any obligations on the Council in respect of the booking. The Trust shall be solely responsible for complying with the terms of any booking it makes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Liaise with the Council on the setting of a price schedule for the use of the indoor courts.</td>
<td>• Be entitled to license use of exterior space for provision of food and refreshment services for users of the Facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Be entitled to naming and signage rights in respect of the Facility on terms to be covered in the Agreement or a separate Naming and Signage Rights Agreement.</td>
<td>• Be entitled to licensing the office space within the Facility subject to the consent of the Council. All revenue received by the Trust in relation to such licensing will be retained by the Trust.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TRIM ref: 180516053807
Provide appropriate warranties to Council in relation to ensuring it complies with all relevant legislation, common law obligations, regulations and bylaws affecting the Facility and their use of it. This shall include the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015 and the Trust will be required to take all necessary steps to ensure that the obligations imposed upon the Council as owner under the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015 will at all times be complied with.

1.1.5. The intended term of the Agreement is ten (10) years with two rights of renewals of five (5) years each, (total term of twenty [20] years). Such renewals will be subject to the consent of Council.

1.1.6. Rent will be:
- CPI adjusted annually (subject to the market rent reviews below) at the discretion of Council.
- Subject to a market rent review every three years [and on renewals]. Such review will take into consideration the nature and use of the Facility along with the commercial viability of the Trust to pay more rent.

1.1.7. Standard confidentiality, good faith, dispute resolution, capacity, and Termination provisions will also be included in the Agreement.
1. SUMMARY

1.1 This report seeks Council approval to confirm the provision for Community facilities as per the Draft Long Term Plan.

Attachments:


2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180514052564

(b) Notes the feedback received from submissions

(c) Confirms the following financial provision and timing in the LTP as follows (note these are unchanged from the provisions in the Draft LTP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LTP Year</th>
<th>Provision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$40,000 Investigation into location of a Library Ravenswood/Pegasus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$50,000 Further planning for library extension at Rangiora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$3million $5,000 Detailed design and construction commencement of Rangiora Library extension Car-parking development for land approved for community groups buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$3.5million Completion of Rangiora Library extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>$50,000 $3.9million Landscaping/car-parking on land approved for community group’s buildings New Library at Ravenswood/Pegasus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes that staff will be further investigating the provision of a library/community facility at North Woodend/Pegasus during 2018/19 financial year.

Notes that a separate report on the provision of land for community owned buildings in the Regeneration Area will be progressed once the Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan is finalised.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1 The Community and Recreation Committee considered a staff report in November 2017 which considered the future provision of community facilities in light of the projected population growth.

3.2 The recommendations from that report, which was endorsed by Council for inclusion in the Draft LTP were:

THAT the Community and Recreation Committee recommends to Council for consideration at its 30 January 2018 (LTP) meeting:

(a) Receives report No 171026115830
(b) Receives the Community Facilities Report (Trim 171017112201)
(c) Approves the level of service for provision of library space of 60m2 per 1000 population
(d) Approves staff investigating off site storage space for library collection storage in either Rangiora or Kaiapoi and reporting back to Council.
(e) Approves the provision of $40,000 in Year 1 of the Draft LTP to allow for further investigation of the provision of a Library/Community Meeting Space in either Ravenswood or Pegasus with such a facility coming on line in Year 10 of the Draft LTP.
(f) Approves the level of service for provision of community meeting space for new communities to service a population of 2,500 it is proposed that there is a facility to cater for around 80 people plus storage space. This can be stand alone or incorporated as part of a facility such as a Library.
(g) Notes that the only part of the District that does not meet this standard is Pegasus and potentially Ravenswood depending on the speed of residential development.
(h) Notes that it is expected that the need for additional community facilities for meeting spaces in Rangiora will be met by developments currently being planned by the Anglican and Presbyterian Churches.
(i) Approves staff investigating the potential for using available Council owned land at the Mixed Use Business Land in the Regeneration Area, for potential development of community owned buildings and notes that staff will prepare a report for Council’s consideration.
(j) Notes that there is no provision for further expansion or development of Aquatic Facilities in the District for the next ten years as the existing facilities have capacity to cope with projected growth.

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

\(\text{(l)}\) Circulates this report to the Boards.

4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

4.1. There were 355 submissions received on the provision of Community Facilities with 303 in support of the Council’s proposal, 29 supporting deferral and 23 supporting no change to the current level of provision.

4.2. There are some comments about the heating and ventilation in Rangiora Library. Staff are currently working through some options for improving this and there will be a separate report to the Community and Recreation Committee on options. There is no additional budget being sought.

4.3. There are also some comments about the age range of people using libraries. The following table provides a percentage breakdown of the current registered users (14,872) of the District’s Libraries as at 30 April.

- 25% are aged 20 and under
- 15% are aged between 21 – 40
- 35% are between 41 and 65
- 25% are over 65.

4.4. There are also other comments about the timing of development and the desire to get a permanent solution earlier for North Woodend/Pegasus. Pegasus and Woodend – advancing “permanent solution for community facility at Pegasus and also for locating a new Library at Ravenswood rather than Pegasus.

4.5. The Draft LTP had a provision of $40,000 to allow for further investigation of the provision of a Library/Community Meeting Space in either Ravenswood or Pegasus with such a facility coming on line in Year 10 of the LTP.
4.6 It is proposed that this provision remains and until that work is completed it would be premature to make any commitment to develop a facility at either location. While the Pegasus community facility has always been described as “temporary” there do not seem to be any compelling reasons to change the status of that facility or to seek to enlarge it. It is a very low risk that the Council will not be able to renew its lease on the Pegasus facility. The current lease is for 3 years commencing April 2017 and it has a right of renewal for a further two years.

4.6. The November report (copy attached) to the Community and Recreation Committee did discuss the need for “offsite’ storage for library books and this has now been addressed through the utilisation of premises at Woodend formerly used by the Rangiora Toy Library.

4.7. There were some comments about the need to expand Rangiora Library and the report on levels of service considered by Council (attached to this report) clearly identified levels of service for space for Libraries and to meet that level the provision of the provision in Years 5 and 6 of the LTP should remain.

4.8. When it becomes time to undertake the detailed design of the proposed extension there will be opportunity for further community input into the intended use of the additional library space.

4.9. There has been further interest expressed by the North Canterbury Model Railway Club in using available Council owned land at the Mixed Use Business Land in the Regeneration Area. This is currently in scope for the planning of use of land in the Regeneration Area and this will be the subject of a separate report to the Regeneration Steering Group and Council.

4.10. There were no substantive submissions on the proposed level of service and space provisions and it is recommended that the Council does not make any changes to the financial provisions in the Draft LTP.

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

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. Groups and Organisations

The following are the views of the Community Boards as submitted to the Council:

Woodend Sefton
The Board urges immediate action to enable a larger permanent community centre to be established at Pegasus and notes that the ‘trigger threshold’ has been reached already. The Board supports the retention of the current Woodend Community Centre but does NOT support the proposal for a Library and Community centre to be located at Woodend/Pegasus and urges that this be placed at Ravenswood and that a suitable site is earmarked even at this early stage in readiness for the expansion of the development and population ‘trigger’ for release of the LTP funding. The Board requests that this Ravenswood Hub should also take the form of a ‘mini service centre’ as in Oxford and the Ruataniwha Kaiapoi Civic Centre.

Rangiora Library Extension
The Board notes that there are currently significant issues with the heating and ventilation systems and that these need urgent attention for the comfort of all users and staff.
5.2. **Wider Community**

5.2.1. The views of the wider community were sought as part of the consultation process for the Draft LTP.

5.2.2. The following table summarises responses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Councils preference: plan and budget for facilities</th>
<th>303</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Defer until after 2028</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change to current provision</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2.3. The Consultation Summary Report has a summary of all of the comments received regarding the provision of community facilities.

5.2.4. There has also been further expressions of interest for the use of Council land for community buildings from the North Canterbury Model Railways Club.

6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**

6.1.1. The following table summarises the financial provisions that are in the Draft LTP and the report recommends retaining these unchanged in the LTP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LTP Year</th>
<th>Financial Provision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$40,000 Investigation into location of a Library Ravenswood/Pegasus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>50,000 Further planning for library extension at Rangiora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$3million $5,000 Detailed design and construction commencement of Rangiora Library extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Car-parking development for land approved for community groups buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$3.5million Completion of Rangiora Library extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>$50,000 $3.9million Landscaping/car-parking on land approved for community group’s buildings. New Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>at Ravenswood/Pegasus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2. **Community Implications**

There will be considerable community interest in new or extended community facilities and there will be further opportunity for community input into when detailed design is undertaken.

6.3. **Risk Management**

This will be addressed through the design and construction processes.

6.4. **Health and Safety**

This will be addressed through the design process of proposed building alterations/extensions.
7. **CONTEXT**

7.1. **Policy**

This matter is a matter of significance in terms of the Council's Significance and Engagement Policy.

7.2. **Legislation**

Building Act 2004

7.3. **Community Outcomes**

The accessibility of community and recreation facilities meets the changing needs of our community.

7.4. **Delegations**

The Council needs to decide on the financial provisions in the LTP.
1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is for Council to consider the future provision of community facilities to in light of the projected population growth.

1.2. Key areas covered in the report are:

1.2.1. Levels of service for Library space. The report proposes the provision of library service on the basis of 60m² of building space per 1000 population.

1.2.2. The provision in the Draft LTP of $6,500,050 million, for the extension of the Rangiora Library. This would be spread over three years with $50,000 in Year 4, $3 million in Year 5 and $3.5 million in Year 6.

1.2.3. The exploration of interim off site storage for collection items during 2018/19 with a subsequent report to Council.

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

1.2.5. A discussion about community meeting space in Rangiora with a recommendation for no financial provision but to work with other providers on a needs assessment with a view to utilising existing facilities and those being proposed by Churches in the next few years.

1.2.6. A proposed level of service for community meeting space.

1.2.7. A proposal to make some existing Council owned land available for community groups to locate their own buildings (similar to the existing Northbrook Studios).

1.2.8. A provision in the Draft LTP of $5,000 in Year 5 and $50,000 in Year 10 for the development of car-parking and landscaping. The exact timing will depend on the level of uptake from community groups.
2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Community and Recreation Committee recommends to Council for consideration at its 30 January 2018 (LTP) meeting:

(a) Receives report No 171026115830
(b) Receives the Community Facilities Report (Trim 171017112201)
(c) Approves the level of service for provision of library space of 60m2 per 1000 population
(d) Approves staff investigating off site storage space for library collection storage in either Rangiora or Kaiapoi and reporting back to Council.
(e) Approves the provision of $40,000 in Year 1 of the Draft LTP to allow for further investigation of the provision of a Library/Community Meeting Space in either Ravenswood or Pegasus with such a facility coming on line in Year 10 of the Draft LTP.
(f) Approves the level of service for provision of community meeting space for new communities to service a population of 2,500 it is proposed that there is a facility to cater for around 80 people plus storage space. This can be stand alone or incorporated as part of a facility such as a Library.
(g) Notes that the only part of the District that does not meet this standard is Pegasus and potentially Ravenswood depending on the speed of residential development.
(h) Notes that it is expected that the need for additional community facilities for meeting spaces in Rangiora will be met by developments currently being planned by the Anglican and Presbyterian Churches.
(i) Approves staff investigating the potential for using available Council owned land at Northbrook Road or Mixed Use Business Land in the Regeneration Area, for potential development of community owned buildings and notes that staff will prepare a report for Council’s consideration.
(j) Notes that there is no provision for further expansion or development of Aquatic Facilities in the District for the next ten years as the existing facilities have capacity to cope with projected growth.
(k) Approves the following financial provisions being included in the Draft LTP:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LTP Year</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>Investigation into location of Library Ravenswood/Pegasus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>Further planning for library extension at Rangiora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$3 million</td>
<td>Detailed design and construction commencement of Rangiora Library extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>Car-parking development for land approved for community groups buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$3.5 million</td>
<td>Completion of Rangiora Library extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>Landscaping/car-parking on land approved for community group’s buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$3.9 million</td>
<td>New Library at Ravenswood/Pegasus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(i) Circulates this report to the Boards.

3. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

3.1. Background

3.1.1. In 2012 the Council adopted a policy which outlined its role in providing community facilities. The policy does not provide the Council with any objective criteria which addresses when facilities may be needed to cope with growth.

3.1.2. The 2012 policy omitted any reference to the provision of Library services for the District.

3.1.3. Recent experience with the Pegasus community has demonstrated how new or growing communities expect to have access to meeting spaces for local groups/residents to meet.

3.1.4. As part of the planning for growth in the District, Staff commissioned Sue Sutherland to undertake a study of community facility provision and to recommend some standards for the provision of new facilities as well as a standard for the space required for the ongoing provision of library services in the District. Note that sporting facilities were specifically excluded from scope.

3.2. Community Facilities Report

3.2.1. The report summarises the current provision of community facilities and libraries in the District and provides a comparative with what some other NZ and Australian areas are planning for levels of service for community facilities.

3.2.2. The critical components of the report for the Council’s forward planning are:

- A proposed standard of space provision for library service
• A proposed level of service standard for the provision of community facilities with criteria or trigger points to be applied in response to growth
• Impacts for the Council on adopting those levels of service

3.2.3. While the complete Community Facilities Report is attached, this report will address each of those components along with further commentary from staff on impacts for the Council and potential matters to be considered as part of the forthcoming LTP.

3.3. **Standard of provision for Library service**

3.3.1. The report discusses the various standards that are used in NZ for library service from the Library Association Standard of 70m2, to Auckland at 41m2 and Christchurch of 60m2 per 1000 population

3.3.2. Staff agree with the report recommendation to adopt a standard of 60m2 per 1000 population. This allows sufficient space to both provide for resource storage as well as meeting spaces, reading spaces and other facilities offered by modern libraries.

3.3.3. This figure is also based on the continuing development of electronic service delivery.

3.3.4. The report concludes that there is no additional space required to meet standards in the West of the District but there is a need for more space in Rangiora and to service the growing Ravenswood/Pegasus area.

**Rangiora Option**

3.3.5. The report’s preferred option is to extend the Rangiora Library by 1000 – 1,200m2 within the next 5 years.

3.3.6. AECOM, Quantity Surveyors, after analysing recently completed projects and their “bottom line” costs i.e. building works plus external works plus professional fees plus consents plus furniture and equipment and a project contingency are in the range of $6,200/m2 to $6,800/m2.

3.3.7. A mid-point would be $6,500m2 would mean the cost of extending the Rangiora Library would be in the order of $6.5 - $7.8 million.

3.3.8. Before actually committing to such a development there would need to be some detailed planning and a specific report investigating options for the consideration of Council. That report should also include potential synergies with any development of office space for Council staff.

3.3.9. It would be prudent to include an allowance of $50,000 in Year 4 of the LTP for further investigation and a provision of $3 million Year 5 of the Plan for the actual development and $3.5million in Year 6 as the development would not be fully finished within a 12 month period. The timing of those provisions could change in future LTPs depending on the speed of population growth and also the outcome of further investigations around the potential development of further office space for Council staff at Rangiora.

3.3.10. In the interim there is a developing challenge for print resource storage. Up until 2017 the Library collection has been accommodated within the available storage
areas and acquisitions have been largely offset by the need to discard old worn items.

3.3.11. With the current collection modelling on the Library’s asset management system it is now likely that in 2018/19 the majority of old stock has been removed and we will now start to make a “net gain” in collection holdings per annum. For example, in 2016/17, 16,921 physical items were added to the collection and 13,041 were withdrawn resulting in a net gain of 3,880 items (equivalent to 30 bays of shelving).

3.3.12. This is a desired state and it is something that the acquisition planning over the last 20 years has been working towards, as up until now the Library has largely only had a current collection with older titles wearing out and needing to be replaced. Now 84 percent of the current physical collection is less than ten years old; 13 percent is 11 to 20 years old; and 3 percent is more than 21 years old.

3.3.13. The collections from 2018 should allow for the retention of key items, particularly series and collections from authors that are likely to still be in demand.

3.3.14. One solution to this until more permanent space becomes available is to provide for some off site storage by leasing some existing office/storage space in either Kaiapoi or Rangiora.

3.3.15. The number of items held per capita is another important factor in the provision of an adequately sized quality collection. In 2008, the Waimakariri District Libraries held 2.61 items per capita (with a target of 3.0 items by 2019 based on National Library standards). Currently, we hold 130,000 (physical and eBook) items, which against the current estimated population of 61,000, equates to 2.13 items per capita. By comparison, Christchurch City Libraries aim to hold between 3 and 3.5 items per capita and currently maintain a collection of 3.2.

3.3.16. An interim target of 2.7 items per capita would suggest a collection size of 164,700 and achievement of this would require an additional 230 bays of (5 shelf high) storage space.

3.3.17. It should be possible to lease some interim storage space in Kaiapoi or Rangiora to accommodate off site storage until a permanent solution is in place.

Ravenswood/Pegasus Provision

3.3.18. The report discusses the need for a new library service point to meet the needs of the growing communities around Pegasus and Ravenswood. It suggests that with an expanded Rangiora Library and the existing Kaiapoi Library there will be enough space for approximately the next ten years.

3.3.19. The exact timing of a future development will need to be reviewed as it will depend on the speed at which new residential development at Ravensood proceeds.

3.3.20. The report has some discussion about the relative merits of Ravenswood and Pegasus for a new development and comments that further work will be needed to determine the better location.

3.3.21. Such a facility would also include community meeting space which is separately discussed below, but the library component of a new facility would be in the
range of 4-600m². As a comparison the new Oxford facility is around 347m² and the library component of that building is around 273m².

3.3.22. While such a development is not anticipated for around ten years it would be prudent to determine a location within the next 2018/19 year so that if it is decided to have a library at Ravenswood then the Council should look to secure land for such a building in the immediate term as once the business land is built up it would be very difficult to find a good site for a library/community centre. Similarly if Pegasus is determined to be the best location it would be possible to work with Todd’s on potentially securing a building or else land.

3.3.23. The size of land needed would be around 1000m² and the actual size will be determined by car parking requirements. It is suggested that Staff be authorised to negotiate with the developers to secure a block of land of around 800 – 1,000m² for a library/community centre as the land that will be vested in Council as reserve will not be suitable for the development of a Library. This is principally because most of the land to be vested is not of a suitable shape or location.

3.3.24. Another option is to further explore the purchase of the building at Pegasus which currently the Council lease’s space in for the community centre.

3.3.25. During 2018/19 it would be prudent to undertake a more in-depth analysis of the relative merits for locating a library/community meeting space at either Pegasus or Ravenswood. This analysis should also include an investigation of the options available at both locations in terms of land and buildings and options around ownership.

3.3.26. For 2018/19 financial year it is recommended that a provisional sum of $40,000 be included in the budget to allow for the engagement of appropriate specialist advice as required.

3.3.27. It is anticipated on current growth projections that a new library/meeting area will be needed at Pegasus or Ravenswood by Year 10 of the LTP so it would be prudent to include a financial provision by way of a placeholder.

3.3.28. Using the same m² rate as for Rangiora Library of $6,500 for a 600m² building this equates to $3.9million.

3.4. Community infrastructure excluding libraries

3.4.1. The report identifies that the District is well served for performing arts venues and halls and it is not anticipated that there will any need for this type of facility to address growth.

3.4.2. The report does identify that there is a need for need for smaller to medium sized spaces that can accommodate workshops, social activities such as book groups, parent and baby gatherings and group exercise sessions such as yoga. Storage of equipment, possibly shared office space for different community organisations and a well fitted out kitchen is also common. There is a trend for such facilities to be co-located or integrated with other activities which support community well-being such as early childhood centres, health care facilities, libraries, or active recreation spaces.

3.4.3. There are no identified standard for the amount of space for community meeting purposes to be used recreation, learning, small meetings, visiting speakers, and associated activities. This includes activities such as indoor bowls, gymbaroo,
chess clubs and book clubs. More active recreation such as badminton and basketball are catered for by sports facilities and indoor courts.

**PROPOSED LEVEL OF SERVICE**

3.4.4. To service a new community population of 2,500 it is proposed that the following provision is required:

- One large room that will accommodate up to 40 people in workshop mode, or 80 people in theatre style seating;
- A smaller room with more comfortable seating that will be available for smaller meetings such as book groups;
- A small kitchen with tea, coffee and food heating facilities – not a commercial kitchen;
- Sufficient toilets to cater for the maximum occupancy, including accessible toilet and baby changing facility;
- Storage for collapsible tables and chairs, and for community group materials and equipment.

3.4.5. Such a facility is likely to require the following space:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room</th>
<th>Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Large room</td>
<td>115-145m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smaller room</td>
<td>40m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>15m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilets x 3 including accessible toilet</td>
<td>15m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage</td>
<td>60-100m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulation/lobby</td>
<td>15m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total space</strong></td>
<td><strong>260-330m²</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4.6. The only town in the District which does not have long term space for community meetings is Pegasus. Rented space is currently being secured to provide a 150m² for community use. By 2018 the population of Pegasus is projected to be 2512 and a more permanent community centre of between 260-330m² as outlined above, would be appropriate. This space could be used by community groups in the town, and the meeting spaces could be used by libraries to deliver programmes or other services such as JP access from time to time as noted above.

3.4.7. Ravenswood is the other new community that may require a community centre. By 2048 Ravenswood is projected to have a population of 3722 and it may well require a community centre similar to that for Pegasus. It would be sensible to look to develop community meeting space in Ravenswood included with the proposed library development.

3.4.8. Rangiora’s population is expected to double by 2048. If we applied the criteria above additional community facilities may be needed to cater for community use.

3.4.9. This projected growth also needs to be considered alongside other facilities being developed in Rangiora by Churches. There are significant developments being discussed by both the Anglican and Presbyterian Churches both of which will have space/s available for Community use.

3.4.10. There is also no hard data on the level of use of community facilities and with new developments planned by Churches and schools it would be useful to
gather some data on actual use and unmet demand, as far as practicable, when
the significant new Church developments are completed.

3.4.11. There is also interest by some Community groups and Social Service Agencies
to have a ‘community house’ in Rangiora. Discussions about this are in their
infancy and there is as yet no agreement on scope, scale and services that
could be provided.

3.4.12. It is likely that elected member representation will be sought for a Working Party
to further explore the concept and in particular to address how such a concept
would address the priority needs for community strengthening in the Waimakariri
District.

3.4.13. A particular focus of such a Working Party will be discussions with key providers
of community meeting spaces and exploring how existing and proposed
developments could be best utilised to meet the needs for community
development.

3.4.14. It is not proposed to make any provision for funding for such a development in
the Draft LTP.

3.4.15. Similarly in Kaiapoi the nearly completed Riverside Church development has
many different spaces available for community use and the recently completed
Coastguard building also has space available for community use. It is not
anticipated that there is a need in the foreseeable future to develop more
community facilities in Kaiapoi.

3.5. **Land for community groups**

3.5.1. Northbrook Studios was originally established to supply land for community
groups to develop premises on. Examples of current occupants include
Woodworking and Drama.

3.5.2. All of the available land at Northbrook Studios has been built on for some time
and staff have been having regular requests from Community Groups for land to
establish a building on.

3.5.3. Recent examples include Wrestling and Model Railways.

3.5.4. Staff have had several discussions with the then Portfolio Holder, Councillor
Allen on the options for land that the Council already has in its ownership.

3.5.5. The preferred option is to utilise a block of the “Sparks Land” on Northbrook
Road. This land was originally purchased for drainage with the surplus available
for recreation purposes.

3.5.6. Originally this was contemplated as a new home for the Rangiora Community
Garden but they have since found a more suitable block of land.

3.5.7. A preliminary proposed draft concept plan is attached for this area. This will get
refined as groups have detailed discussions with Council but the initial concept
allows for a variety of sizes of building as well as associated carparking.

3.5.8. The concept allows for 6 small buildings of 100m2; 3 medium buildings of 150m2
and one large building of 300m2 and this would potentially allow for around ten
groups to be established on site. The exact number would be determined by the actual size of buildings.

3.5.9. The concept is that the Group/Club would meet the building costs and sewer/water connection costs but that Council would develop the carparking/landscaping as required.

3.5.10. It is envisaged that the carparks would be gravelled and only developed as groups come forward. It is hard to predict the timing of such developments as typically groups would approach staff about potential land and then proceed to try and source funding.

3.5.11. There is also the potential, as an alternative to Northbrook site, to utilise land designated as mixed use business in the Regeneration Area. This could have significant advantages in terms of servicing costs and access.

3.5.12. It is proposed that staff further investigate both options during 2018 and prepare a report for Council’s consideration.

3.5.13. At this early stage it is proposed to include $5,000 in Year 5 of the Draft Annual Plan for some car-parking/landscaping and a further placeholder provision of $50,000 in Year 10. These provisions can be further refined in subsequent LTPs as further information on timing from potential groups is obtained.

3.5.14. Staff anticipate that this land would meet demands for community groups wishing to relocate/build premises, not associated with Sports grounds for at least the next 10 years.

3.6. **Aquatic Facilities**

3.6.1. The District’s two indoor facilities at Dudley and Kaiapoi both have capacity for further learn to swim and recreational users.

3.6.2. Both facilities also currently attract out of District customers from both Christchurch City and Hurunui District.

3.6.3. It is anticipated that the new facilities being planned and developed in both Christchurch and Hurunui will significantly reduce the current utilisation of Waimakariri District facilities by out of District customers.

3.6.4. For those reasons it is considered that the current level of service of 2 year round indoor facilities, an outdoor pool at Oxford and a paddling pool/splash pad at Waikuku will be sufficient to cater for the projected growth of the District over the next ten years, although it is likely that there will be requests from some communities for further aquatic facilities.

3.7. The Management Team/CE has reviewed this report and supports the recommendations.

4. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

4.1. The views of the community will be sought through the Long Term Plan Process.
5. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

5.1. The following table summarises the direct financial implications of the recommendations in this report:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LTP Year</th>
<th>$</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>Investigation into location of Library Ravenswood/Pegasus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>Further planning for library extension at Rangiora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3 million</td>
<td>Detailed design and construction commencement of Rangiora Library extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>Car-parking development on land approved for community groups buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.5 million</td>
<td>Completion of Rangiora Library extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>Landscaping/car-parking on land approved for community groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.9 million</td>
<td>New Library at Ravenswood/Pegasus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. **CONTEXT**

6.1. Policy

This matter is a matter of significance in terms of the Council’s Significance Policy.

6.2. Legislation

N/A

6.3. Community Outcomes

i. People will involve themselves in a range of recreation activities.

Craig Sargison
Manager Community and Recreation
Introduction

The Waimakariri District Council is experiencing significant growth in population which is expected to continue over the next 30 years. Work is underway on the District Development Strategy to determine where that growth is most likely to occur. The Strategy will focus on planning the physical aspects of the District, such as residential and business growth areas and relationships with transport, infrastructure, the environment, rural areas and community spaces and places. This includes understanding the impact of growth on community facilities and what additional facilities might be needed and when.

This report proposes a number of objective, evaluative criteria that can be used in determining what community facilities and libraries will be needed in response to growth. These have been informed by a review of existing Council policies and strategies, a desktop research exercise which looked at other local authorities who may have done similar work, and an in-depth analysis of library and information needs.

The report is in three parts. The first part outlines the policy context and the demographic and other factors that make the Waimakariri District unique. The second part looks at trends in libraries and community centres, and examines how five other local authorities in Australia and New Zealand are addressing changing needs in response to growth. The third part discusses how Waimakariri District can address growth and offers some possible criteria.
Section I: Local context

Policy

Community facilities

The Council adopted a policy in 2012 which outlines its role in providing community facilities.\(^1\)

Community facilities are defined as:

- District wide – large multi-purpose performing arts venues, sports venues or town halls that cater for a wide range of activities are capable of drawing visitors from across or outside the District.
- Community meeting facilities – venues that provide space for regular or casual use by community groups, and for some local social service providers as the office space from which they base their operations. These spaces are used for meetings and for passive recreation for those involved in arts, crafts, cultural or other passive creation.
- Sports pavilions – venues that are primarily designed to provide changing and toilet facilities to support sports codes. They may also include function or meeting rooms and kitchens.

Sports pavilions are outside the scope of this report unless they have substantial meeting room facilities attached.

The policy identifies a number of criteria for determining whether or not to fund a new facility. In summary they are:

- Potential for multiple current and future use having functional areas that include meeting rooms/conference spaces, storage, and administration spaces
- There is no capacity in other parts of the district that would be suitable, including facilities provided by other than Council
- A business case projects the level of operating income, expenditure and potential subsidy, including any community fundraising or anticipated corporate or community sponsorship
- The business case also identifies the social, economic or cultural needs, particularly in relation to population growth.

These criteria provide a good checklist once the need for a facility has been identified. They do not, however, provide the Council with any definitive, objective criteria which anticipate when a new facility might be needed as the area grows. This report addresses that issue.

Libraries

The Community facilities policy does not cover libraries, and there is no Council policy on library provision. However, the Library and Information Association of New Zealand has standards and guidelines\(^2\) which provide some guidance on the appropriate level of provision of facilities and

---

\(^1\) Waimakariri District Council. Council’s role in the provision of community facilities. Adopted 23 January 2012

services. In determining the location and size of a library or libraries for a particular community the Council needs to take account of the following:

- The total population to be served, the make-up of the population and its distribution
- The commercial characteristics of the community or communities
- Distance between, and from libraries related to geographic and physical infrastructure of the area;
- The range of services and activities to be accommodated in the facility, including space for collections, study, programming and events, meeting, browsing, reading and use of technology.

The standards note that “a limited number of libraries may provide more effective service than a proliferation of small branches. However neighbourhood branches may be more accessible to many people, such as children, older people and those with limited incomes. Too many branches can create fragmentation of services and resources. The effectiveness of branches depends primarily on their location and accessibility for the user”.³

The standards recommend an overall provision of 70 square metres per 1000 population.

The State Library of NSW in Australia published *People Places*⁴ which provides two methods of assessing the required size – one based on population and the other based on the specific spaces to be provided. They provide another way of assessing appropriate size for a particular library, although their overall provision of space in Australia tends to be less that of New Zealand libraries.

The way space is utilised has also changed somewhat since the last edition of the standards, with more space being given over to people related activities in libraries and reduced amount of space for collections. This has not changed the total space required.

### Current provision of community facilities and libraries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District wide facilities</th>
<th>Community facilities</th>
<th>Libraries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cust Community Centre</td>
<td>Cust Domain Pavilion</td>
<td>Rangiora Library (includes Chamber Gallery and CAB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Town Hall</td>
<td>Dudley Park Pavilion</td>
<td>Ruataniwha Kaiapoi Civic Centre (housing library, museum, service centre, art space and meeting rooms)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Town Hall</td>
<td>Fernside Memorial Hall</td>
<td>Oxford library and service centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Eyreton Hall</td>
<td>Kaiapoi Community Centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend Community Centre</td>
<td>Lees Valley School Reserve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loburn Domain Pavilion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ohoka Domain Pavilion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oxford Centennial Building (community leased)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oxford Jaycee Hall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson Park Pavilion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rangiora War Memorial Hall and offices Waikuku Beach Hall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

³ Ibid p37
There are other community halls, not owned by the Council, at Coopers Creek, Sefton, North Loburn, Eyreton, Ohoka and Swannanoa. Libraries and community facilities, including four of the halls not owned by Council, are indicated on the preceding map. In addition there are various sports pavilions with club rooms that may also be used from time to time by community groups which are not shown. A list of these is provided as an appendix.

**Arts and cultural venues**

The district wide facilities above provide venues for theatrical performances, dance and movies (in Rangiora and Oxford). The largest number of people that can be accommodated in the Rangiora Town Hall (the largest council owned venue) is 361 with a further 150 seating capacity suitable for smaller performances. The Baptist Church seats 500 and can be used for bigger gatherings. With larger, purpose built facilities being located within a reasonable driving distance to Christchurch the district is probably well served into the future for this type of community facility.

The Waimakariri District supports a number of local Museums in Rangiora, Kaiapoi, Oxford and Cust and also contributes to the Canterbury Museum. This provision will also be sufficient into the future. Similarly the Council provides two opportunities for the display of art, both by local artists and wider (Rangiora and Kaiapoi) and the Christchurch Art Gallery is relatively close by for an extension of those activities.

It is therefore considered unlikely that additional facilities of this type will be needed in the next thirty years.

**Waimakariri District Plan**

The District Plan provides the objectives, policies and methods, including rules that have been developed to ensure sustainable management of the environment in relation to land use and subdivision. The District Plan defines two key activity areas (Rangiora and Kaiapoi), and the various business, residential and rural zones. While Rangiora and Kaiapoi are defined as the main centres, the Business 1 zones in Oxford, Woodend, Pegasus and Ravenswood are also important secondary centres for business, social, community, cultural and administration activity for those towns. The District Plan seeks to maintain the characteristics of a rural environment while ensuring there is sufficient land for both residential and commercial development.

Through the work underway on the District Development Strategy the Council is engaging with the community to help shape the future of the district. It will provide a spatial framework to guide the growth and may influence changes to the District Plan.

---

Demographics and geography

Population growth

At the 2013 Census 53,905 people were resident in the Waimakariri District. Council has recently upgraded its growth projections and these indicate that by 2048 the district will have grown to between 86,200 and 96,996 residents. The former is the medium growth scenario provided by Statistics NZ and the latter is the WDC Scenario. It is recommended that the “prudent approach for population projections in the Waimakariri District is to use the medium and WDC scenarios as the low and upper bound”.

The growth predictions for the towns and rural area is below. A breakdown by towns for the Statistics New Zealand medium projections is not available for 2048 therefore the 2043 projection figure has been used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
<th>WDC Scenario</th>
<th>Stats NZ medium growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>17,552</td>
<td>22,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
<td>10,300</td>
<td>12,217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend/Pegasus</td>
<td>5,150</td>
<td>7,914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>2,206</td>
<td>2,796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural including small settlements</td>
<td>24,613</td>
<td>29,128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>59,820</td>
<td>74,572</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the WDC scenario, Rangiora is projected to have the biggest growth and will account for 31% of the district’s population by 2048. The next biggest growth will occur in Pegasus and Ravenswood and with the adjacent area of Woodend, these areas will account for 12% of the district’s population. Kaiapoi remains the second biggest area of population with 15,132 people and 16% of the population. Although the numbers living in rural areas and small rural settlements are projected to increase the percentage of rural to urban drops from 41% in 2013 to 37% in 2048.

Geographical factors

The area of the district is 2219 km². It is bound by the Waimakariri River in the South, the Pacific Ocean to the east, and the north-west is high country and hills, including Mt Oxford, Mt Richardson, Mt Thomas and Mt Grey which dominate the District’s western landscape. A large portion of the

---


7 Ibid p22
District is fertile flat land, or highly productive rolling downs. Much of the land to the east of Rangiora is reclaimed swamp, which is still subject to poor drainage and occasional flooding.

As noted already the population is largely concentrated in the eastern part of the district in Rangiora, Kaiapoi, Woodend, Pegasus, and a number of beach towns and small settlements north of the Ashley River. Oxford in the west of the district is the other main population centre and there are rural residential settlements clustered in Cust, Ohoka, Swannanoa and Mandeville. Travel distances between the main population centres are:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora to Kaiapoi</td>
<td>10.8km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora to Pegasus</td>
<td>10.7km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora to Woodend</td>
<td>7.0km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pegasus to Kaiapoi</td>
<td>11.3km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pegasus to Woodend</td>
<td>4.5km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend to Kaiapoi</td>
<td>6.8km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora to Oxford</td>
<td>35.0km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora to Ravenswood</td>
<td>8.0km</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The travel distance between Rangiora and Kaiapoi to the centre of Christchurch City is 28.6km and 19.7km respectively. Bus services provided by the Canterbury Regional Council link the eastern towns with Christchurch City and one route links Rangiora and Kaiapoi. As part of the government’s urban cycle ways programme a 6.5 km shared path is planned to connect Rangiora to Woodend, and an 8 km shared path is planned to connect Rangiora to Kaiapoi enabling safer cycling for people.

People who live in the rural residential areas expect to drive elsewhere for services. Those living in the town centres also expect to drive but increasingly there is a desire for other forms of transport such as cycling and walking within reasonable distances.
Section 2: A changing world

Community infrastructure
The type of community facility has changed over the years, as the requirements and pastimes of people have changed. At the time the majority of halls were built in the District they needed to accommodate theatrical performances, dances, craft fairs, bring and buy sales and whole of community meetings. Such halls would often have a stage or raised platform, a good sized space with a wooden floor, toilets and possibly a kitchen and smaller room or rooms at the back. The pavilions in domains whilst predominately filling a sporting function, have been used as hall spaces in some of smaller rural communities. Waimakariri District is well served by this type of facility and apart from Pines/Karaki Community hall currently under construction it is not anticipated that there will be any need for this type of facility to address growth.

However, the interests of people have changed over time and there is a need for smaller to medium sized spaces that can accommodate workshops, social activities such as book groups, parent and baby gatherings and group exercise sessions such as yoga. Storage of equipment, possibly shared office space for different community organisations and a well fitted out kitchen is also common. There is a trend for such facilities to be co-located or integrated with other activities which support community well-being such as early childhood centres, health care facilities, libraries, or active recreation spaces. Section 3 discusses this need more fully and identifies possible criteria and where the need is likely to be.

The world of libraries
Libraries and library services have also changed significantly over the past decades moving from being primarily places which provided access to learning and knowledge via the book, to being places where such access is via multiple media channels, including the internet supported by programmes and events that enhance learning and skills. The nature of spaces has changed: more sitting and study space, room for activities and group work, children and youth spaces, café, spaces to create and make things, and room for a variety of technologies, including computers.

The boundary between the traditional library and community space has been blurred. The Ruatanwha Kaiapoi Civic Centre is one example, housing complementary cultural activities, community spaces and the Council’s customer service centre in the one facility. Increasingly this is the trend across other local authorities in New Zealand and Australia where councils look to maximise the use of the investment in expensive infrastructure.

Libraries are also developing new service delivery models. These include delivering services via online channels (eContent, serendipitous browsing, voice over IP, email, online chat), the use of pop-up libraries, mobile vans and unstaffed service points for part of the time. Auckland Libraries new service model incorporates all of these aspects alongside their physical network of libraries.

Local authority response
A number of local authorities in New Zealand and Australia have recognised these changes and are building integrated facilities as a result. The following five local authorities provide examples of the criteria being used to determine growth needs and the type of facilities being constructed.
**Auckland Council**

The Auckland Council has a road map for how it will invest in community facilities over the next 20 years. The plan covers arts and culture facilities, community centres, libraries, pools and leisure facilities and venues for hire such as community or rural halls. To keep pace with Auckland’s growing and diverse population they are taking a more “holistic, community led approach” to the planning and provision of community facilities which includes considering different models of ownership, design, location and operation of facilities. They want to work in partnership with communities and others to provide integrated and fit for purpose community spaces that are vibrant, welcoming and at the heart of communities.

Their plan provides some criteria for determining provision of facilities in response to growth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Centres</th>
<th>Local - small</th>
<th>Local – Large</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Function</strong></td>
<td>Community development activities including small meetings, co-located working spaces, clubs and social gatherings with activated programming and services.</td>
<td>Community development activities including small and large meetings, social gatherings, recreation, local arts and culture, health and wellbeing with activated programming and services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provision approach</strong></td>
<td>Located in local neighbourhoods, walking catchment of up to 15 minutes or 30 minute drive of rural and coastal villages</td>
<td>Serves a catchment of up to 15 minute driving time. Located in metropolitan or town centres and satellite towns. Desirably located within the centre of town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identifying gaps</strong></td>
<td>•Within 15 minute walk from local or town centres  •Target population threshold 5000-10,000</td>
<td>•Within 15 minute drive from metropolitan areas, key town centres  •Target population of 20,000 plus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Rural | •Within 30 minute drive of rural centres  •Target population threshold 5000-10,000 | •Within 15 minute drive from satellite towns  •Target population of 20,000 plus |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Libraries</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Regional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Function</strong></td>
<td>Access to information and technology, programming and events, display of library collections, informal gathering spaces</td>
<td>As for local plus specialist services such as heritage and research, meeting space, etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provision approach</strong></td>
<td>Maintain a level of 41m² per 1000 population</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identifying gaps</strong></td>
<td>Capacity testing based on 41m²/1000 of local catchment population, including capacity of neighbouring libraries and maximum distance of 30 minutes travel</td>
<td>Respond to population growth of population growth of 10,000 in a rural area and 30,000 in a metropolitan centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rural</strong></td>
<td>Respond to population growth of 10,000 in a rural area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Christchurch City Council

In 2007 Christchurch City Council developed *The Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy* (UDS) and the *Strengthening Communities Strategy* which provide insight into their approach to providing community facilities. With the disruption of the earthquakes many local facilities and libraries have had to be rebuilt or significantly repaired.

An update of the UDS in August 2016 has as one of its strategic goals that “people and communities have equitable access to a range of integrated community infrastructure, facilities and services, including education, health, sport and recreation and core council services”. In consultation processes since 2007 one of the things people have asked for is neighbourhood centres and hubs that provide facilities and services at a local level. Christchurch has classified facilities as metropolitan, suburban, neighbourhood and rural but it does not appear to have developed any quantitative criteria for determining when additional facilities might be needed to accommodate growth. It has probably been too busy regenerating infrastructure destroyed or damaged by the earthquakes.

Christchurch, however, has been building community hubs with libraries at the centre, for the past sixteen years when the South Library, Learning Centre and Service Centre was built. Their latest community hub at Halswell, Te Hapua, houses the library, swimming pool and recreation spaces, meeting spaces and a café. The *Libraries 2025 Facilities Plan* identified criteria for prioritising proposed library facility developments as:

- Meets future growth needs where there are gaps that will complement existing facilities and identifies
- Preference for shared costs (land, capital and/or operational) while retaining ownership of the assets and its maintenance
- Locations of proposed developments have good connectivity with identified activity centres and/or major destinations, and public transport, walking and cycling routes.
- Developments display design innovation and best industry practice,
- Preference is given to developments that are: economically sustainable, located with other community facilities, accommodate changing library, social and technology trends, and provide for further expansion.

The earthquakes intervened but Christchurch is still working to this plan and two new libraries that were identified in the plan (Aranui and a replacement library at Halswell) have been completed. Once the new Central Library is complete the network will consist of 1 Central library and 19 suburban and neighbourhood libraries. A possible new library in Belfast is indicated but not yet
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9 Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy Update August 2016  

committed to. Although the Council has no formal criteria for the level of provision of library space the network, once central is complete, provides between 60m2 and 63m2 per 1000 population.

Christchurch City Libraries works on a 2km ‘buffer’ for its suburban libraries and a 1km buffer for its neighbourhood libraries. In theory this means that most of the city’s residents are within 2km of a library, although in the northwest, because of the boundaries prior to amalgamation in 1989, there is some overlap of library catchments.

**Hutt City Council**

The Hutt City Council plans to redevelop many of its facilities over the next 30 years with a particular focus on recreation and community hubs. These hubs will “provide multiple facilities at an appropriate level for the needs and size of the communities they serve … [which] households increasingly expect in their community” 11. Hutt City sees these as rejuvenating the city and making it a more attractive place for people to live.

Their plan includes providing community hubs at six local centres plus the Civic Centre. The first of these at Taita, the $12 million Walter Nash Centre, has five multi-purpose courts, a new library, fitness centre, meeting spaces and a café. Four of the proposed hubs serve communities of less than 10,000 population; the other two between 16 and 18,000 population. The strategy notes that “generally hubs require a population base of 5000 and will be dependent on the extent of Council and other funding, and potential commercial partnerships”.

**Kapiti District Council**

Kapiti District Council advised that they are in the final stages of completing a comprehensive community facilities strategy, the first draft of which is due in late March or early April 2017. The strategy is intended to inform what facilities the district has, including council owned, and those owned by government or NGO groups that are available for public use. This strategy includes sporting and physical recreation facilities, community centres but excludes libraries. It outlines their current and projected demographics and indicates whether there are gaps in provision, or certain areas that lack facilities while others are over provisioned. In doing this work Kapiti advised that they did not find any officially recognised standards or agreed criteria around community centres, or community meeting space as is the case for sporting and recreational facilities.

**City of Wanneroo Council**

The City of Wanneroo in Western Australia has been experiencing significant growth and the population is expected to double by 2036 to around 350,000 people with most of the growth occurring in the northern coastal region. The city is one of the northern most in the greater Perth conurbation.

The city provides 25 community centres, youth centres, club rooms and recreation centres and four libraries for their current population of approximately 150,100. Two of their libraries are co-located with other activities (a museum, café, art space, volunteer office and council service centre).

However, none could be considered community hubs in the same way as Hutt City is conceptualising. However, as part of the Northern Coastal Growth Corridor plan\textsuperscript{12} Wanneroo has developed a set of population based criteria which drive the development of new facilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACILITY</th>
<th>RATIO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Facility : People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multipurpose hard courts (6-10 Courts)</td>
<td>1:35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Open Space (Active)</td>
<td>1:50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>1:60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Recreation Centre (3-6 Courts)</td>
<td>1:75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Centre</td>
<td>1:100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic Centre</td>
<td>1:120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Gallery</td>
<td>1:150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach Activity Nodes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surf Life Saving Club</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multipurpose hard courts (2 Courts)</td>
<td>1:25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Open Space (Active)</td>
<td>1:25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>1:35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Recreation Centre (1-2 Courts)</td>
<td>1:30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Centres</td>
<td>1:35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Gallery</td>
<td>1:47,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach Activity Nodes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surf Life Saving Club</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Centres</td>
<td>1:7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Open Space (Active)</td>
<td>1:7,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Building on that framework, a report on libraries in Wanneroo indicated that the distance from a library should be between 5 – 15 kilometres with no more than 10 Kilometres in built up suburban areas. It also noted that where possible good public transport, rail or bus needed to be in place with sufficient parking for those that drive.

**Insights**

While this is only a sample of five local authorities they provide some pointers for Waimakariri District in developing its own set of criteria. The factors are a mix of catchment population (whether that is rural or suburban), distance to travel, and the availability or otherwise of good public transport.

Christchurch City, Hutt City and Auckland are also looking to maximise use of their facilities by bringing community, cultural, library and recreational activities into community hubs.

\textsuperscript{12} Northern Coastal Growth Corridor Community Facilities Plan: final report. City of Wanneroo, December 2011
Section 3: Framework for growth

Library requirements
Waimakariri District currently has three libraries serving a population estimated in 2016 as 59,820.

Rangiora Library
Rangiora Library is a standalone building which houses the library, the library administration for the district and the Chamber gallery, a small meeting room and Citizens’ Advice Bureau (CAB) in the former Council building. The building was extended in 1997 and the extension designed by architects Skews Hey and Ussher. The total area of the library is 1265m2 and the gallery, CAB and meeting rooms are 150m2 giving a total area of 1415m2.

Kaiapoi Library
The Kaiapoi Library is part of the Ruataniwha Kaiapoi Civic Centre. In 2011 Council opted to build a library, Council Service Centre, an art space and the Kaiapoi Museum to serve the combined populations of Kaiapoi, and surrounding small beach towns, plus Woodend and Pegasus. The building was designed by Warren and Mahoney and the total area of the building is 1892m2. The breakdown of the space in the Ruataniwha Centre is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library</th>
<th>m2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collections</td>
<td>483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seating</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s area</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning area</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>circulation functions</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workroom</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Store</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>circulation areas</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal library space</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of total = 62%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of common space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Library space</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Oxford Library
In Oxford the library and Council service centre has been rebuilt. The total area is 347.5m2 with the library occupying 273.5m2.

In summary the amount of current library space is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library</th>
<th>m2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Library</td>
<td>1265m2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi Library</td>
<td>1182m2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Library</td>
<td>273.5m2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2720.5m2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Levels of service standard
LIANZA Public library standards recommend that there should be 70m2 per 1000 population of library space. Christchurch City libraries has adopted a standard of 60-63m2 and Auckland is considerably less at 41m2 per 1000 population. It is recommended that the Waimakariri District
Council aligns itself with Christchurch City and calculates its requirement for the District’s population on 60m2 per 1000 population.

Using this measure we can calculate the expected space requirements for the total population as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table: Library space in m2 for total population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>WDC Scenario</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend/Pegasus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural including small settlements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At 60m2/1000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not all the rural population will access a physical library. We have therefore discounted the rural population and assumed that only 65% of people will access a physical library.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table: Library space in m2 for rural population calculated at 65%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>WDC Scenario</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural at 65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At 60m2/1000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The current amount of library space is 2720.5m2. It is clear by 2028 there will be a shortfall in the amount of library space available. This can be further broken down by the current catchment areas. For the purposes of calculation we have allocated the rural population based on the same ratio as the population in the WDC scenario.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table: Library space in m2 for Rangiora and surrounding rural population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>WDC Scenario</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural at 65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At 60m2/1000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Current size 1,265m2
Table: Library space in m² for Kaiapoi, Woodend and Pegasus and surrounding rural population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>WDC Scenario</th>
<th>Stats NZ Medium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
<td>10,300</td>
<td>12,217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural at 65%</td>
<td>4,063</td>
<td>4,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend/Pegasus</td>
<td>5,150</td>
<td>7,914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural at 65%</td>
<td>3,047</td>
<td>3,606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22,560</td>
<td>28,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At 60m²/1000</td>
<td>1,354m²</td>
<td>1,713m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current size</td>
<td>1,182m²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table: Library space in m² for Oxford and surrounding rural population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>WDC Scenario</th>
<th>Stats NZ Medium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>2,206</td>
<td>2,796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural at 65%</td>
<td>1,016</td>
<td>1,202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,222</td>
<td>3,998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At 60m²/1000</td>
<td>193m²</td>
<td>240m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current size</td>
<td>273.5m²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Oxford Library is of sufficient size to cater to the population whichever scenario comes about. However, Rangiora Library is too small now and Kaiapoi Library will not cater sufficiently for the growing population in Woodend, Pegasus and the new area of Ravenswood in ten years’ time.

**Community centre requirements**

As noted previously the amount of community hall space and venues for hire is sufficient, even when growth in rural areas and small communities is taken into account. None of these areas is projected to have growth of a significant nature, or to have business zones that would warrant additional community facilities other than what is provided for by community halls or sports pavilions and facilities.

However, the growth in the two key activity areas of Rangiora and Kaiapoi, and the towns of Oxford, Pegasus, Ravenswood and Woodend may justify additional facilities or community hubs, where none exist currently. As already noted the trend is towards Community Hubs, which incorporate meeting space, kitchen, office/administration space, storage and activity space often collocated along with other council, community, library or recreation facilities. The size of the spaces is dependent on the needs to be accommodated and who the other partners are in a shared facility. Possible commercial partners might include health centres, early child care centres or suitable retail spaces such as pharmacies and bookshops. If the population warrants a full library service then this should be an integral part of any community hub.
Levels of service standard

As far as we have been able to determine there are no standards for the amount of space for community meeting purposes, as there are for sporting facilities and libraries. We have therefore calculated the space required for a neighbourhood facility to be used by community groups and clubs for recreation, learning, small meetings, visiting speakers, and associated activities. This includes activities such as indoor bowls, gymbaroo, chess clubs and book clubs. More active recreation such as badminton and basketball are catered for by sports facilities and indoor courts.

To service a population of 2500 plus the following is required:

- One large room that will accommodate up to 40 people in workshop mode, or 80 people in theatre style seating;
- A smaller room with more comfortable seating that will be available for smaller meetings such as book groups;
- A small kitchen with tea, coffee and food heating facilities – not a commercial kitchen;
- Sufficient toilets to cater for the maximum occupancy, including accessible toilet and baby changing facility;
- Storage for collapsible tables and chairs, and for community group materials and equipment.

The required space for such a facility is:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Large room</td>
<td>115-145m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smaller room</td>
<td>40m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>15m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilets x 3 including accessible toilet</td>
<td>15m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage</td>
<td>60-100m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulation/lobby</td>
<td>15m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total space</strong></td>
<td>260-330m²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A plan outline for space requirements to accommodate 80 people theatre style is attached as an appendix.

Possible Criteria

The analysis of the requirements for library services and community centre facilities above suggests a number of criteria or trigger points which can be applied in response to growth in the district.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighbourhood</th>
<th>Town centre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Function</td>
<td>Provide space for meetings, clubs (such as book clubs, indoor bowls, etc) and social or community gatherings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Space for library programmes to be delivered on a regular basis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Access to internet connected computers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Book kiosks or access to physical media by library card</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide space for meetings, clubs (such as book clubs, indoor bowls, etc) and social or community gatherings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Co-located/integrated with other community and recreational activities, including cafe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staffed library service operating as a branch library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Access to internet connected computers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activated programmes and events (both Council and community initiated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision approach</td>
<td>• Located adjacent to business zone or shops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population trigger</td>
<td>• Population 2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service standard</td>
<td>• 260-330m² minimum size (community centre)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>• Within 10-15 minute walk from local centre, or 5-10 minute drive  • Within 15 minute drive from rural dwellings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These criteria need to be applied in conjunction with the other criteria already in place in the WDC Policy Council’s role in the provision of community facilities. As noted earlier, they do not include sporting and physical recreation facilities which are separately identified.

**Impacts of adopting criteria to address growth**

**Library service**

The new Oxford Library will cater for the growth in population projected for Oxford including the surrounding areas to 2048. No additional service will be needed in the west of the district.

Rangiora and the surrounding catchment will require additional library space. The preferred option would be to extend the existing library by 1000-1200m² preferably within the next 5 years. This would provide for more spacious and comfortable reading areas, quiet study space, a stack district collection, a learning centre and meeting room and event space. It may also provide space for new partners such as public print production services, for example. The current library is well positioned in the centre of the town and most residents in the expanded town will live within a 3 km radius of the library. Given the compact nature of the town, and its centralized shopping area one larger library to service the town and its surrounding catchment is considered the best option.

The population in Woodend, Ravenswood and Pegasus is projected to be between 11,105 – 12,116 by 2048 plus the rural and small town areas that will use this area for shopping. A bigger Rangiora library and the existing Kaiapoi Library can probably provide the services for these areas for the next ten years. However, as the total population grows additional library space will be needed. One option would be to build a library to service the combined area of Woodend, Ravenswood and Pegasus.

Two possible locations for an additional library are Pegasus or Ravenswood. They each have advantages. Ravenswood will have a business zone alongside which a community hub, including a library could be located. Pegasus residents are likely to travel to the supermarket and use the library whereas Woodend and Ravenswood are less likely to go to Pegasus for library services on their own. However, Ravenswood is only 8km from Rangiora whereas Pegasus is around 11km from either Rangiora or Kaiapoi. There are also natural barriers of the state highway which provides a degree of separation for Pegasus residents. Further work would be needed to determine the better location.
but a facility of between 500-750m² of library space plus additional space for other services such as a café, meeting rooms etc is indicated, depending on where it is sited.

The extension to Rangiora and the proposed building of a new facility in Ravenswood/Pegasus should serve the projected population until 2048.

Until such a facility is needed, library services to Pegasus could use a self-help service model. This would mean library resources are available via a dispensing machine, or a library card access only area. Library staff based in either Rangiora or Kaiapoi could deliver programmes at regular times, e.g. one morning a week a baby time session, another day a digital technology class. Access to Wifi and computer technology could also be provided.

**Community centres**

The only town which does not currently have any space for community meeting is Pegasus. Rented space is currently being secured to provide a 150m² for community use. By 2018 the population of Pegasus is projected to be 2512 and a more permanent community centre of between 260-330m² as outlined above, would be appropriate. This space could be used by community groups in the town, and the meeting spaces could be used by libraries to deliver programmes or other services such as JP access from time to time as noted above.

Ravenswood is the other new community that may require a community centre. By 2048 Ravenswood is projected to have a population of 3722 and it may well require a community centre similar to that for Pegasus. Whether it would need the self-service library services is debatable given its distance from other libraries.

Rangiora’s population is expected to double by 2048. If we applied the criteria above additional community facilities may be needed in one or more of the new subdivisions to cater for community use. There is already some indication that it is difficult for community groups to access suitable space for their activities.

**Conclusion**

The proposed criteria, if adopted will provide a trigger for Council in looking ahead to plan for new community facilities. Each facility will still require a needs assessment, a review of options for addressing the need and a business case that provides Council with the information necessary to make sound decisions.
Recommendations
Is recommended that the Waimakariri District Council:

1. Adopts the criteria for determining the appropriate community centre and library developments as follows:

   - 60m² per 1000 population for library facilities (rural population discounted to 70% of total)
   - A trigger population of 10,000 in an urban population for a library
   - A minimum distance of 5km between libraries
   - A minimum of 200m² for a community centre
   - A trigger population of 2500 for a community centre
   - A trigger population of 20,000 for additional community facilities

2. Amends its policy on the Council’s role in the provision of community facilities to include the criteria outlined above. These criteria are the ‘triggers’ that alert Council to the need for future facilities which are then assessed against the other criteria already in place to determine the feasibility of and best option for a new facility.

3. That based on the criteria above, extend the Rangiora library by 1000-1200m² within the next 5 years to cater for growth. Given the compact nature of the town and the centralised shopping one library facility will be sufficient to service Rangiora and its surrounding catchment.

4. Provide a 260-330m² community centre in Pegasus when the population reaches 2500 (within the next three years).

5. Do a more in depth needs assessment for the community facilities at Pegasus/Ravenswood and provide a library and community facility of between 500-750m² in ten years to meet the growing population.

6. Undertake a needs assessment for additional community facilities in Rangiora.

Appendices

Appendix 1: List of halls and clubroom available in the district

- Baptist Church Hall, Rangiora
- Blue Skies Conference and Training centre, Kaiapoi
- Eyreton Hall
- Gladstone Park - Rugby Club rooms
- GP Hall Oxford (Partly owned by Council)
- Kaiapoi High School - School Hall
- Mandeville Sports Club – Club rooms used as hall space
- Maria Andrews Clubrooms
- McAlpines North Canterbury Pipe Band Hall, Rangiora
- North Canterbury Netball Centre
- Northbrook Museum and Rossburn Receptions Function centre
- Northern Bulldogs Rugby League Club - Club rooms used as a hall
- Ohoka Hall
- Pines/Karaki Community Hall (under construction)
- Rangiora A&P Showgrounds
- Southbrook Sports Club - Club room used as a hall
- Tuahiwi Hall Marae

Appendix 2: Plan for meeting room
This is the minimum size to accommodate 80 people theatre style. It does not allow for a centre aisle.
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COUNCIL’S ROLE IN THE PROVISION OF COMMUNITY FACILITIES

1 Introduction

This policy proposes to establish a consistent approach to the Council’s involvement in the provision of community facilities in the Waimakariri District. Community facilities are defined, for the purposes of this policy, as community buildings, pavilions, halls, including the car park and any structures associated with the carpark or building, such as bollards, rubbish bins, gardens, trees and signs.

Concurrent to the development of this policy is the development of a recreation master plan for the District. That plan will address the location of new community facilities in relation to levels of population growth in the District. This policy supports that plan by outlining the intent of the Council in providing the facilities considered by the plan, and explains how the Council broadly intends to meet the expectations of the community in providing facilities that address increasing demand.

Community facilities are the buildings and amenities that support communities, groups, families and individuals to meet their social needs, make the most of their potential and achieve community wellbeing. The Council provides facilities to cater for meetings and events of civic importance, as operating bases for social service groups, and places for people to meet for recreation, sporting and other social purposes. Some facilities may also contribute to community identity, particularly in rural areas, or be historically significant.

This policy explains how, and the extent to which, the Council is and will in future be involved in the provision of a range of community facilities in the District. The policy outlines the circumstances where the Council may consider developing new and/or upgrading its existing facilities. It outlines the criteria which it will consider when making the funding decisions associated with these new or improved amenities.

The policy also outlines situations in which the Council may consider supporting other non-Council facilities on private land, supporting externally funded facilities on Council land, or entering into public/private partnerships to enable the provision of new facilities.

2 Policy Context

The policy provides for Council involvement in a range of community facilities. These are:

A) District Wide Facilities. These are large multi-purpose performing arts venues, sports venues, or town halls that cater for a wide range of activities and are capable of drawing visitors from across or outside of the District. The Council provides these District Wide Facilities to make available large meeting, performance or sporting areas for general use, where groups can gather, socialise, network, compete or entertain, and where clubs can rehearse and perform. These facilities encourage development of new skills within the community, provide options for local entertainment and assist the District to retain its cultural and recreational talent and initiative. They also retain
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some of the spending capacity that is available for social purposes within the District, and provide opportunities for social and cultural development.

B) **Community Meeting Facilities.** These are venues that provide space for regular or casual use by community groups, and for some local social service providers as the office space from which they base their operations. The purpose of Council providing meeting room venues is to provide areas for social service groups and agencies to perform their functions, assist clients, and develop networks that draw valuable services and resources into the community. These groups can effectively target and address social issues in the District using the community meeting spaces as their operating base. These spaces also provide opportunities for passive recreation by clubs or groups involved in arts, crafts, cultural or other passive recreation activities.

C) **Sports Pavilions.** These buildings are primarily designed to provide changing and toilet facilities to support those sports codes that use Council sports grounds for active forms of recreation. Pavilions may also incorporate function or meeting rooms for use by the club/s using the sports-ground. Many sports pavilions are designed to cater for multiuse. Competition level pavilions are those attached to premier sports grounds, and include kitchen facilities, function rooms, changing rooms and toilet facilities. Local sports club pavilions include a meeting room and may include basic kitchen facilities, toilets and changing rooms.

The Council recognises that there are a number of externally owned facilities in the District that serve a similar function to the Council facilities. For instance, various externally owned facilities provide meeting places and support community gatherings. These facilities may include church and school halls, and club buildings. The policy takes into account the function of these external buildings when considering the type and level of Council's involvement in its provision of facilities.

3 **Policy Objective**

The objective of this policy is to provide a consistent basis for the Council’s involvement in providing new (or upgrading existing) community facilities. The contributions that the Council makes to various facilities and the organisations that operate within them need to be applied fairly and transparently across the various activities and groups which request this form of assistance. The basis by which the Council makes these decisions needs to be reasonable and equitable, in order to demonstrate to ratepayers that community facilities are provided in response to assessed community need, and to provide criteria that can be consistently applied in a range of circumstances.

The policy frames Council involvement in community facilities provision in a way that enhances the social benefits of its involvement, which provide incentives for the multi-use of venues and which promote collaboration among supporters of new venues and upgrades. The policy also encourages those groups developing new venues to plan for general community use of a proposed facility where possible. The policy encourages future proofing...
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by focusing Council involvement in proposals that provide sufficient space to cater for projected population growth and change of use over time.

The Council aims to achieve a network of facilities configured to best suit community needs, reflect the dynamic and shifting nature of our communities, located in close proximity to growing population hubs, near town centres or within areas with a compatible land use.

4 Policy Statement

The policy statement is divided into sections which outline the form of Council involvement in provision of different types of facilities. These categories are

A. District Wide Facilities (performing arts venues, sports venues and town halls)
B. Community Meeting Facilities
C. Sports Pavilions

Section 4.1 addresses the Council’s role in providing new facilities.

Section 4.2 of the policy outlines how the Council will support externally owned or externally funded facilities.

Section 4.3 of the policy outlines the Council’s approach to upgrading its facilities.

Section 4.4 of the policy proposes the criteria that the Council will consider when making decisions on which facility proposals to fund.

The policy implementation approach outlines how a network of facilities that are fit for purpose will be achieved.

Policy Implementation Approach

1) Before considering a Council investment in a new facility the Council will:
   • Work with external facility providers to encourage better community access to non-Council facilities
   • Develop partnerships and/or provide funding support to enhance community access to external facilities and to assist these facilities to become better fit for purpose

2) To rationalise existing Council facilities the Council will:
   • Regularly review the usage arrangements for existing facilities to ensure they are most appropriately meeting community needs and expectations, and where appropriate, change the classification and use of a facility to provide the best usage in relation to need or demand
   • Over time, demolish damaged, less well maintained or earthquake risk older facilities that are underutilised or are not fit for purpose, or that
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are poorly located in relation to current or projected future population growth, or where there are sufficient existing facilities available to address community need, and consider sale of the land

- Consider sale or lease of obsolete facilities that are no longer used for the intended purpose or that are not fit for purpose, where the facility is in a safe condition, has been adequately maintained, is not an earthquake risk, and has some remaining useful life

3) When investing in new Council facilities Council will:

- Prioritise Council expenditure on projects that improve safety of existing facilities, and/or that provide maintenance and improvement of existing Council facilities in relation to their level of current use and/or future projected population growth
- Directly invest in new Council owned facilities only where evidence is provided of a clear community need and existing capacity of relevant Council and non-Council facilities is fully utilised
- Consider contributing to new facilities or improvements to facilities in areas where population growth is anticipated or growing community demand is demonstrated
- Ensure that new facilities will be located in areas that are easy to find and are easily accessible including by public transport, vehicle and by walking or cycling.

4.1 Councils Role in Providing New Community Facilities

4.1.1 District-Wide Facilities (Performing Arts & Indoor Sports Venues & Town Halls)

The Council provides performing arts, major sporting and town hall facilities capable of drawing visitors from across and outside of the District. These may be used primarily for large scale social, sporting, recreation, or performance events and activities, including large indoor performances.

The Council provides the land and venue for these facilities. It subsidises their use by the community through covering most of the ongoing operating costs. The Council provides district wide facilities for use by all district residents, provided these facilities generate a significant social or cultural benefit and strengthen district communities.

These facilities are provided by the Council in situations where it is not considered viable for the private sector to provide the same standard of multiuse facility at a rate that would encourage regular ongoing participation or meet specific community requests for particular forms of usage. The Council may provide district wide facilities when there are no alternative private sector facilities (such as large church or school halls or club rooms) available for general community use that would serve the required purpose.
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The Council will consider providing up to 100% funding for new town halls, indoor sports venues or performing arts venues that meet the relevant criteria in section 4.4 of this policy, if supporters of proposed new facilities are able to demonstrate they can meet any fundraising target for the venue that may be specified by the Council.

The Council, in considering whether to provide additional district-wide facilities, will take into account the likely frequency and regularity of use of a proposed new venue. The Council will assess new venue proposals against a target for the projected use of the venue of at least 10% of District residents in any one year (e.g. over 5,000 different people would be projected to use the proposed facility in any one year); and of at least 1000 individual visits per week on average.

The Council will require any new district-wide facilities that are developed to make a significant contribution to the network of civil defence or post disaster function buildings.

The Council may consider the provision of commercial kitchens within district-wide facilities.

4.1.2 Community Meeting Facilities (for Passive Recreation or Social Services Support)

The Council provides community meeting spaces to create areas for groups and organisations to gather for regular meetings, to perform their regular functions, or for casual use. These venues either provide the office space for activities which will benefit the wider community, or are widely available for general community use.

As with district-wide facilities, the Council also subsidises the use of community meeting spaces by the community. These venues are only provided where they generate a significant social or cultural benefit. Additional community meeting spaces will only be provided by the Council in situations where there are no alternative private sector venues available that are fit for purpose.

The Council will consider whether to provide up to 100% funding for new community meeting facility proposals that meet the relevant criteria in Section 4.4 of this Policy, to serve a predominantly social service, volunteer or community support function, or that meet the needs for meeting spaces for recreation, arts, crafts, or cultural clubs or groups. These facilities are widely available for use by all people in the community.

The Council will only consider provision of additional community meeting (and office) spaces in the following circumstances:

- There is no further availability at peak times at all other suitable venues within the ward in which the new venue is proposed to be located, including venues not owned by the Council
- The venue will be of sufficient size to cater for at least 100 people at any one time (where relevant).
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The Council will seek to develop new community meeting spaces where a need is demonstrated within a particular ward in a way that optimises the efficiency of each venue in relation to its projected use. This will be achieved through design and configuration of additional meeting spaces that utilise a number of separate meeting areas with shared kitchen and bathroom facilities, or larger meeting areas with shared amenities either of which can be used by multiple groups or agencies at any one time, or in sequence throughout a week.

Note: The venue may provide either multiple break out rooms (possibly with retractable partition dividers) for separate or shared use by a number of proposed user groups, or a larger conference/function room available for multi-use in accordance with assessed current and future demand. Exclusivity could be established in areas within these facilities although common amenities such as kitchens, bathrooms and some storage spaces may be shared.

The Council will seek written expressions of interest by potential users of proposed new community meeting spaces. The Council will consider proposals for new community meeting space that demonstrate an intended use of the venue for a majority of weekdays in any one year (supporters of the proposed venue will need to demonstrate that significant ongoing usage of the venue is achievable).

A venue that is required for the use of just one club or group will be required to be wholly funded by that group or club.

4.1.3 Pavilions for Active Sport and Recreation

Sports and Recreation Pavilions have the primary purpose of providing changing and toilet facilities for use in preparation for, and changing after sporting and recreation events at Council sports grounds. Priority use of each pavilion is usually established for one or more of the club/s using the associated sports ground.

Competition level sports pavilions on premier sports grounds are generally to a standard that is suitable for hosting functions including regional competitions, and include changing, toilet and kitchen facilities. Local club pavilions attached to community sports grounds cater for formal or informal local sport or recreation activities. These are generally simple buildings with a common meeting space and have very basic kitchens, toilet and changing rooms. Pavilions often include external access public toilets for use by the wider public visiting a sports ground.

With rapid growth in the District, the Council is receiving many requests for it to contribute to, or provide, new sports pavilions for use by one or several sporting codes on a number of Council sports grounds.

The Council’s role in new sports pavilion development is through forming partnerships with local sports clubs. Through these arrangements, the Council may provide funding for external access toilets and changing rooms, together with parking facilities and security arrangements, subject to the criteria in Section 4.4 of this policy. The Council will normally only fund those components of a pavilion that are available for use by the wider public using the sports ground.
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as well as by the sports code/s that would primarily use the pavilion. It is the responsibility of the club/s using the pavilions to provide meeting or function spaces with catering and bar facilities as required.

Sports pavilions are usually only available for use by those sports codes that have an associated use of the sports ground. For this reason the Council does not provide meeting and function spaces for these groups as their usage of their amenities is usually exclusive.

In deciding whether to provide funding for external access toilets and changing rooms, parking and security for a new sports pavilion, the Council will take into account the proposed building configuration of the pavilion. For instance, Council input into building configuration during the design stages reduces the risk of the facility becoming obsolescent over time as levels of involvement in a particular code, and levels of use of the associated sports ground, change.

The Council will, through partnership arrangements with sports clubs, seek the inclusion of multi-use pavilions on each premier sports ground in the District that are available for use by all those codes that use that sports ground. Through partnership arrangements it will also encourage inclusion of local multi use pavilions on community sports grounds where they will achieve regular usage and where sufficient demand is demonstrated.

Over time some pavilions that were originally externally funded have been vested in Council as the codes’ use of the facility declines, to ensure that maintenance can continue. The Council will seek to devolve the management of these pavilions it owns, where possible, to a club or Community Trust when that pavilion is just used by one or two codes.

If a sports pavilion is made available for wider community use on a regular basis and continuing wider use is evident, then the Council may consider a contribution to meeting, kitchen or function spaces in sports pavilions, subject to Section 4.4 of the policy.

Where the Council approves the development of a new pavilion on a Council sports ground, as a condition of pavilion development, it may require a contractual agreement with the key pavilion user/s outlining the ongoing financial contribution to be required of all parties, together with any other responsibilities. The contract may specify arrangements in circumstances where one or more of the club/s using the pavilion become unable to meet their commitments. Minimum usage requirements for the pavilion may apply in relation to management arrangements.

4.2 Council Contributions to External Facilities

4.2.1 Contribution to Externally Funded Buildings on Council Land

There are a number of buildings that have been constructed by clubs or groups in the District that are located on Council reserves or sportsgrounds. This policy explains the purpose served by these buildings and outlines the situations in which the Council may consider making an investment to improve these facilities or assist with their maintenance.
Within the District, a number of sports codes and other community organisations have constructed pavilions or buildings for their own use, and in some cases, for the shared use of two or more codes or groups, on a Council sportsground or reserve. The sports pavilions are usually of a similar nature and configuration to the Council sports pavilions. Other external buildings may be constructed by clubs or groups that serve a passive recreation, or educational purpose. These facilities were generally developed to provide spaces for meetings for social and recreation purposes, similar to the purpose for the provision of the comparable Council facilities.

In some cases, the club facility has experienced declining usage and support to such an extent that the club may choose to either vest the pavilion or building in Council ownership in order that the facility may continue to be maintained, or allow maintenance of the building to deteriorate over time as usage declines.

In some cases clubs or groups may find themselves unable to fund any required capital upgrades or repairs to their buildings. In recognition of these issues the Council proposes the following policy:

The Council may make a capital contribution to an upgrade to an externally funded facility on Council land in accordance with the criteria in Section 4.4 of this policy, as applicable. The Council is more likely to support a contribution to a venue upgrade where the proponents of that upgrade provide or fundraise a significant contribution to the project costs and make the facility widely available for general use by the community. In addition, the Council normally covers building and resource consent costs for external buildings on Council land.

The level of any Council contribution considered for an externally funded facility is likely to be in proportion to the degree of general public access to the facility that is made available, and/or the degree of benefit to the wider public that is associated with the activity/s undertaken in the facility.

The Council may consider whether the facility should be vested in the Council as an alternative to considering assisting with capital costs incurred by a group in relation to its usage of its facility.

4.2.2 Contributions to Voluntary or Community Organisations

The Council may provide a grant or loan toward a new externally owned facility or proposed facility upgrade (where the owner is a voluntary, or community social service or not for profit organisation or a NGO) for the purposes of meeting a social support, health or safety function for the community in accordance with the applicable criteria in Section 4.4.

In making its decision the Council will consider whether the activity for which the facility is needed should alternatively be funded by the Government as a Government service. The Council will take into account the level of fundraising by the venue proponents in determining
its level of investment in any such facility and is more likely to support investment in facilities where some fundraising has been undertaken.

4.2.3 Contributions to Educational/Recreation or Arts Facilities:

The Council may provide a grant or loan toward a new externally owned facility or proposed facility upgrade for the purposes of meeting a sports, recreational, educational, arts or crafts or cultural need within the community subject to applicable criteria in Section 4.4.

The Council will take into account the level of fundraising by the venue proponents in determining its level of investment in any such facility and is more likely to support investment in facilities where proponents are prepared to contribute the majority of the costs that would be incurred.

4.2.4 Contributions to External Organisations Operating Costs

The Council may also make a temporary, or short term contribution by way of grant, or loan, or a longer term partial operating grant, to an organisation’s operating costs where the organisation operates a privately funded venue on Council land or on its own land, subject to the following:

- Viability of the activity would cease without the Council contribution; and
- The applicant provides a business plan indicating how it will address its funding shortfall in future; and
- The applicant can demonstrate that all other potential funding sources have been fully investigated; and
- The applicant demonstrates ability to repay any loan that may be granted, if applicable; and
- The activity provides for the education of, or provides for the improved physical or mental health of participants or for improved public safety; or
- The funding will assist to meet an identified social, economic or cultural need in relation to population growth.

The Council may consider whether the facility should be vested in the Council as an alternative to considering funding ongoing operating costs of a group in relation to its usage of its facility.

4.2.5 Contributions to Commercial Facilities (e.g. Commercial Cultural Precinct/Arts Gallery/ Fitness Centres)

The Council may select from the following forms of contribution to a new commercial facility in the District, or an upgrade to an existing commercial facility, where the facility would provide a significant social or cultural benefit to the community (such as a significant contribution to public health or safety, or significant contribution to the network of cultural facilities available within the District):
POLICY
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- seed funding of the total value of the proposal
- funding by way of a loan to be repaid by the facility proponent
- underwriting of a loan for a new facility or facility cost upgrade

4.3 Upgrading Council Facilities

The Council, when considering whether to fund requested upgrades to any of its facilities, may consider fully funding the following types of improvements (to district wide facilities, community meeting facilities and sports pavilions), subject to the criteria in Section 4.4 as applicable:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amenity</th>
<th>Council Funding Provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security lighting</td>
<td>For all facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved parking facilities</td>
<td>For all facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping of facility grounds</td>
<td>For all facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New public toilets &amp; changing rooms</td>
<td>For all facilities, external access may be provided in some circumstances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded kitchens</td>
<td>For district wide and community meeting facilities only*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded common meeting or function space used by multiple groups</td>
<td>For district wide and community meeting facilities only*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: the Council may choose to stage upgrades to facilities over a number of years

*Sports clubs that have an established sole or multi use of a Council sports pavilion will be required to fully fund those proposed improvements to the venue that have a direct and exclusive benefit to their club/s (e.g. expanded bar area, flood lighting, venue features, expanded meeting areas, new storage or administration areas or other equipment specific to their functioning). The Council will normally only fund improvements to changing rooms, toilets, parking and security features for its sports pavilions, subject to the criteria in Section 4.4.

Groups using district wide or community meeting facilities that have unique storage requirements, functional space requirements, administrative needs or chattels specific to the use of their group within the venue may be required to fully fund these types of upgrades to accommodate their equipment and any other specific requirements.

4.4 Criteria for Council Investment in Community Facilities

4.4.1 General Criteria for Council Funding for Facilities

The Council will consider the extent to which proposals for new community facilities, or facility upgrades, meet each of the following criteria (as applicable) before determining the level of any funding it may provide:
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- Any new facility is designed with the potential to incorporate multiple current and future usage by various groups within the District;
- The wider facility incorporates multiple functional areas including meeting room/conference spaces, storage, administration and other supporting functional areas in relation to assessed demand for facility use as relevant;
- The Council has assessed available space at other facilities across the District which serve a similar purpose (whether owned by Council or externally owned) and there is no further capacity available at peak times at these venues and no opportunity to reschedule existing venue usage to create further capacity;
- For existing facilities, usage or functionality of the venue as a whole would increase if the improvement was made or the proposed improvement would address specific on site safety concerns;
- The projected levels of operating income and expenditure are provided with an outline of how operating costs are intended to be covered. The Council may assess new facility proposals against a target of projected operating cost recovery through direct user fees and charges of at least 10%. The Council will consider the level of cost recovery likely to be achieved for proposals in determining which proposals to support;
- An indication of how long term operating costs will be reduced over time;
- Level of community fundraising achieved and/or ability of proponents to meet any fundraising target which the Council specifies in relation to the proposal;
- Level of anticipated social, economic or cultural benefit to the community from the proposal in relation to a specific cost benefit analysis;
- Level of anticipated corporate and/or other community sponsorship including terms and conditions related to naming or advertising rights as applicable;
- Ownership, operating or management proposals for the venue;
- Ability of proponents to repay any loan that is granted (if applicable) including a contract providing security for the loan if required by the Council;
- The Council will approve the design, colour, materials and siting of any new facility that is approved for location on Council land;
- Supporters of the facility provide a business plan (supported as required by Council analysis) that indicates:
  - Increasing demand for the activities to be accommodated by the proposed venue is clearly demonstrated including by either:
    a) undertaking per capita comparisons of rates of participation in the activity/s to be accommodated by the facility within the District with relevant regional and/or national comparisons, or
    b) comparing per capita levels of access or proximity (in km) to the type of facility that is proposed with regional and/or national comparisons, as applicable; and
  - Why existing venues are not adequate to meet current demand (examples of existing venue usage figures must be provided);
  - An assessment of the suitability of the proposed location/s;
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- An assessment of the proposed management structure for the venue and how space will be allocated among potential users and how usage will be maximised over time;
- How the facility will improve the physical health or safety of those using the venue, and contribute to the development of new skills or education of facility users;
- How the facility will meet identified social, economic or cultural needs of the District in relation to population growth.

The level of any Council contribution will be considered on a case by case basis taking into account the above criteria. Any contribution made is likely to be greater for projects that provide a high degree of social benefit, including projects that enhance public health or safety, or that enable widespread public use including use by multiple groups with diverse activities in the community.

4.4.2 Criteria for Land and Access Arrangements

In any situation where the Council invests in an external facility (that it does not own, or that it will own, but that is located on private land) the following is a condition of its contribution to or development of the facility:

1) The Council may require first option of the purchase of the land and/or facility from the owner at any time the owner sought to sell the land and/or facility. The sale price for the land/facility, if the Council wished to purchase, would be based on its rating valuation at the time the sale was considered.

2) A contract would be required to define the following:
   - usage agreements for the facility and access across the associated land
   - timeframes by which review of land ownership provisions would be initially considered

5 Links to legislation, other policies and community outcomes

The policy gives effect to the following Waimakariri community outcomes:

- Public spaces and facilities are plentiful, accessible and high quality
  - There is a wide variety of public places and spaces to meet people’s needs
  - The range of community and recreation facilities meets the changing needs of our community.

A separate policy is currently being developed proposing streamlined fees and charges for the use of Council facilities. This policy is titled “Proposed Charges for Council Owned Facilities” and can be applied to the use of all of the facilities which are owned by the Council.
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6 Adopted by and date

Adopted by Council on 23 January 2012.

7 Review

This policy will be reviewed every three years and is next due for review in July 2015.
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT FOR DECISION

FILE NO and TRIM NO: RES-23 / 180514052641

REPORT TO: Council

DATE OF MEETING: 29 May 2018

FROM: Craig Sargison, Manager Community and Recreation

SUBJECT: Fees and Charges for Community Facilities

1. SUMMARY

1.1 This report is seeking Council approval for the fees and charges applicable to Council owned community facilities from 1 July 2018.

1.2 The report is proposing a staged implementation of increased hire fees for the majority of the facilities and recommending that the charges as consulted on are confirmed for the two Town Halls and the Airfield lease land charge.

Attachments:
i. Original schedule as approved for the Draft LTP 30 January 2018 (TRIM 180117003266)

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180514052641

(b) Notes the submissions received on community facilities fees and charges.

(c) Confirms that the applicable charge for ground rental at the Rangiora Airfield is $4.00m² applicable to lease renewals occurring from 1 July 2018.

(d) Notes that staff are reviewing the basis of charging at the airfield with the intent of reducing the operating subsidy to the airfield and will present a report to Council prior to the adoption of the 2019/20 Annual Plan.

(e) Approves the Woodend Combined Friendship Club continuing to utilise the Woodend Community Centre for its monthly afternoon meetings on the basis of having the two meeting rooms available but only being invoiced for one room.

(f) Approves Staff concluding an agreement with Agape Dance Academy for the use of Pearson Park Pavilion and Oxford Town Hall as detailed in 4.3 of the report.

(g) Approves the following definition of user types for charging:

Where the event or meeting is run by an association managed by a committee and all profits after reasonable operating expenses are returned to the community in some verifiable
manner. Profits may also be held by the group and applied to the upgrading of equipment for use in future events or improving services to the members of the group and/or the community at large.

This category would also include an event or meeting where there is a passive or active recreational value to the community and activities where meetings or events are organised on a regular, scheduled basis but attended by members of the public on a casual basis and where a nominal fee is charged to cover the cost of the venue and reasonable operating costs. This would include events such as fitness or aerobic type classes, music and dance groups, gardening groups and other activities designed to provide recreation on a not for profit basis. Organisers of subscription based, or classes with a rate per term or per month will be charged the applicable tutor rate unless the use is covered by a separate Council approved agreement.

(h) Approves the following table of fees and charges for community facilities with effect from 1 July 2018 applying to all users unless otherwise agreed by the Community and Recreation Committee:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pavilion</th>
<th>Commercial per hour (incl gst)</th>
<th>Other users per hour (incl gst)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cust Domain</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohoka Domain</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sefton Domain</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View Hill</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pavilion</th>
<th>Commercial per hour (incl gst)</th>
<th>Tutor Rate per hour (incl gst)</th>
<th>All other users per hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sports Hall</td>
<td>$28.75</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td>$20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Room A or B</td>
<td>$28.75</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td>$20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Meeting Rooms A &amp; B</td>
<td>$57.50</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>$40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entire Complex</td>
<td>$414 per day</td>
<td>$200 per day</td>
<td>$180 per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room One</td>
<td>$28.75</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room Two</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other venues: (excl those above, Rangiora Town Hall, Oxford Town Hall)</td>
<td>$28.75</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td>$20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Town Hall</td>
<td>Commercial users (incl gst)</td>
<td>Other users (incl gst)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A &amp; P Room</td>
<td>$57.50/hour</td>
<td>$15/hour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Hall</td>
<td>$57.50/hour</td>
<td>$25.00/hour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entire venue – per hour</td>
<td>$86.25/hour</td>
<td>$40/hour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entire venue – day rate (six hour or more)</td>
<td>$517.50</td>
<td>$240</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wedding rate (incl 3 hrs set up, full day hire and 2 hrs cleaning)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditorium projection equipment (incl technician)</td>
<td>$57.50/hour</td>
<td>$50.00/hour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OB&amp;I League for movies (x3 hrs, incl WDC owned projection equipment, wi-fi and electricity)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rangiora Town Hall</th>
<th>Commercial users (incl gst)</th>
<th>Other users (incl gst)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Auditorium – Performance Day</td>
<td>$1,035.00</td>
<td>$373.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Auditorium – Pack In/Out, Rehearsal (maximum 14 days)</td>
<td>$230.00</td>
<td>$143.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Auditorium – Pack In/Out, Rehearsal (additional days)</td>
<td>$287.50</td>
<td>$172.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Theatre – per hour (minimum 2hrs)</td>
<td>$115.00/hour</td>
<td>$57.50 hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Theatre – day rate</td>
<td>$690</td>
<td>$345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Theatre – Projection Equipment (incl Tech)</td>
<td>$57.50/hour</td>
<td>$57.50/hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function Room</td>
<td>$57.50/hour</td>
<td>$57.50/hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function Room</td>
<td>$345.00/day</td>
<td>$345.00/day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studio Room</td>
<td>$23.00/hour</td>
<td>$23.00/hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Room</td>
<td>$23.00/hour</td>
<td>$23.00/hour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(i) Circulates this report to the Boards.
3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1 Fees and charges for Community Facilities have not been reviewed since 2012 and since then the community facilities have been earthquake strengthened and in most instances upgraded.

3.2 The other significant difference is that heating is now included in the hire charge and there are no separate coin operated meters plus the halls have all had heating plant upgrades with most now having heat pumps installed.

3.3 The Airfield Ground rental charges have not been reviewed since 2011 when the ground rental rate was increased from $2.50 to $2.55 per m².

3.4 When Council was discussing the level of fees and charges for community facilities there was concern that the proposed increases could be too big an increase for some community groups to cope with in one financial year.

4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1 The January report to Council did propose that the Council could enter into separate agreements with user groups if required. This report is proposing two special agreements, one with Agape Dance Academy and one with Woodend Combined Friendship Club (formerly Woodend Combined Probus Club).

4.2 **Agape Dance Academy**

   4.2.1 The Agape Dance Academy is a not for profit dance school operating in Oxford. It keeps its charges to a minimum so local children get the opportunity to learn a variety of dance. All tutors, with one exception, work voluntarily.

   4.2.2 The Academy has been using the Pearson Park Pavilion for some time and work closely with Staff to ensure that the Pavilion is always left appropriately.

   4.2.3 The Academy also uses the Oxford Town Hall for public performances and for performances for external examiners.

   4.2.4 Staff and Councillor Doody met with Agape Dance Academy representatives and discussed what fair and reasonable charges for the Academy could be. The following terms were agreed:

   (a) Use of Pearson Park Pavilion – for up to 25 hours per week Sunday – Friday (not used on Saturdays) for $8.00 (incl GST) per hour.

   (b) Use of Oxford Town Hall – for up to 4 times per year (weekends) at the "Wedding Rate" for weekends.

   (c) Other uses of the Town Hall Auditorium will be at $15.00 (incl GST) per hour.

   4.2.5 The intention is that these charges would come into effect from 1 October 2018 and apply for a 2 year period. Both parties agreed that any future agreement would include provision for an annual rent review.

4.3 **Woodend Combined Friendship Club**

   4.3.1 The Woodend Combined Friendship Club, which was formerly the Woodend Combined Probus Club, has been using the Woodend Community Centre for several years.
4.3.2. The Club is never certain of the actual numbers attending each month and accordingly have had an arrangement with the Council that the Club could use the two meeting rooms for the price of hire of one room.

4.3.3. This has never caused any conflict with other users as the Club is using the facility during the early afternoon for their monthly meeting.

4.3.4. It is proposed that Council continues the arrangement with the Woodend Combined Friendship Club that the Club can utilise both meeting rooms for their monthly meetings and be charged the hire charge for one meeting room.

4.4. There were no submissions on the proposed level of charges for the Pavilions (4) and this report is proposing that they apply from 2 July 2018.

4.5. Similarly the key submissions on the Rangiora Town Hall Auditorium hire fees have been addressed as the proposed increase will include the cost of electricity used for productions.

4.6. There was also comment about potential changes to the fee structure for the Small Theatre at the Rangiora Town Hall and wanting a rehearsal/set up rate. The Small Theatre is not designed to have productions that need a lot of props on stage as the stage is not very deep and the projector screen is permanently fixed. The Small Theatre is designed, and used, for musical productions, seminars, trade events and dinners all of which are set up on the day. The balance of the time the Theatre is used for screening of films which the Council receives income from. This report is not proposing any changes to the fee structure for the Small Theatre.

4.7. For the majority of the facilities the Draft LTP proposal was for an increase from either $6 or $8 per hour to $15 per hour. Following consideration of the submissions combined with conversations with several users it is now being proposed to introduce the fee increases over two financial years.

4.8. The proposal is for most users, in 2018/19 the hourly rate will be $10 per hour increasing to $15 per hour in 2019/20.

4.9. There was also a proposed Tutor rate and it is recommended that this be retained but also staggered in its introduction.

4.10. As indicated in the January report to Council the introduction of a tutor rate requires some amendment to the definitions of various groups for applying charges. The following is now recommended:

Where the event or meeting is run by an association managed by a committee and all profits after reasonable operating expenses are returned to the community in some verifiable manner. Profits may also be held by the group and applied to the upgrading of equipment for use in future events or improving services to the members of the group and/or the community at large.

This category would also include an event or meeting where there is a passive or active recreational value to the community and activities where meetings or events are organised on a regular, scheduled basis but attended by members of the public on a casual basis and where a nominal fee is charged to cover the cost of the venue and reasonable operating costs. This would include events such as fitness or aerobic type classes, music and dance groups, gardening groups and other activities designed to provide recreation on a not for profit basis. Organisers of subscription based, or classes with a rate per term or per month will be charged the applicable tutor rate unless the use is covered by a separate Council approved agreement.
4.11. The following table is the recommended level of charges to commence on 1 July 2018:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pavilion</th>
<th>Commercial per hour</th>
<th>Tutor Rate per hour</th>
<th>All other users per hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend Community Centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Hall</td>
<td>$28.75</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td>$20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Room A or B</td>
<td>$28.75</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td>$20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Meeting Rooms A &amp; B</td>
<td>$57.50</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>$40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entire Complex</td>
<td>$414 per day</td>
<td>$200 per day</td>
<td>$180 per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruataniwha Civic Centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Room One</td>
<td>$28.75</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Room Two</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other venues:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(excl those above, Rangiora Town Hall, Oxford Town Hall)</td>
<td>$28.75</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td>$20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Town Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A &amp; P Room</td>
<td>$57.50/hour</td>
<td>$15/hour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Hall</td>
<td>$57.50/hour</td>
<td>$25.00/hour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entire venue – per hour</td>
<td>$86.25/hour</td>
<td>$40/hour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entire venue – day rate (six hour or more)</td>
<td>$517.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wedding rate (incl 3 hrs set up, full day hire and 2 hrs cleaning)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditorium projection equipment (incl technician)</td>
<td>$57.50/hour</td>
<td>$50.00/hour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OB&amp;I League for movies (x3 hrs, incl WDC owned projection equipment, wi-fi and electricity)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Town Hall</td>
<td>Commercial users (incl gst)</td>
<td>Other users (incl gst)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Auditorium – Performance Day</td>
<td>$1,035.00</td>
<td>$373.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Auditorium – Pack In/Out, Rehearsal (maximum 14 days)</td>
<td>$230.00</td>
<td>$143.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Auditorium – Pack In/Out, Rehearsal (additional days)</td>
<td>$287.50</td>
<td>$172.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Theatre – per hour (minimum 2hrs)</td>
<td>$115.00/hour</td>
<td>$57.50/hour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Theatre – day rate</td>
<td>$690</td>
<td>$345</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Theatre – Projection Equipment (incl Tech)</td>
<td>$57.50/hour</td>
<td>$57.50/hour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function Room</td>
<td>$57.50/hour $345.00/day</td>
<td>$57.50/hour $345.00/day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studio Room</td>
<td>$23.00/hour</td>
<td>$23.00/hour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Room</td>
<td>$23.00/hour</td>
<td>$23.00/hour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that evening hire charges (per hour) apply until 10pm for all venues except for:
- Oxford and Rangiora Town Halls – apply until 11pm
- Fernside and Waikuku Halls – apply until 12 midnight.

4.12. Airfield Ground rental:
There were submissions on the level of the increase but it is recommended that Council proceed with the proposed charge of $4.00 per m². Note that this will be applied to all annual rent reviews from 1 July 2018.

4.13. Staff will continue to work with Councillors and Airfield Users on other modifications to fees and charges at the Airfield and report back to Council prior to the consideration of the 2019/20 Annual Plan.

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

5. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

5.1. **Groups and Organisations**

5.2. **Wider Community**
6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1. Financial Implications

6.1.1. The Airfield budget has been prepared on the basis of the proposed increased charges for land rental. It is budgeted to receive $95,510 in 2019/20 compared with $65,510 in 2018/19. The reason for the income not increasing until the 2019/20 financial year is the rent renewal clauses in the leases.

6.1.2. The budgets for the Rangiora and Oxford Town Halls have been prepared based on the current charges. While there will be an increase in the income received the total net increase will be negligible as this will be used to offset additional technician costs.

6.1.3. The total income currently received from all other buildings excluding the Oxford and Rangiora Town Halls is $32,450. Should the recommendations in this report be approved it is expected that this total income will increase by around $7,000 for 2018/19.

6.2. Community Implications

The community were consulted during the Draft LTP and the proposed recommendations will address most of the concerns raised by the Community.

6.3. Risk Management

6.4. Health and Safety

There are Health and Safety processes for each Community Facility and the Airfield has a dedicated Safety Committee.

7. CONTEXT

7.1. Policy

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

7.2. Legislation

Local Government Act

7.3. Community Outcomes

- Public spaces and facilities will be accessible and of a high standard.
- People will involve themselves in a range of recreation activities.

7.4. Delegations

The Council has to decide on fees and charges as part of the LTP process.
## APPENDIX 1:

### PROPOSED LEVEL OF CHARGES EFFECTIVE 01/07/2018

*(as approved for Draft LTP, 30 January 2018)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pavillon</th>
<th>Commercial per hour (excl gst)</th>
<th>Tutor Rate per hour (incl gst)</th>
<th>All other users per hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cust Domain</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohoka Domain</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sefton Domain</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View Hill</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Woodend Community Centre – Sports Hall</th>
<th>Commercial per hour (excl gst)</th>
<th>Tutor Rate per hour (incl gst)</th>
<th>All other users per hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$25</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Woodend Community Centre – entire complex</th>
<th>Commercial per hour (excl gst)</th>
<th>Tutor Rate per hour (incl gst)</th>
<th>All other users per hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$360</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All other venues excl: Woodend CC, Rangiora Town Hall and Oxford Town Hall</th>
<th>Commercial per hour (excl gst)</th>
<th>Tutor Rate per hour (incl gst)</th>
<th>All other users per hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$25</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oxford Town Hall</th>
<th>Commercial users (excl gst)</th>
<th>Other users (incl gst)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A &amp; P Room</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Hall</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entire venue – per hour</th>
<th>$75/hour</th>
<th>$40/hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entire venue – day rate (six hour or more)</td>
<td>$450</td>
<td>$240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wedding rate (includes 3 hours set up, full day hire and 2 hours cleaning)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditorium projection equipment (incl technician)</td>
<td>$50/hour</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OB&amp;I League for movies (3 x hours, includes WDC owned projection equipment, wifi and electricity)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Town Hall</td>
<td>Commercial users (excl gst)</td>
<td>Other users (excl gst)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Auditorium – Performance Day</td>
<td>$900</td>
<td>$325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Auditorium – Pack In/Out, Rehearsal (max 14 days)</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Auditorium – Pack In/Out, Rehearsal (additional days)</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Theatre – per hour (min 2hrs)</td>
<td>$100/hour</td>
<td>$50/hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Theatre – day rate</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Theatre – Projection Equipment (incl Tech)</td>
<td>$50/hour</td>
<td>$50/hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studio Room</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is for Council to consider increasing the fees charged for the use of Community Facilities and the ground rent at the Rangiora Airfield charged to hangar owners.

Attachments:

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180117003266

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

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

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

3. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

3.1. Background

3.1.1. Fees and charges for Community Facilities have not been reviewed since 2012 and since then the community facilities have been earthquake strengthened and in most instances upgraded.

3.1.2. The other significant difference is that heating is now included in the hire charge and there are no separate coin operated meters plus the halls have all had heating plant upgrades with most now having heat pumps installed.

4. OTHER

4.1. Additional information or comments

4.2. Recommendations for future action or follow-up

5. ATTACHMENTS

5.1. List of attachments or related documents

6. SIGNATURES

6.1. Signatures of relevant officials or representatives

7. DISCUSSION

7.1. Discussion on the report and its implications

8. ACTION ITEMS

8.1. Action items approved by the Council

9.附录

9.1. Additional notes or appendices

10. 附录

10.1. Additional notes or appendices
3.1.3. The Airfield Ground rental charges have not been reviewed since 2011 when the ground rental rate was increased from $2.50 to $2.55 per sq metre.
3.2. Community Facility Categories

3.2.1. It is proposed that there are 3 categories of venues:

Category 1: Performance venues – Rangiora and Oxford Town Halls which are both designed for a variety of performances and large groups.

Category 2: Basic venues: These have a basic level of service and not generally suitable for community meetings. Prime purpose is to support activities on the adjoining domain. This includes Cust Domain; Ohoka Domain; Sefton Domain and View Hill Domain pavilions.

Category 3: Standard venues – includes all venues with the exception of those in Category 1 and 2.

3.3. Categories of Users

3.3.1. Traditionally our fees and charges have had 3 user categories:

- Commercial
- Casual
- Community Group

3.3.2. In reality only 2 categories have actually been used: Commercial and Community Group.

3.3.3. The definition that has been used for community users is:

Where the event or meeting is run by an association managed by a committee and all profits after reasonable operating expenses are returned to the community in some verifiable manner. Profits may also be held by the group and applied to the upgrading of equipment for use in future events or improving services to the members of the group and/or the community at large.

This category would also include an event or meeting where there is a passive or active recreational value to the community and activities where meetings or events are organised on a regular, scheduled basis but attended by members of the public on a casual basis and where a nominal fee is charged to cover the cost of the venue and reasonable operating costs. This would include events such as fitness or aerobic type classes, music and dance groups, gardening groups and other activities designed to provide recreation on a not for profit or minimal profit basis.

3.3.4. The main issue that has arisen with this definition is the fact that there are "commercial" providers of martial arts, dance academies whose business model is to utilise our facilities at the community rate.

3.3.5. It is proposed to amend the definition of community users to remove the reference to make it clear that organisers of subscription based or classes with a rate per term or per month will be charged at a tutor rate.

3.3.6. The Tutor/Coaching category will include sports/dance, martial arts and similar events when there is an admission charge for classes either nightly or on a lesson basis that is beyond the gold coin donation.

3.3.7. There are some issues with group domination of a particular venue and it is proposed that the one group/organisation cannot book more than 16 hours per week at one venue without approval of the Community and Recreation Committee of Council.

3.3.8. Similar arrangements are already in place with the North Canterbury Academy of Music which has an agreement with Council for the use of parts of the complex.
3.3.9. It is also proposed to discontinue the Casual rate as it is seldom used.

3.4. Waiver of fees

3.4.1. Traditionally the Greenspace Manager and the Manager Community and Recreation have had the authority to waive charges for hall hire.

3.4.2. This does cause issues as there is a widespread expectation that any event that has a fundraising element will have the hall hire waived as well as events that can be seen as having a “community education” aspect and events run or administered through the local business/promotion organisations.

3.4.3. The quantum of these requests does vary from year to year but staff estimate that during 2017 calendar year there were in the order of 30 bookings for venues that had the fees waived.

3.4.4. The Council is still incurring costs for those events relating to cleaning and power and it is proposed that no charges can be waived by staff so the charges apply to all users regardless of the type of event.

3.5. Current level of charges for community facilities

3.5.1. Appendix 1 has the current list of charges for the community facilities except for Rangiora Town Hall.

3.5.2. Most venues are charged at $6.00 or $8.00 per hour inclusive of GST, for community groups.

3.5.3. These charges are extremely reasonable and less than most comparable buildings operated by other local authorities.

3.5.4. The current charges are also considerably less than those charged by other providers in the District (mostly church owned). Typical charges for comparable other venues in the District are in the range of $16 - $20 per hour.

3.6. Proposed level of charges for community facilities

3.6.1. The following level of charges, inclusive of GST, are proposed for Category 2 Buildings. This is the basic category of venues indicating no changes for commercial fee and with only minimal proposed increases for all other users:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pavilion</th>
<th>Commercial per hour</th>
<th>Other users per hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pavilion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current charges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed new</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>charges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cust Domain</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohoka Domain</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sefton Domain</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View Hill</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.6.2. The following level of charges are proposed for Category 3 venues (most of the venues) and includes use of facilities and furniture:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Commercial per hour (excl gst)</th>
<th>(New) Tutor Rate per hour (incl gst)</th>
<th>All other users per hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current charges</td>
<td>Proposed new charges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend Community Centre – Sports Hall</td>
<td>$25</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend Community Centre – entire complex</td>
<td>$360</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other venues excl: Woodend CC, Rangiora Town Hall and Oxford Town Hall</td>
<td>$25</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$6-$8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.6.3. The following charges are proposed for Oxford Town Hall:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oxford Town Hall</th>
<th>Commercial users (excl gst)</th>
<th>Other users (incl gst)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current charges</td>
<td>Proposed new charges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A &amp; P Room</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Hall</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entire venue – per hour</td>
<td>$75/hour</td>
<td>$23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entire venue – day rate (six hour or more)</td>
<td>$450</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wedding rate (includes 3 hours set up, full day hire and 2 hours cleaning)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditorium projection equipment (incl technician)</td>
<td>$50/hour</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OB&amp;I League for movies (3 x hours, includes WDC owned projection equipment, wi-fi and electricity)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.6.4. Rangiora Town Hall: The only changes proposed for Rangiora Town Hall relate to some minor adjustments to the performance rate and rehearsal day charges to cover the increase in technician support rates which are now $50.00 per hour.
The performance rate will increase from $300.00 to $325.00 per day and rehearsal day charges will increase from $100.00 to $125.00 (all GST inclusive).

3.6.5. Full schedule: A full schedule of all proposed rates is included as Appendix 1.

3.7. Current level of charges for airfield land:

3.7.1. The current rental charges are $2.55 (gst inclusive) per sq metre of land leased. This figure was set in 2010 which came into effect in 2011 and was an increase of 5c per sq metre.

3.7.2. The standard lot size at the Airfield is 150sq metres so currently that equates to an annual rental of $382.50.

3.7.3. The Council supplies water to each lot and maintains all of the surrounding land that is not directly leased.

3.8. Proposed level of charges for airfield land

3.8.1. It is proposed to increase the annual charge to $4.00 sq metre which for a standard lot would equate to $600.00 per annum incl of GST.

3.8.2. Staff have checked with comparable airfields and the $4.00 charge is within the range of rentals charged which was from $3.55 - $5.00. Comparatives are not easy however as different airfields have differing levels of service and the $5.00 charge is at a field that has a sealed runway as well as grass.

3.8.3. The figure of $4.00 has been discussed with the Airfield Advisory Group and there was general acceptance that maintenance costs are continuing to increase and agreement that the airfield is maintained to a good standard.

3.8.4. It is not proposed to increase the landing fees as these are comparable with other fields and now that we have the automated billing system in place we are collecting additional revenue.

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

4. COMMUNITY VIEWS

4.1. Community views will be sought during the LTP process but it is likely that there will be community reaction to the proposed changes to charges for community facilities and also the increase of land rental at the Rangiora Airfield.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

5.1. The Airfield budget has been prepared on the basis of the proposed increased charges for land rental. It is budgeted to receive $95,510 in 19/20 compared with $65,510 in 18/19. The reason for the income not increasing until the 19/20 financial year is the rent renewal clauses in the leases.

5.2. The budgets for the Rangiora and Oxford Town Halls have been prepared based on the current charges. While there will be an increase in the income received the total net increase will be negligible as this will be used to offset additional technician costs.

5.3. The total income currently received from all other buildings excluding the Oxford and Rangiora Town Halls is $32,450. Should the recommendations in this report be approved it is expected that this total income will increase by $15,000. This is not currently shown on the building budget spreadsheets. The income for Rangiora Town Hall hire, excluding the leased area is around $42,000 and Oxford Town Hall around $4,200. In addition there is lease income from Rangiora Town Hall which is in the order of $63,000.
6. **CONTEXT**

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

6.2. **Legislation**
Local Government Act

6.3. **Community Outcomes**
- Public spaces and facilities will be accessible and of a high standard.
- People will involve themselves in a range of recreation activities.

APPENDIX 1:
## PROPOSED LEVEL OF CHARGES EFFECTIVE 01/07/2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pavilion</th>
<th>Commercial per hour</th>
<th>Other users per hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cust Domain</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohoka Domain</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sefton Domain</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View Hill</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Woodend Community Centre –  | Commercial per hour (excl gst) | Tutor Rate per hour (incl gst) | All other users per hour |
| Sports Hall                  | $25                   | $20                         | $15                      |
| Woodend Community Centre –  | $360 per day          | $200 per day                | $180 per day             |
| entire complex               |                       |                             |                          |
| All other venues excl: Woodend CC, Rangiora Town Hall and Oxford Town Hall | $25 | $20 | $15 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oxford Town Hall</th>
<th>Commercial users (incl gst)</th>
<th>Other users (incl gst)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A &amp; P Room</td>
<td>$50/hour</td>
<td>$15/hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Hall</td>
<td>$50.00/hour</td>
<td>$25.00/hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entire venue – per hour</td>
<td>$75/hour</td>
<td>$40/hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entire venue – day rate (six hour or more)</td>
<td>$450</td>
<td>$240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wedding rate (includes 3 hours set up, full day hire and 2 hours cleaning)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditorium projection equipment (incl technician)</td>
<td>$50/hour</td>
<td>$50.00/hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OB&amp;I League for movies (3 hours, includes WDC owned projection equipment, wi-fi and electricity)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Rangiora Town Hall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Commercial users (excl gst)</th>
<th>Other users (excl gst)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Auditorium – Performance Day</td>
<td>$900</td>
<td>$325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Auditorium – Pack In/Out, Rehearsal (max 14 days)</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Auditorium – Pack In/Out, Rehearsal (additional days)</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Theatre – per hour (min 2hrs)</td>
<td>$100/hour</td>
<td>$50/hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Theatre – day rate</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Theatre – Projection Equipment (incl Tech)</td>
<td>$50/hour</td>
<td>$50/hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function Room</td>
<td>$100/hour</td>
<td>$50/hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studio Room</td>
<td>$20/hour</td>
<td>$20/hour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that evening hire charges (per hour) apply until 10pm for all venues except for:
- Oxford and Rangiora Town Halls - apply until 11pm
- Fernside and Waikuku Halls – apply until 12 midnight.
1. **SUMMARY**

1.1 This report is seeking a decision from Council about the allocation and timing of the budget for Regeneration.

1.2 The Draft LTP consultation material sought community input on the programme with 291 submitters supporting the financial provision and timing and 46 submitters wanting it deferred.

1.3 The report recommends retaining the timing and financial provision for the various components of the Regeneration programme with the exception of the Memorial Gardens which is proposed to move to an outer year of the LTP beyond the ten year period and a re-spreading of the funding for Recreation and Ecological Linkages.

**Attachments:**

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180518054707

(b) **Notes** the submissions that have been received.

(c) **Approves** the deferral of the provision of $1.4 million for the development of the Memorial Garden to an outer year of the LTP (beyond Year 10).

(d) **Approves** the balance of the Regeneration Budget as per the Draft LTP and the re-spread of the funding for the implementation of Recreation and Ecological linkages to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$520,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(e) **Notes** that this re-spread does not affect the overall budget provision for Regeneration.
3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1 The Regeneration Steering Group has provided advice and guidance to staff on all aspects of the implementation programme planning and delivery.

3.2 The Steering Group has also provided a series of recommendations to Council on various aspects of programme delivery and approvals for expenditure.

3.3 The Steering Group made a series of recommendations to the Council for its deliberations in January on the Draft LTP (TRIM 171109121919).

3.4 The Council accepted those recommendations and the programme was included in the Draft LTP and in the Consultation Summary.

4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1 Some submissions suggested variations to the programme both in terms of bringing items forward, altering the order of programmes or deferring items.

4.2 The timing and staging of the programme has been discussed with the Regeneration Steering Group on more than one occasion and it is recommended that the timing and staging of the programme remain unaltered.

4.3 A key factor to consider in any change of programme timing is the potential impact on other programmes and also the economies of scale that can be achieved. An example of this is earthworks. At present there is one package of work that will address earthworks for the proposed sportsground development, the BMX track, the dog park and the stormwater treatment areas.

4.4 Staff have, however, adjusted the spread of money allocated to the development of recreation and ecological linkages. The total amount in the Draft LTP of $1,094,000 is unchanged but with the programme of earthworks it is unlikely that the original spend identified for Years 1 – 3 will be achieved.

4.5 The Draft LTP had the following spread for Recreation and Ecological Linkages:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$555,000</td>
<td>$422,000</td>
<td>$117,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.6 The recommended spread is now:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$520,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.7 There were also some suggestions for the timing of spend on the development of the Memorial Garden.
4.8. The Draft LTP had a provision of $1.4m in Year 10 and it is recommended that this be deferred to an outer year (beyond the ten year period of this LTP).

4.9. The changes to timing have already been made in the Council budget and this is reflected in the rating movements as presented to Council.

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

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. Groups and Organisations

5.2. Wider Community

5.2.1. The consultation material for the Draft LTP asked for feedback on the timing of the Regeneration spend – with feedback asked on Supporting the spread over 10 years or deferring the programme.

5.2.2. 291 submitters supported the 10 year programme and 46 wanted the programme deferred.

6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1. Financial Implications

6.1.1. The deferral of the provision for the development of the Memorial Garden removes $1.4m of borrowing in year 10 of the LTP.

6.2. Community Implications

The Community is consulted on every landscape design and roading/footpath design in the Regeneration area.

6.3. Risk Management

The principal risk to the Regeneration programme budget is scope change and this is managed through the Regeneration Steering Group and recommendations to Council for expenditure.

6.4. Health and Safety

This is addressed through each development contract let for development of the Regeneration area.

7. CONTEXT

7.1. Policy

This matter is a matter of significance in terms of the Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.

7.2. Legislation

Greater Christchurch Regeneration Act 2016
Local Government Act 2002
7.3. **Community Outcomes**

- There is a safe environment for all.
- Public spaces and facilities are plentiful, accessible and high quality.

7.4. **Delegations**

The Council has to decide on the provisions of the LTP.
1. SUMMARY

1.1 This report is for the Council to consider funding of an upgrade to surveillance cameras in Oxford.

1.2 The report recommends an additional $31,000 to be included in the Recreation Budget to undertake an upgrade of the Oxford Surveillance cameras.

Attachments:

i. Report from Visual Networks (Trim 180518054627)

ii. Proposed camera location plan (Trim 180518054619)

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180517054436

(b) Notes the report from Visual Networks on Oxford Street Surveillance Cameras.

(c) Approves an additional $31,000 in the Greenspace Budget for the installation of additional surveillance cameras and infrastructure in Oxford during 2018/19.

(d) Circulates this report to the Oxford Ohoka Community Board.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1 The Council has provided the local Kaiapoi and Rangiora Communities with a street surveillance camera system for over 10 years.

3.2 Previously, limited surveillance cameras were located on the former Oxford Service Centre. The local supermarket has kindly funded a small CCTV system which the Police have limited access to.

3.3 This issue has been discussed for some time with the police, some local business owners and some members of the Pearson Park Advisory Group and the ward Councillors.

3.4 During discussion of the Recreation Budget as part of the Draft LTP debate, Staff were asked to present a report on the potential upgrade of surveillance cameras in Oxford.
4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1. Visual Networks have met with representatives from the Police and undertaken an assessment of the needs in Oxford.

4.2. The key issues with the current system in Oxford are identified in the Visual Network’s report and are summarised as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recording server and wireless network</td>
<td>The recording server and wireless network infrastructure is currently being provided by the local supermarket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited camera coverage</td>
<td>There are only a small number of street cameras based at the supermarket entrance and limited coverage of the Skate Park &amp; Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recording system is not accessible from Oxford Police station</td>
<td>Due to configuration issues, the Police must go onsite to the supermarket to review recorded history</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camera performance</td>
<td>Existing cameras are not optimised for low light operation or obtaining vehicle license plates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited expansion options &amp; visibility from other NZP locations in the future</td>
<td>In the current configuration, it will not be possible to remote access the system in the future should this functionality be required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3. The recommendations in the report will result in a system that will retain the Supermarket based cameras being retained and the new surveillance camera system being independent from the Supermarket and a milestone recording server placed in the Oxford Police Station.

4.4. The new cameras (5) will include a license plate number camera overlooking the Main Road through Oxford.

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

5. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

5.1. **Groups and Organisations**

No specific views have been canvassed but there have been comments from businesses and members of the community about the desire to have improved surveillance of areas where there are frequent behavioural issues.
6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**

The table below from the Visual Network’s report provides the cost breakdown:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Street Camera Hardware</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skate Park Overview</td>
<td>Axis Q1765-LE, HD Fixed Camera located on Town Hall</td>
<td>$2,370.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$2,370.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street - LPR</td>
<td>Axis Q1765-LE, HD Fixed Camera located on Supermarket Sign on roadside</td>
<td>2,370.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$2,370.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Street Frontage</td>
<td>Axis P3225-LVE, Outdoor HD Fixed Dome</td>
<td>$1,180.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,180.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool Complex Carpark</td>
<td>Axis P3225-LVE, Outdoor HD Fixed Dome</td>
<td>$1,180.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,180.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wireless Hardware</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wireless Network Upgrade</td>
<td>Replace all existing Wireless equipment, Ubiquiti NanoBeam 5GHz &amp; Mounting Brackets</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$2,100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recording Hardware &amp;</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recording Server</td>
<td>Milestone M20 Recording Server + 8 TB Storage (16 Channel Licence Inc)</td>
<td>$5,500.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$5,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Display Monitor</td>
<td>24&quot; LED Display</td>
<td>$320.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$320.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPS</td>
<td>UPS Supply for Police Station</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Router</td>
<td>Ubiquity Firewall/Router</td>
<td>$375.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$375.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Switch</td>
<td>8 Port 1GB Switch - Managed</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$1,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>System Implementation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offsite Configuration</td>
<td>Camera, Wireless, Milestone System Configuration</td>
<td>$1,200.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Installation &amp; Configuration</td>
<td>Installation &amp; Configuration of Cameras and Milestone Software</td>
<td>$7,200.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$7,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multimedia Communications</td>
<td>Cabling for External Camera at Library Cabling for External Camera at Pool Complex</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lift Hire</td>
<td>Truck Access Lift Hire</td>
<td>$1,850.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,850.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc Items</td>
<td>Cable, Patch Cables, Fixings, Conduit, POE Injectors, Brackets</td>
<td>$800.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel &amp; Mileage</td>
<td>Travel &amp; Mileage</td>
<td>$700.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight</td>
<td>Freight</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Ex GST</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$30,745.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2. **Community Implications**

The provision of surveillance cameras in Oxford will greatly assist the Police in addressing vandalism and other associated criminal activity in Oxford.

6.3. **Risk Management**

Visual Networks is an approved supplier by the Police of Camera Surveillance Systems and also carries out maintenance as required.

As with other surveillance systems in Kaiapoi and Rangiora the access to the system is restricted to the Police (Council Staff do not have access).

6.4. **Health and Safety**

Visual Networks will submit a Health and Safety Plan to Council prior to undertaking this work.
7. **CONTEXT**

7.1. **Policy**

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

7.2. **Legislation**

Privacy Act 1993 – 12 principles around the collection, use and disclosure of personal information

7.3. **Community Outcomes**

There is a safe environment for all

7.4. **Delegations**

The Council needs to make decisions on financial provisions in the LTP.
Oxford Street Surveillance
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Project Summary

Waimakariri District Council (WDC) has provided the local Kaiapoi and Rangiora community a Street Surveillance System for well over 10 years. Oxford has now been identified as requiring additional CCTV coverage. Oxford currently has a small CCTV system which the Police have limited access to. This has been provided by the local Supermarket Owner.

This document is to highlight the current issues, remediation, as well as make recommendations on how the CCTV coverage in the area can be increased.

It is recommended the core infrastructure is initially upgraded (Stage 1). Additional cameras and locations can be introduced in the future as required. Local Police have provided a list of locations they would like to have CCTV coverage of in the future. Some of these locations are somewhat remote from the main centre, as such this creates challenges around video transmission and providing power to these positions.

Costs for delivering Stage 1 of the project are provided in the Investment Summary section of the document, however, Stage 2 will require additional scoping and validation of the requirement.
Current Issues

The existing system does not perform to an acceptable level, and is suffering from continuous failures in both camera and wireless infrastructure. The following issues have been identified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No #</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CI-01</td>
<td>Recording Server and Wireless Network</td>
<td>The Recording server and Wireless Network infrastructure is currently being provided by the local Supermarket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI-02</td>
<td>Limited Camera Coverage</td>
<td>There are only a small number of street cameras based at the Supermarket entrance and limited coverage of the Skate Park &amp; Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI-03</td>
<td>Recording system is not accessible from Oxford Police station</td>
<td>Due to configuration issues, the Police must go onsite to the supermarket to review recorded history</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI-04</td>
<td>Camera Performance</td>
<td>Existing cameras are not optimised for low light operation or obtaining Vehicle Licence Plates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI-05</td>
<td>Limited expansion options &amp; visibility from other NZP locations in the future</td>
<td>In the current configuration, it will not be possible to remote access the system in the future should this functionality be required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Recommendation**

The following solution is recommended to address the issues highlighted in the “Current Issues” section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No #</th>
<th>Detail</th>
<th>CI Addressed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R-01</td>
<td>Due to the age of existing Wireless Hardware, it is recommended all Wireless Equipment is upgraded to the latest generation hardware. It will also provide increased speed across the network, improving the user experience.</td>
<td>CI-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-02</td>
<td>Upgrading the wireless network will also provide the platform for stage 2 expansion to other locations outside the main business hub</td>
<td>CI-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-03</td>
<td>A new Milestone recording server is recommended to replace the existing Supermarket supplied system. This will be located in the Oxford Police Station.</td>
<td>CI-01, CI-03, CI-05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| R-04 | Retain existing external supermarket cameras and overview camera located on the town hall. Optimise configuration where possible for low light performance. Access to these cameras will be provided to the market owner as he will retain ownership of these devices

*Camera Plan: 3, 6, 7, 8*                                                                                                           | CI-02, CI-04 |
| R-05 | Replace existing Skate Park camera which is currently located on the rear of the Town Hall

*Camera Plan: 2*                                                                                                                                                                                      | CI-02        |
| R-06 | Install a new camera on the main street facing side of the Library

*Camera Plan: 4*                                                                                                                                | CI-02        |
| R-07 | Install a new camera on the Pool complex main building overlooking the carpark

*Camera Plan: 1*                                                                                                                            | CI-02        |
| R-08 | Install a new Licence Plate camera on the Supermarket street sign overlooking the Main Road through Oxford

*Camera Plan: 5*                                                                                                                            | CI-02        |
Investment Summary

The section below provides costs for implementing Stage 1 of the new Street Surveillance Solution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Street Camera Hardware</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skate Park Overview</td>
<td>Axis Q1765-LE, HD Fixed Camera located on Town Hall</td>
<td>$2,370</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$2,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street - LPR</td>
<td>Axis Q1765-LE, HD Fixed Camera located on Supermarket Sign on roadside</td>
<td>2,370</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Street Frontage</td>
<td>Axis P3225-LVE, Outdoor HD Fixed Dome</td>
<td>$1,180</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool Complex Carpark</td>
<td>Axis P3225-LVE, Outdoor HD Fixed Dome</td>
<td>$1,180</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wireless Hardware</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wireless Network Upgrade</td>
<td>Replace all existing Wireless equipment, Ubiquiti NanoBeam 5GHz &amp; Mounting Brackets</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$2,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recording Hardware &amp; Network</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recording Server</td>
<td>Milestone M20 Recording Server + 8 TB Storage (16 Channel Licence Inc)</td>
<td>$5,500</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$5,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Display Monitor</td>
<td>24&quot; LED Display</td>
<td>$320</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPS</td>
<td>UPS Supply for Police Station</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Router</td>
<td>Ubiquity Firewall/Router</td>
<td>$375</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Switch</td>
<td>8 Port 1GB Switch - Managed</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>System Implementation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offsite Configuration</td>
<td>Camera, Wireless, Milestone System Configuration</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Installation &amp; Configuration</td>
<td>Installation &amp; Configuration of Cameras and Milestone Software</td>
<td>$7,200</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$7,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multimedia Communications</td>
<td>Cabling for External Camera at Library</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lift Hire</td>
<td>Truck Access Lift Hire</td>
<td>$1,850</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc Items</td>
<td>Cable, Patch Cables, Fixings, Conduit, POE Injectors, Brackets</td>
<td>$800</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel &amp; Mileage</td>
<td>Travel &amp; Mileage</td>
<td>$700</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight</td>
<td>Freight</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Ex GST</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$30,745</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exclusions

- Traffic Management if required. Costs for Traffic Management and Traffic Plans will be on charged at actual cost.

Appendix 1: Camera Location Plan

See Attached Camera Location Plan
Terms & Conditions

THESE TERMS
These terms apply whenever we provide services to our customers. The terms “service” and “services” cover all goods and services that we provide and anything else we may do. We have used “we” for Visual Networks Limited and “you” for the customer. Both companies agree that these terms apply whenever we agree to do anything for you.

OUR GENERAL STANDARDS
We want to make it easy for you to do business with us. We are committed to:
• Providing a high level of responsive service to you
• Putting you in touch with the right person to answer your enquiries
• Responding to your needs quickly and efficiently
Please tell us if you have any complaint about our service. Our aim is to resolve any complaints as soon as possible.

OUR RESPONSIBILITIES TO YOU
Whenever we provide services to you, we will:
• Provide the services with care and skill
• Make sure the services we provide perform in the manner we have stated or as you have asked us to provide (so long as you tell us before we agree to provide the services)
• Provide the services within a reasonable time frame or within an agreed time period
• Endeavour to provide a professional, responsive service and act on your behalf as and when required, to the best of our abilities
• Manage any problem and use all reasonable endeavours to ensure that appropriate parties rectify that problem
• Ensure that you are paying competitive market rates for all of your equipment by using our knowledge and industry position
• Remotely log on to or arrive at your site as soon as is practically possible

YOUR RESPONSIBILITIES TO US
Wherever we provide services for you, it is your responsibility to:
• Follow our directions about the use of our services
• Make sure all information you provide us is correct and complete
• Inform us if you have any queries regarding our services or products
• Pay all of our accounts within the required time frame
• Contact us if there is a problem regarding our services so that the issue can be discussed and rectified.
• Allow us to act on your behalf as and when required.
• Provide us with a single point of contact within your organisation

OUR FEES
If work is required to be performed out of normal business hours, Visual Networks will charge the after hours rate as per the Fee Schedule.
In the event of after hours work, expenses (i.e. meals) will be charged on at the actual rate, unless this has been otherwise negotiated or specified in the design document or Estimate.
You agree to pay for the services we provide for you. Our payment terms are payment 20th following month from date of invoice.
Third party organisations that work with us will bill you directly. They will have their own payment terms that they will provide to you.

PROJECTS
Before we commence any project with your organisation we will either create a design document or provide you with a written estimate. These documents will provide the technical and logistical details for your project.
If we undertake at your request, services that are not included in the applicable design document or estimate, then those services shall be charged in addition to any written estimate, with the charges based upon our normal charges for the provision of those services, together with additional costs or expenses incurred by us in the provision of those services.
We will bill you in stages throughout a project. Payment is due at the completion of each stage. If payment is not received at the completion of a stage we will reserve the right to suspend that project until payment is received.
Stages are normally specified in our written estimate. If stages have not been specified we will bill you at the completion of the project.

EXPIRY OF DOCUMENTS
It is our intention that all quotations, scopes, estimates and relevant documentation will remain valid for 30 days. Unfortunately, we cannot guarantee this due to external factors such as exchange rate fluctuations, product deletions and stock availability. All orders and pricing will be confirmed upon acceptance and when orders are placed with the relevant vendor(s).

OUR RIGHT TO SUSPEND OR CANCEL SERVICES
If you do not pay our accounts or meet any responsibilities you have with us, we may suspend, cancel or restrict any service at any time.
We reserve the right to access your system remotely and disable it for your use until payment has been made.

YOUR RIGHT TO GIVE UP ANY SERVICE
You may give up any service simply by telling us in writing. Where you have agreed to take the service for a period of time or the service is part of a project, charges for the service will continue until the end of the period or project.

THIRD PARTY ORGANISATIONS
We will ensure that any third party organisations that provide services to you are briefed on your requirements before they enter your premises. Third party organisations that we work with will receive a copy of our terms. It is the third party organisations responsibility to provide you with their standard business terms and conditions.
USING INFORMATION ABOUT YOU
We will respect the Privacy Act and ensure that we abide by the conditions of it. We will only release information regarding your business to other parties when it specifically relates to a service you have asked us to provide. We will always obtain your prior consent to any such procedures.

SOFTWARE LICENSING AND VIRUSES
It is outside of our ethical charter to knowingly recommend illegal software to you or to recommend licence levels lower than those actually required.
It is your responsibility to ensure that all software that you purchase or obtain is both legally obtained and virus free. We will not be held responsible for software piracy or licensing violations on your system.

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS
As part of providing the services to you we may be making intellectual property available to you, including intellectual property in our systems, products, services and technology initiatives. You agree that all intellectual property which we make available to you as part of providing the services will remain our property. You agree not to question or dispute the ownership of the intellectual property.

FORCE MAJEURE
We are not liable for failure to perform our obligations if such failure is caused by conditions beyond our control, including but not limited to Acts of God (including fire, flood, earthquake, storm, hurricane or other natural disaster), wars, insurrections and/or any other cause beyond our reasonable control (including or interruption or failure of electricity or communication services. You are not entitled to terminate our services under in such circumstances.

OUR LIABILITY IS LIMITED
We will not be liable to you if you suffer any loss or damages of any sort, including any loss of business or profit, as a result of us providing or not providing the services to you.

GENERAL
We reserve the right to amend these terms of business at any time and to amend our services if this is required as a result of a change in the law.

OUR RIGHT TO ASSIGN
We reserve the right to assign our rights and obligations in relation to our contracted services to you, to a third party. In such circumstances, we would endeavour to give you 14 days notice.
Appendix 1
Camera Locations

Key:
- New Camera
- Existing Camera
- Existing PTZ
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WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT FOR DECISION

FILE NO and TRIM NO: CBD-05-02/180516053730

REPORT TO: Council

DATE OF MEETING: 29 May 2018

FROM: Simon Markham, Manager Strategy & Engagement and Simon Hart, Business and Centres Manager

SUBJECT: Kaiapoi Town Centre Activation

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

Department Manager

Chief Executive

1. SUMMARY

1.1 This report proposes budget provision (ultimately to be funded from future Kaiapoi Mixed-Use Business Zone revenues) be allocated to investigations into a sustainable mechanism for managing the divestment and development of these areas into the long term.

Attachments:

i. 13 March Council Briefing Slides (180516053733)

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180516053730.

(b) Allocates $150,000 over 2018/19 and 2019/20 to fund investigations into a sustainable mechanism for managing the divestment and development of the Kaiapoi Town Centre (KTC) mixed use business areas (MUBA) into the long term.

(c) Notes that cost incurred in such investigations leading to an ongoing mechanism to manage the Council’s interest in the MUBA land would be a cost against which future revenues from divestment could be applied.

(d) Notes that the extent and future timing of take up of this funding beyond the initial report costed at up to $50,000 would be determined by Council decision-making on that report.

(e) Notes that the potential for the Government’s Provincial Growth Fund among other funding sources to contribute to the costs of these investigations and any follow-on actions will be considered as part of the initial investigation.

(f) Notes the potential for the learning out of this investigation to be applied to the challenges faced in ensuring long term activation of the Rangiora Town Centre, as key sites there undergo comprehensive redevelopment.
3. BACKGROUND

3.1 At the 13 March Council Briefing the attached slide presentation introduced the issue of achieving ‘activation’ of the proposed MUBA likely to be part of the proposed reviewed KTC Plan. While the draft KTC Plan is not quite ready for Council consideration for notification, a number of conclusions can already be made. Key points in this regard from this presentation (see slides for more detail) are highlighted below:

- There are unique opportunities and challenges presented by the MUBA – rarely in one ownership at favourable cost does this extent of potential business land become available. However it comes with substantial land preparation requirements to enable active reuse for built outcomes that need to be managed on an area-wide basis in concert with a staged ‘release-to-market strategy’ that is both practical and achieves highest possible return;

- Given the scale of the MUBA land holdings relative to the existing town centre (equivalent to about a 60% increase in size) and likely catchment growth it will take many years to achieve full utilisation and so enduring focused effort will be required to manage to that end;

- Experience from other regeneration areas confirms the long lead times, innovative funding and management arrangements as success factors but above all – establishing a planning framework is ‘necessary but not sufficient’ – active and focused management is required.

4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

4.1. Apart from establishing, the planning framework for the MUBA integrated with that for the established KTC (which is the goal of the current project) there are a number of tasks required to achieve KTC MUBA activation:

- Overseeing area-based land preparation framed and paced according to feasibility/cost, matched with investor/market interest;

- Developing and implementing active marketing strategies integrated with that for the town centre as a whole and seeking to maximise the ‘point of difference’ advantages of KTC/MUBA location;

- Sustained and at time intensive engagement with interested/potentially interested investor/developer/business partners;

- Accepting that to realise the full potential of the MUBA in ways that complement but don’t detract from the existing KTC business areas, a long - 10 to 20 year - time horizon is required and so structures and processes that are durable over this period are required;

- Managing interim uses of these areas until longer term permanent activities are commercially feasible and doing so consistently over a number of years;

4.2. Given the diverse nature of these tasks, currently no one part of the Council has the required mandate or range of skills at their disposal to provide the necessary implementation focus, drive and agility that is likely to be required. A range of options are available – separate business units, Trusts, separate organisations, etc., – each have advantages and disadvantages and experience elsewhere point to no ‘one size fits all’ recipe as to which is best.
4.3. Governance, management and operations are distinct elements to be considered remembering the extended timeframes involved. Also as innovative funding options exist (e.g. Provincial Growth Fund) and are likely to be required there is a need to actively consider these options.

4.4. It is proposed as a first step that suitably qualified advisors be engaged to undertake an initial scoping study for the Council with follow-on actions determined by the conclusions from that study. Irrespective of the follow-on work/arrangements that might subsequently be agreed, additional cost are likely and so a further indicative budget provision is proposed.

4.5. It is relevant to note that the Council faces now in Rangiora Town Centre (and can expect to have with a Reviewed RTC2020 Strategy an increased range and intensity) of not dissimilar issues in achieving the desired level of activation across the many redevelopment sites there. This is likely for many years to be exacerbated by the large oversupply of business land elsewhere in Greater Christchurch.

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

5. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

5.1. **Groups and Organisations**

There are expressions of interest both for funding/investment and development of MUBA land holdings that have been made. As indicated, there are no agreed mechanisms/authorities in place to advance them.

5.2. **Wider Community**

Forthcoming community engagement on MUBA development concepts is an opportunity to gauge wider community views.

6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**

Cost would be incurred through loan funding in anticipation of future revenues which would be deficit funded in the interim. The annual costs of this would be approximately $7,500 and it may take several years to recoup proceeds of sale to repay the loan and accrued interest.

6.2. **Community Implications**

Substantial community benefits are presented by the potential for activation of MUBA adjoining the KTC currently without activity. However to realise this opportunity required concerted efforts over a long period.

6.3. **Risk Management**

To manage exposure to cost, a staged approach to investigations/actions is proposed.

6.4. **Health and Safety**

Normal health and safety practice relevant to office-based contractors applies.
7. CONTEXT

7.1. Policy

This matter is not in itself a matter of significance in terms of the Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy, but it foreshadows actions that could be significant in terms of that policy.

7.2. Legislation


7.3. Community Outcomes

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

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

Businesses in the District are diverse, adaptable and growing

- There are growing numbers of businesses and employment opportunities in our District.
- There are sufficient and appropriate places where businesses are able to set up in our District

7.4. Delegations

Current delegations to staff and committees/groups do not efficiently deal with the range and nature of decisions that are likely to be required on an enduring basis to implement the agreed plan for the MUBA.
**KTC Plan Review Update – ‘Activation’**

Council Briefing, 13 March 2018

---

**KTC Plan Review Process**

The Project is being undertaken in three main phases to conclude by mid-2018:

**Phase 1: Project Activation**
Jan. – Jun. 2017
- Project scope and process design;
- Confirm mandate, structure and funding;

**Phase 2:**
Develop Master Plan and Draft KTC Review
Jul. 2017 - Feb. 2018
- Research and Analysis;
- Hold Inquiry by Design sessions;
- Prepare drafts.

**Phase 3:**
Wider Community Consultation and Confirm Plans
Mar-Jun. 2018
- Engage widely on draft plans;
- Hear and consider community views;
- Confirm plans and further implementation arrangements.
### Project Update on Progress

**Project Task** | **Progress**
--- | ---
Introductory Report to Management Team | Complete
Draft Project Plan Developed | Complete
KTC Monitoring Report Developed | Complete
Community Board Briefing #1 | Complete
Council Report – Budget Implications | Complete
Formal Documentation and Council Approval | Complete
Community Board Briefing #2 | Complete
Confirm External Advice Requirements | Complete
Establish Stakeholder Reference Group | Complete

---

**Project Task** | **Progress**
--- | ---
Reference Group Initial Meeting | Complete
Inquiry By Design Workshop #1 | Complete
Iterative MUB Concept Design Work | Complete
Inquiry By Design Workshop #2 | Complete
Iterative MUB Concept Design Work | Complete
Regeneration Steering Group Briefing | Complete
Iterative MUB Concept Design Work, & Initial Exiting Town Centre Concepts | Complete
Inquiry By Design Workshop #3 | February
Drafting of Draft KTC Plan and Summary Document | **March/ April**
Communications and Engagement Plan Completed | March
Project Update on Progress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Task</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steering Group Approval of Draft Documents</td>
<td>May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Approval of Draft Documents</td>
<td>June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation and Engagement Period</td>
<td>June/July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalisation and Adoption of Reviewed KTC Plan</td>
<td>August</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Government Policy Context

- Same as for Red Zone Plan:
  - Seek ‘highest and best use’ that will maximize return - consistent with technical viability, financial feasibility and compatibility with local context.
  - Demonstrate that systematically all options have been considered and have cogent reasons to exclude uses.

- A ‘hands off’ approach with WDC best placed to manage KTC Plan review and re-zoning in the context of achieving the Recovery Plan.

- Residential development/activity within the Mixed-Use Business zone is an accepted and expected part of such a zone as in most business zones.

- Crown appetite for further investment (e.g. for land repair) would require a good quality business case that cogently considers monetary and social outcomes.
Adaptive Reuse Casebook

• A study commissioned by the RZ Plan project to consider what we can learn from regeneration and ‘adaptive reuse’ projects in areas of hazard-prone or under-utilised lands elsewhere.

• Case studies included areas in locations and at comparable in size and proposed land uses to the Waimakariri regeneration areas; that involve public/private partnerships and provide community-wide benefits; and governance and funding practices comparable to the local/national context within New Zealand.

• Projects in New Zealand, Australia, China, Japan, the United Kingdom, Canada, the United States, and Chile were investigated.

Insights From The Casebook

• Regeneration planning needs to consider pre-existing and future conditions of more than just individual project sites.

• Regeneration project planning and implementation takes many years.

• Regeneration projects benefit from special, collaborative and sustaining governance arrangements among government agencies as well as citizen and stakeholder groups.

• Land ownership and the sources and availability of funding are two key determinants in the governance arrangements.

• By their very nature, regeneration projects require innovative funding schemes.
**Insights from Urban Regeneration**

- Apart from post-disaster situations there is a rich experience with urban regeneration of ‘derelict’ areas – so called ‘brownfields’ and ‘greyfields’.
- Overarching conclusion is that a (re)activation planning framework is necessary but not sufficient – that other initiatives are also necessary.
- Increasing recognition of this in NZ - moves underway to enable ‘Urban Development Authorities’ with special powers.
- Fast growing urban-edge Councils like WDC have not had to contend with these situations but will increasingly need to do so.

**Insights from Experience with Town Centres**

- In the face of the recent transformation of business activities securing town centres vitality is a constant challenge.
- Apart from planning frameworks (e.g. RTC2020; KTC Plan, 2011) experience indicates the need for at least co-investment in the public realm but increasingly in property development to achieve the objectives; ‘I-Zone’ in Selwyn a case in point as is ‘North of High’ in RTC.
- Success involves ‘catalyzing’ changed perceptions of a place and de-risking private investment.
- Tends to require constant attention through enduring structures and processes.
**MUB Areas - Situation/Objectives**

- Mixed Use Business Areas (MUBAs) were identified through Red Zone Recovery Plan process.
- Unique opportunity to ‘future proof’ long term town centre expansion – one ownership, planned approach and land release.
- A situation/unique advantage unlike that which challenges most town centres in growing communities.
- DPMC recognized at the time the similarly unique challenge of land damage and quake exacerbated flood risk would produce a cost penalty to overcome.
- Required investment in land remediation & flood mitigation not spatially even – value uplift required to offset that spend/get back to ‘ground zero’ at the least.
- Nevertheless there remains an expectation of return to the Crown from MUBAs.

---

**Mixed Use Business Areas**
Mixed Use Business Areas

Stage 5
Area: 8,000sqm approx

Stage 1B
Area: 30,000sqm approx

Stage 4
Area: 5,000sqm approx

Stage 1A
Area: 23,200sqm approx

Stage 3
Area: 1,000sqm approx

T+T Flooding/Geotechnical Options

Opportunities
Approach 3 – All of the above...
- It might be possible to combine the “high value” and “hazard tolerant” approaches when addressing the various hazards at play.
**Town Centre Situation**

- Substantial post-quakes recovery – public realm in good shape, significant private rebuild.
- But; western precinct lagging relative to 2011 Plan aspiration, limited further commercial investment and ‘new’ retail.
- Mainly food and services activity growth.
- Major WDC investment in Riverbanks/Marine Precinct and Green Regeneration Areas made/planned – Kaiapoi and beyond focus.
- ‘Steady’ catchment growth anticipated but chronic spend leakage.
- To sustain its future and leverage the WDC public realm investment requires a step change in perception of the KTC as a destination worth visiting and spending time in.

**Town Centre Review – Progress Update (1)**

- Its ‘all about the river’ as the point of difference to leverage.
- 3x IBDs indicate ambition to reposition the town centre in the market through a comprehensive approach to MUBAs development to underpin town centre vitality.
- Connects with WDC wider Econ. Dev. objectives about growing self sufficiency...local spend, local jobs, increasing visitor spend.
- A positive story off the back of an aspirational plan unlikely to be enough.
- A staged approach to area-based land remediation/flood mitigation and which ‘manages’ the cost penalty arising is required – ripe for innovative building technologies/‘living with water’ – could be another ‘point of difference’?
- The likely timeframe for this and ensuing (re)development is 10-20 years.
- Necessitates long interim use management arrangements and careful ‘place’ management closely integrated with the existing town centre.
Town Centre Review – Progress Update (2)

- Likely requires catalytic initial development(s) to demonstrate it can be successfully done.

- Need to turn our minds to both short and longer term activation as elements of the implementation plan that accompanies the Reviewed KTC Plan.

- Giving consideration to the structures and processes that support this long-term, active management approach.

- BAU of functional split within WDC Units and parallel workflows unlikely to be optimal – required activities reach beyond current Council roles.

Where To From Here?

- Experience elsewhere points to consideration of alternative arrangements to give the necessary implementation focus, drive and agility is required.

- A range of options available – separate business units, Trusts, CCOs, etc., – each have advantages and disadvantages.

- Governance, management and operations are distinct elements to be considered remembering the extended timeframes involved.

- We have now in RTC and expect to have with a Reviewed RTC2020 Strategy not dissimilar issues in the face of large oversupply of business land elsewhere in Greater Chch and the desired level of activation in the many redevelopment sites there.

- Seeking support to further consider options for changed structures and processes.
1. **SUMMARY**

1.1 This report seeks Council approval for a new annual Waimakariri Youth Development Grant of $4,000 as submitted to the Draft Long Term Plan on behalf of the Community Board Chairs and Board Member Thomas Robson.

**Attachments:**

i. Draft Youth Development Grant Criteria and Allocation Process (Trim 180410038656).

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180423043863.

(b) **Approves** the introduction of an annual Waimakariri Youth Development grant of $4,000 to operate as described in **attachment i**: Draft Youth Development Grant Criteria and Allocation Process (Trim 180410038656).

(c) **Confirms** the establishment of a Youth Development Grant Committee comprising the Community Board Chairs and a representative of the Youth Council to administer the Grant Fund and that the Youth Council now be invited to make such an appointment.

(d) **Requests** the Governance Manager to make all necessary arrangements to introduce the Waimakariri Youth Development Grant for the 2018/2019 financial year.

3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1 A number of Councils and other agencies across New Zealand offer some form of grant funding to young people with a range of criteria for eligibility.

3.2 For example Christchurch City Council Community Boards offer grants to young people who are representing their city, region or New Zealand in sporting and academic championships or for personal development. These grants are of the order of $100 to $400.

3.3 There are numerous educational Scholarships whilst other funds are targeted towards specific categories of our young people – young offenders, those living in remote parts of New Zealand/island communities for example.
3.4 Having attended the Community Boards’ Conference in Methven in 2016, heard a number of speakers and engaged with counterparts across New Zealand, the Waimakariri Board Chairs and Oxford-Ohoka Community Board Member Thomas Robson (Youth Council member) identified a desire to introduce a Waimakariri Youth Development Grant.

3.5 The initial thinking being that it would both enable and support the personal development and growth of a young person but would additionally and specifically benefit others. Even at this stage elected members were clear that it should be a more substantial award targeting one or perhaps two young people rather than multiple small grants that potentially are of little actual value to the recipient.

3.6 The Board Chairs and member Robson held an exploratory meeting with the Mayor on 30 October 2017 to discuss the concept further. The Mayor expressed his support and suggested that a submission could be made to the Draft Long Term Plan in 2018. The Governance Manager included a request for $4,000 per annum for a potential Youth Development Grant in the staff submission to the LTP.

3.7 Two further meetings have taken place facilitated by the Governance Adviser resulting in the final proposals. This report seeks to confirm these proposals and seeks Council approval to progress the details so that the scheme can be introduced in 2018/19 to the benefit of our young people.

4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

4.1 Informal assessment was made of other schemes to assist in the definition of the criteria for the Waimakariri proposal. The age range for applicants was discussed and agreed that it should be from 16 years to 22 years at time of application, as this is when our young people move to become even more independent, begin to establish themselves and make life choices with longer term consequences.

4.2 Any prospective applicant must identify not only their own growth and development but also the clear and tangible benefit to others. There are few, if any, other schemes that require this. The application and assessment process has been designed to concentrate on the young person, for the Committee to engage fully with them on their proposal and also after any grant is awarded. The presentation/interview will be the key determinator. There is no ‘means test’ to be applied. The intention is for it to be a single annual award. However it is recognised that there may not be suitable applicants and that a further round may be considered.

4.3 The Management Team have reviewed this report.

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1 Groups and Organisations

Not Applicable.

5.2 Wider Community

Not Applicable.

6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1 Financial Implications

a. This is a request for a new budget of $4,000 per annum via the Long Term Plan.
b. That the young person commences but does not complete the approved learning/development and that the funding has to be withdrawn. The process is designed to mitigate this eventuality through the ongoing engagement and support of the committee to the young person throughout.

c. That there are no suitable applicants or the fund is not fully expended in any one year, in which case the funds should return to the Council and NOT be carried forward. It is anticipated that the Grant Fund should remain at $4,000 per annum and not be subject to cumulative carry forwards. If this is required or additional funds are envisaged then a formal report to the Council seeking such decisions will be presented.

6.2. Community Implications

The opportunity is available to all young people living in the District between 16 years and 22 years of age at time of application.

The applicant will only be granted funds on the basis of the benefit to others and not solely to themselves.

Any course of study or other learning will be accredited and delivered by a formally recognised NZ Institution or other accredited group or agency.

6.3. Risk Management

The Committee will engage on a regular basis with the successful young person(s) and assist in identifying any obstacles to completion of the activity or remedial action.

References for the young person are mandatory.

The young person will be required to both complete a formal application form and attend for an ‘informal but robust interview’ process. The interview will be conducted by four Community Board Chairs and one appointed Youth Council Member.

6.4. Health and Safety

Not Applicable.

The organising body of the learning opportunity will be responsible for the Health and Safety of the individual undertaking that study.

7. CONTEXT

7.1. Policy

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

7.2. Legislation (Not Applicable)

7.3. Community Outcomes

People are friendly and caring, creating a strong sense of community in our District. People have wide-ranging opportunities for learning and being informed.

7.4. Delegations

Not Applicable.
Waimakariri District Council
Youth Development Grant

Purpose
To support one or more young people seeking:
  o  To enhance and grow their personal development
  o  To enhance their leadership skills
  o  To enhance the community in which they live
  o  To help or benefit others

General overview
Available to young people living in the District aged between 16 and 22 at the time of application.
An annual Grant of up to $4000 will be available for allocation to suitable applicants.
The Committee may award more than one grant up to a combined maximum of $4000.
Applications will be sought annually.
A second ‘funding opportunity’ may be offered if the fund is not fully utilised.

Application Process outline
The Grant will be advertised in July of each year.
Applications must be received by 31 August of each year.
Applications must be fully completed and supported by two references. For example teacher, head teacher, faith leader, community group leader. One reference may be permitted from a member of the applicant’s wider family.
Applications will be considered and Grant(s) awarded by 30 September.

Selection Process
The Young Achievers’ Grant Committee comprises each of the Community Board Chairs and an appointee of the Waimakariri Youth Council.
The Committee is the sole decision making body.
The Committee will meet in September of each year to assess and award grant(s)
Applicants will be expected to attend in person to present their application to the Committee and to answer any questions that the Committee may have.
The Committee may choose to award more than one grant up to a maximum of $4000 in any one year.
If the Committee determines that the full fund should NOT be allocated (in September) a further application round may take place in February/March.

The young person will be expected to present their progress or achievements to the Committee regularly as the Committee determines.

Outline Application Form Content

- A little bit about you, your aspirations and what you seek for the future.
- How will the grant help you to do this?
- What is it that you want to do and need funding for?
- Why do you want to do this and why have you chosen this specifically?
- How will you benefit or become a better person as a consequence?
- How will others benefit?
- Explain why you think you fit the Grant criteria.
- When does the project/course/proposed activity start and finish
- What are the costs and how much are you seeking from the Grant fund?
- Two References and why you have chosen them.
1. SUMMARY

1.1 Several general matters were raised by submitters in isolation from kerbside collection services. These are in relation to:

a. Provision of services outside collection areas;

b. Enviroschools programme;

c. Expansion of Southbrook resource recovery park to include composting; and

d. Illegal rubbish dumping.

Attachments:

i. Submission Summary: Collection Zones (TRIM 180515053043)

ii. Submission Summary: Enviroschools Programme (TRIM 180515053045)

iii. Submission Summary: Expansion of Southbrook resource recovery park (TRIM 180515053046)

iv. Submission Summary: Illegal rubbish dumping (TRIM 180515053048)

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180515053040.

(b) Notes that there was no significant demand during LTP consultation from rural residents wanting Council to extend kerbside collection services into rural areas.

(c) Endorses staff continuing to work with rural residents and communities as requests arise to determine if the Council could provide appropriate and cost effective kerbside collection services to, or recycling facilities closer to, those communities.

(d) Notes that the draft Waste Management & Minimisation Plan includes an Action to continue funding for Enviroschools.
Notes that the Solid Waste Budget allocates $25,000 per annum to fund Enviroschools over the next ten years.

Notes that any expansion of the Enviroschools Programme would require an increase in funding above current levels.

Notes that the Southbrook resource recovery park is an unsuitable location for composting operations for a number of reasons, including:

i. Proximity to several composting operations results in competition for the feedstock and end markets

ii. The limited space available for compost maturation

iii. The sensitivity of the receiving environment to leachate and odour in particular

iv. Proximity to businesses that sell compost both in bulk and in bags

Notes that once the reuse and recycling areas have been expanded there may be an opportunity to sell compost produced from our residents green waste, but that the implications of this with regard to Council competing with local businesses would first have to be considered by the Council.

Requests that staff develop a campaign around correct disposal of recyclable and reusable materials and the responsible disposal of rubbish, which can be run in local media and social media.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1 On 6 June 2017, Council approved the proposed draft Waste Management & Minimisation Plan 2017 (WMMP) for release for public consultation, and agreed to initiate a Special Consultative Procedure for the WMMP.

3.2 The central issue within the draft WMMP was consideration of a number of options for additional kerbside collection services, which would provide householders with a choice of services that would best serve their needs. At the conclusion of this consultation process and hearings, the panel resolved to recommend to Council that it insert “Option C” into the draft Waste Management & Minimisation Plan 2017 as the preferred suite of kerbside collection services to be offered to those households currently receiving the Council’s recycling and refuse bag collection service.

3.3 When developing the Long Term Plan’s consultation document, and during the consultation process, the proposed kerbside collection service was referred to as the “your choice” collection service (Option A). The one standard service choice (Option B) is the current weekly bag and fortnightly recycling bin collection service. The bulk of submissions received related to the kerbside collection service choice, and these are summarised in a separate staff report 180515053012.

3.4 The WMMP includes action plans for continuing education, which includes messaging around anti-litter campaigns, and plans to expand the Southbrook resource recovery park refuse pit area to increase capacity and diversion, and relocation of the Reuse area and expansion of the recycling area. Budgets for these activities and capital works were included in the draft Long Term Plan.

4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

4.1 Five submissions were received, that did not accompany a choice for kerbside collection services, and the four topics raised in these submissions are discussed below.
Provision of services outside collection areas

4.2. Two submissions were received from residents wanting collection services, one that lives on Oxford Rd near Cust, and one from several kilometres outside the collection area boundary. Eleven of the submissions received that supported a service choice were from residents who lived outside the Council’s kerbside collection areas. Of these, 6 asked to have this service provided to their area or property and 4 were opposed to the provision of Council services, and one objected to the cost of WDC-branded bags.

4.3. The collection areas cover specific towns and the adjacent properties along some of the roads between the collection areas. To date this has not included properties along Oxford Rd between Rangiora and Cust, and from Cust to Oxford as there has been little demand for the service. It would be feasible to add properties along Oxford Rd to the collection area, as long as the collection truck drivers can pull off the road out of the live traffic lane to make the collections and safely pull back out into the live lane, and any such collection wouldn’t impact on the overall efficiency of the service provision.

4.4. Each property along a transportation route would be considered on a case-by-case basis. The final request for service would have to be made by the property owner, as the request to provide the service would result in the kerbside collection rate being added to onto the property’s rates.

4.5. With regards to any extensions beyond the collection area, the Council and contractor would need to confirm if it would be practicable and cost-effective to do so. Again each extension application would be considered on a case by case basis, and the assessment would include whether:

4.5.1. It would be cost-effective to undertake the collection (i.e. at least 7 properties rated per km of truck travel)

4.5.2. There would be no H&R risks from providing the collection

4.5.3. There would be all-weather access along the road and where the truck is to turn (if necessary)

4.5.4. More than 75% of the residents in an area want to receive the collection and agree to being rated for the service.

4.6. Staff are currently in the process of starting a trial recycling drop-off facility for the rural community in the Cust area. Once this trial has been undertaken the Council will be in a position to consider whether it would be feasible to continue with this service and also if it would be practicable to provide recycling drop-off services into other rural areas.

4.7. Staff are seeking Council’s endorsement of the current process whereby staff work with rural residents and communities on a case-by-case basis to determine if the Council could provide appropriate and cost effective kerbside collection services to, or recycling facilities closer to, those communities.

Enviro schools programme

4.8. The Toimata Foundation acknowledges Waimakariri District Council (WDC) for supporting young people in our district to be part of the Enviro schools network since 2003. They say that thanks to this long-term support there is now a network of 18 Enviro schools in the district that are part of a larger network of 80 in the Canterbury region.

4.9. This network is supported in partnership with: Environment Canterbury; the Selwyn, Timaru, McKenzie, Hurunui, and Waimate District Councils; the South Canterbury
Kindergarten Association and DOC Canterbury. Christchurch City Council has provided some funding through community grants.

4.10. The Toimata Foundation requests that WDC maintains its valuable supporting role in Enviroschools.

4.11. The Solid Waste department funds the Enviroschools programme in the District, as we consider that their principles around sustainable schools and communities align well with the goals in our Waste Management & Minimisation Plan. The Solid Waste LTP Budget allows to continue the same level of funding for Enviroschools over the next ten years.

4.12. If the Council were to support extending the Enviroschools programme into more schools, funding would have to be increased. Because the Enviroschools programme is not just focused on waste minimisation Council could consider widening the funding pool to other departments for example 3-Waters (water conservation), Greenspace (biodiversity), Roading (sustainable transportation options), or alternatively the Council could fund the programme from a 'corporate' level.

Expansion of Southbrook resource recovery park

4.13. One submitter wanted to see the “Recycling Centre expanded to cater for more green waste being composted down and sold in bags like the Bromley setup in Christchurch”. Another of the submissions received, that supported a service choice, stated that they support this statement from the WMMP: " Provision of a permanent education centre, and possibly a community garden-type area, will provide better opportunities for community education and will encourage the necessary change in attitudes."

4.14. The Council previously looked at composting at the Southbrook RRP site, but that was discounted for a number of reasons. There were several composters within a 30-40km radius of Southbrook and these sites tended to compete for the same feedstock, and also competed for a market-share of compost sales.

4.15. At that time space was a potential issue at Southbrook RRP, given the footprint needed to mature the compost. Since the site has been expanded and with plans to further increase the footprint of the pit and the recycling & recovery areas, there is now insufficient area for composting operations on-site.

4.16. There are ephemeral springs on-site and the environment is particularly sensitive to discharge of contaminants. With the level of commercial and industrial development that has occurred around the resource recovery park, there has been a consequent rise in sensitivity to odour as was experienced by the composting operation that was located off Ryan Place.

4.17. The decision was made not to enter the composting market to compete with these existing operators, but to make use of the situation by providing a good quality feedstock for an already established composting business.

4.18. Staff are looking at selling bags of compost to support fundraisers for local groups and schools at the ReSale Store in Southbrook. This compost was produced by Andrew Giles' operation off Ryan Place, and staff have agreed to be an outlet for the bags on condition that a portion of the monies that go to Rural Trees is donated toward local community groups, sports clubs and schools. There is a limit to the volume of composting that Giles has available for this purpose.
Illegal rubbish dumping

4.19. One submitter expressed concern about the amount of rubbish being dumped illegally by the river and other rural areas, including Whiteware and other articles which can be recycled for free at the Council’s transfer stations. They suggest Council running a social media campaign or putting something on the website reminding people what they can recycle free of charge.

4.20. Solid Waste and Communications staff are working together to promote the proper disposal of household items and rubbish. For example a video was created showing how much of a load that was illegally dumped by the Kaiapoi River could have been recycled at no charge. This also pointed out that some of the items that had to go in the pit because they got wet may have been able to be on-sold at the second-hand shop.

4.21. Regular adverts are also placed in local papers, and we could use these on social media as suggested by the submitter. Staff could put a proposal to the Canterbury Waste Joint Committee to fund development of a region-wide social media campaign, which would have greater reach than a local campaign. Such a campaign would build on local communications.

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

4.23. The Solid & Hazardous Waste Working Party discussed this report at a meeting on 15 May 2018 and supported the recommendations.

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. Groups and Organisations

Presentations were made to groups and organisations during the WMMP and LTP consultation processes.

5.2. Wider Community

The WMMP consultation documentation went out to all serviced properties, and over 1,300 submissions were received. The Consultation Document included the “your choice” bin collection service as a theme, and there was considerable community engagement undertaken during the LTP consultation process. This resulted in 371 submissions being sent in about the kerbside collection service.

6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1. Financial Implications

Any extension of kerbside collection would only be approved if it were cost-effective, that is the rates collected would cover the costs of providing the service. Carrying out the recycling drop-off facility trial in Cust, particularly if it proves to be both popular and successful, may raise interest in other rural areas in receiving the same level of service. Provision of drop-off facilities would impact overall on operational costs, and each site would also have to be properly scoped and consented. These costs have not been allowed for in the LTP budgets.

There is a budget allowance of $25,000 p.a. in the Waste Minimisation Account, which is sufficient to pay for facilitator support of the 18 Enviroschools in the District.
A social media campaign would cost the Council very little to prepare and run, and has the potential to reduce the amount of illegal dumping in the district. This would be a cost-saving to the Council as a whole from reduced clean-up costs.

6.2. Community Implications

Carrying out the recycling drop-off facility trial in Cust, particularly if it proves to be both popular and successful, may raise interest in other rural areas in receiving the same level of service.

6.3. Risk Management

There is a risk that more remote rural communities may want the same levels of service provided closer to urban collection areas. Provision of services to more distant and less-populated areas would be at a greater cost owing to distance travelled to provide those services. The Council would have to consider how to fund provision of waste collection services into these areas: whether it be a higher targeted rate for roadside collection, or a drop-off facility funded via a specific area-rate or that is funded out of the General Rate.

6.4. Health and Safety

Health & safety is an important component in delivery of solid waste services, and this will be an important factor to be considered in any Council-provided waste service.

7. CONTEXT

7.1. Policy

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

7.2. Legislation

Local Government Act (S101 Financial Management)

Waste Minimisation Act (S42: Territorial authorities to encourage effective and efficient waste management and minimisation; S46 Funding of plans)

7.3. Community Outcomes

k. Core utility services are provided in a timely and sustainable manner

- Council sewerage and water supply schemes, and drainage and waste collection services are provided to a high standard. 1,4
- Waste recycling and re-use of solid waste is encouraged and residues are managed so that they minimise harm to the environment. 1,3,4

7.4. Delegations

The Council has the delegated authority to set rates and gate charges, and amend budgets during the LTP and Annual Plan process.

Kitty Waghorn
Solid Waste Asset Manager
Recommendation for Section: Rubbish Collection Zone

Group: General

20182028.171.1 in Submission 20182028.171 by Mrs Lika Rump

Summary: I have a question in regards to the roadside collection of rubbish. We are living at 1960 Oxford Road so just after Tippings Road on the right side, the farm even goes over Tippings Road at the back – but unfortunately from the interactive map it looks like we are just outside of the rubbish collection zone? We have a wee one on the way and pick up of recycling and rubbish would make our life so much easier.

Relief Sought: I was just wondering if there is a chance if we pay for it to just drop the bags into Cust Township?

20182028.245.6 in Submission 20182028.245 by Ms Jenner Litchtwark

Relief Sought: What about rubbish collection outside of the towns - even once a fortnight would be good.

Officer recommendations

Partially Accept 20182028.171.1, 20182028.245.6

Reasons: The collection areas cover specific towns and the adjacent properties along some of the roads between the collection areas. To date this has not included properties along Oxford Rd between Rangiora and Cust, and from Cust to Oxford as there has been little demand for the service. It would be feasible to add properties along Oxford Rd to the collection area, as long as the collection truck drivers can pull off the road out of the live traffic lane to make the collections and safely pull back out into the live lane, and any such collection wouldn't impact on the overall efficiency of the service provision.

Each property would be considered on a case-by-case basis. The final request for service would have to be made by the property owner, as this would trigger the addition of the kerbside collection rate onto the property's rate.

Staff have received approval from the property owner to providing the kerbside collection service to the property at 1958 Oxford Rd, and have asked Waste Management to consider the implications of providing a collection to this property.

With regards to any extensions to the collection area, the Council would need to confirm if it would be cost-effective to undertake the collection (i.e. at least 7 properties rated per km of truck travel), if there are no H&R risks from providing the collection and that there is all-weather access along the road and where the truck is to turn (if necessary), and also have agreement from the greater majority (more than 75%) of the residents in an area to joining the collection and being rated for the service. Again each extension application would be considered on a case by case basis.

Recommendations:

Endorses the current approach of considering the risks and costs of providing a kerbside collection to rural properties between and beyond kerbside collection areas on a case-by-case basis

Notes that property owners will have to approve the Council providing and rating for a kerbside collection to their property should any request for service be made by renters

Notes that a request for service in Oxford Rd close to Cust has already been considered by staff and the collection contractor
Recommendation for Section: Enviro Schools Programme

Group: General

20182028.284.1 in Submission 20182028.284 by Toimata Foundation

Summary: Enviroschools is a holistic framework that supports the development of resilient, connected and sustainable communities. Through Enviroschools children and young people plan, design and implement a wide range of sustainability projects in collaboration with their communities. Nationally over 1,100 early childhood education (ECE) centres, primary, intermediate and secondary schools are part of the Enviroschools network—this is a third of all schools and 6% of the large ECE sector.

Enviroschools is managed nationally by Toimata Foundation (a charitable trust).

We would like to acknowledge Waimakariri District Council (WDC) for supporting young people in your district to be part of the Enviroschools network since 2003. Thanks to this long−term support there is now a network of 18 Enviroschools in your district that are part of a larger network of 80 in the Canterbury region. This network is supported in partnership with: Environment Canterbury; the Selwyn, Timaru, McKenzie, Hurunui, and Waimate District Councils; the South Canterbury Kindergarten Association and DOC Canterbury. Christchurch City Council has provided some funding through community grants.

Relief Sought: This submission requests that WDC maintains its valuable supporting role in Enviroschools.

Officer recommendations

Accept: 20182028.284.1

Reasons: The Solid Waste department funds the Enviroschools programme in the District, as we consider that their principles around sustainable schools and communities align well with the goals in our Waste Management & Minimisation Plan. If the Council supported extending the programme into more schools, funding would have to be increased. As Enviroschools is not just focused on waste minimisation I would suggest Council consider widening the funding pool to other departments for example 3-Waters (water conservation), Greenspace (biodiversity), Roading (sustainable transportation options), or alternatively the Council could fund the programme from a 'corporate' level.

Recommendations:

Thanks the submitter for their acknowledgement of the Council's ongoing support of Enviroschools in the Waimakariri District

Notes that the draft Waste Management & Minimisation Plan includes an Action to continue funding for Enviroschools

Notes that the Solid Waste Budgets allow to continue the same level of funding for Enviroschools over the next ten years

Notes that any expansion of the Enviroschools Programme would require an increase in funding above current levels
Recommendation for Section: Recycling Centre Expansion

Group: General

20182028.863.5 in Submission 20182028.863 by Ms Shirley Cairns

Relief Sought: Want to see Recycling Centre expanded to cater for more green waste being composted down and sold in bags like the Brawley setup in Christchurch.
Officer recommendations

Not Accept: 20182028.863.5

Reasons: The Council previously looked at composting at the Southbrook RRP site, but that was discounted for a number of reasons.

When the Council investigated the option it was noted that there were several composters within a 30-40km radius of Southbrook. These sites tended to compete for the same feedstock, and also competed for a market-share of compost sales. The decision was made not to enter the composting market to compete with these existing operators, but to make use of the situation by providing a good quality feedstock for an already established composting business.

At that time space was a potential issue at Southbrook RRP - there would need to be sufficient area to mature windrows whether the composting process was in-vessel, under cover, or in covered windrows, and there was a limit to the area available for that. There would also have been little room available for expansion of the composting operation. Since then the site has been expanded, and with plans to further increase the footprint of the pit and the recycling & recovery areas, there is now insufficient area for composting operations in-site.

There are ephemeral springs on-site and the environment is particularly sensitive to discharge of contaminants. We would need a leachate capture system for any composting operations and this leachate would need to be treated either on-site or at the Council's wastewater treatment site. Also, with the level of commercial and industrial development that has occurred around the resource recovery park, there has been a consequent rise in sensitivity to odour as was experienced by the composting operation that was located off Ryan Place.

It should also be noted that there are several other businesses in and around Rangiora that sell compost, whether in bulk or in bags. The Council would need to consider the implications if it were to enter into the compost sales retail market in direct competition with these businesses.

The final staff comment is that we have begun selling bags of compost to support fundraisers for local groups and schools at the ReSale Store in Southbrook. This compost was produced by Andrew Giles' operation off Ryan Place, and staff have agreed to be an outlet for the bags on condition that a portion of the monies that go to Rural Trees is donated toward local community groups, sports clubs and schools.

Recommendations:

Notes that the Southbrook resource recovery park is an unsuitable location for composting operations for a number of reasons, including:

- Proximity to several composting operations results in competition for the feedstock and end markets
- The limited space available for compost maturation
- The sensitivity of the receiving environment to leachate and odour in particular
- Proximity to businesses that sell compost both in bulk and in bags

Notes that once the reuse and recycling areas have been expanded there may be an opportunity to sell compost produced from our residents green waste but that the implications of this with regard to Council competing with local businesses would first have to be considered by the Council.
Recommendation for Section: Illegal Rubbish Dumping

Group: General

20182028.670.7 in Submission 20182028.670 by Ms Evelyn Zuberbuhler

Relief Sought: I am also concerned about the amount of rubbish being dumped illegally by the river or other rural areas. Even whiteware articles which we’re able to recycle here at the refuse station for free. Maybe a social media campaign or something on the website reminding people what they can recycle free of charge.

Officer recommendations

Accept: 20182028.670.7

Reasons: Solid Waste and Communications staff are working together to promote the proper disposal of household items and rubbish. For example a video was created showing how much of a load that was illegally dumped by the Kaiapoi River could have been recycled at no charge. This also pointed out that some of the items that had to go in the pit because they got wet may have been able to be on-sold at the second-hand shop. Regular adverts are also placed in local papers, and we could use these on social media as suggested by the submitter.

Staff could put a proposal to the Canterbury Waste Joint Committee to fund development of a region-wide social media campaign, which would have greater reach than a local campaign. Such a campaign could build on local communications.

Recommendations:

Instructs: staff to develop a campaign around correct disposal of recyclable and reusable materials, and the responsible disposal of rubbish, that can be run in local and social media.
1. SUMMARY

1.1 This report summarises the 371 submissions received that gave a preference about the proposed “your choice” kerbside collection service. Of these, 76.5% were in favour of the proposed service (Option A), and 23.5% preferred the status quo (Option B). Given this level of support staff recommend that the Council approves inclusion of the "your choice" kerbside collection service in the 2018-28 Long Term Plan.

1.2 A number of other matters were raised by submitters in conjunction with their service choice submissions. These relate to education and engagement around waste minimisation, commercial and construction waste, and provision of services outside collection areas, and these are also discussed in this report.

Attachments:

i. Kerbside Services Option A Submissions Summary (Trim 180515053019)

ii. Kerbside Services Option B Submissions Summary (Trim 180515053021)

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180515053012.

(b) Approves inclusion of the "your choice" kerbside collection service in the 2018-28 Long Term Plan.

(c) Notes that 284 (76.5%) of the 371 submissions received are in favour of the "your choice" kerbside collection service.

(d) Notes that the Solid Waste Activity Management Plan and the Waste Management & Minimisation Plan will be amended to include the "your choice" collection service: fortnightly rubbish bag or bin collection and/or weekly organics bin collection.

(e) Notes that the final version of the Waste Management & Minimisation Plan will be presented to Council for adoption in July 2018.
(f) **Approves** increasing the level of education and community engagement around waste minimisation.

(g) **Endorses** the provision of support to and promotion of local waste minimisation initiatives that are led by businesses and community groups.

(h) **Notes** that there is sufficient budget in the Waste Minimisation account to fund an increase in community engagement and provide support to and promotion of local waste minimisation initiatives that are led by businesses and community groups.

(i) **Requests** staff to investigate requiring better waste and litter management by developers and building companies through consenting processes in order to reduce the impact of earthworks and windblown construction materials on the surrounding environment.

(j) **Notes** that there was no significant demand from rural residents wanting Council to extend kerbside collection services into rural areas during the LTP consultation.

(k) **Endorses** staff continuing to work with rural residents and communities as requests arise to determine if the Council could provide appropriate and cost effective kerbside collection services to, or recycling facilities closer to, those communities.

3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1 On 6 June 2017, Council approved the proposed draft Waste Management & Minimisation Plan 2017 (WMMP) for release for public consultation, and agreed to initiate a Special Consultative Procedure for the WMMP.

3.2 The central issue within the draft WMMP was consideration of a number of options for additional kerbside collection services, which would provide householders with a choice of services that would best serve their needs.

3.3 An extensive advertising campaign was carried out to publicise the kerbside collection options that were being considered, and submissions were sought. A significant number of submissions were received (3,148 submissions), with 35 submitters wishing to be heard.

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

3.5 When developing the Long Term Plan’s consultation document, and during the consultation process, the proposed kerbside collection service was referred to as the “your choice” collection service (Option A). The one standard service choice (Option B) is the current weekly bag and fortnightly recycling bin collection service.

3.6 Option A allows ratepayers to choose a bag or bin for a fortnightly rubbish collection, and a bin for a weekly mixed organics collection, with bin size options also available to them, in addition to the fortnightly recycling bin collection service.

4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1 Of the 371 submissions received on the “your choice” kerbside collection service, 284 (76.5%) are in favour of the proposed new service and 87 (23.5%) preferred the one standard service.

Option A: “Your Choice”
4.2. Of the 284 submissions supporting Option A, 99 provided comments either in support of their choice or bringing up additional topics.

4.3. Twenty six, including the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board (OOCB), Woodend-Sefton Community Board (WSCB) and Federated Farmers, liked the fact that this is a flexible and user-pays service. Eighteen submissions considered Option A made sense or would suit their circumstances, 8 specifically said that the ‘green’ bins would be good to have, and 6 wanted it brought in as soon as possible.

4.4. Thirteen submitters object to the use of plastic bags as a waste of resources and a littering issue, and one also raised concern about the health & safety risks of the bag service to both users and contractors. A few supported Option A even though they stated that they would not use a bin service themselves.

4.5. Eleven submissions came from residents outside the collection areas. These are discussed in 4.38-4.43.

4.6. Eight supported the option because it will reduce the amount of waste and plastic bags going to the landfill and would be better for the environment overall.

4.7. Seven submitters said the 3 bin service worked well in Christchurch, and 3 submitters proposed that the Council follow the City Council's lead by providing every property with a set of bins and charging them accordingly.

4.8. Three, including the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board (RACB), expressed concern at the amount of administration that such a flexible system would require and its attendant increase in costs to oversee. Three also stated their concern that if insufficient people opt into the bin service there would be an increase on rates, and one submitter thought there should be a reduced organics service over winter which would reduce the charges.

4.9. The RACB further asked that the Council pay attention to the transition period (householders transitioning from private bins to Council bins) to ensure those changing to the Council bin service don't pay additional costs relating to cancellation of contracts or have to pay for two services in the same period.

4.10. The Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board (KTCB) was in support of only a rubbish bin service and opposed a Council organics collection service given that there are alternative private collectors already providing a greenwaste collection service. The board and one other submitter considered that composting should be encouraged wherever practicable.

4.11. The KTCB supported the fact that there is a range of bin size options and sought assurance that the Council will monitor and minimise costs of this service. The board also stated their concern at the ongoing H&S and environmental risks of continuing to use plastic bags and suggested that alternative strategies could have been considered to reduce costs to make a bin service more affordable for small households.

4.12. Six other individual comments were made related to: Council taking ‘soft plastics’ in the recycling bins, Council providing a bi-yearly ‘organic’ collection at the kerb, concern at the affect that the Council service would have on private collectors, liked that they could keep using a private provider, they never used bags, and were happy with the current system.

**Option B: Status Quo**

4.13. Of those in support of Option B, 23 provided comments either in support of their choice or bringing up additional topics.
4.14. Twenty three were satisfied with the current bag & recycling service. Those including comments generally stated they "do not use many bags a year" or "use a private collector". It should be noted that in Option A, these ratepayers would have the choice of continuing to use WDC rubbish bags or private collectors and would not be rated for an additional Council bin service. The only change would be to the frequency of the rubbish bag collection.

4.15. Five submissions came from residents outside the collection areas. These are discussed in 4.38-4.43.

4.16. Four, including Greypower, commented on the cost of a Council bin service and said that it was not affordable.

4.17. Greypower’s submission, in preferring option B (no change), states that “the financial pressure of additional bin services on their members who are on fixed incomes is unacceptable”, and that “the choices in Option A are too expensive to be tailored to requirement”. They also state that “proposals should consider reducing the cost option to one size fits all with a choice of small or standard bin sizes as a way to reduce per-property costs”. This last comment would appear to be at odds to their submission choices to both the WMMP and LTP, both of which support the retention of the current level of service (recycling bin + WDC bag collections).

4.18. Two submitters said they did not have space to store any more bins.

4.19. One submitter objected to the rubbish collection in Option A dropping to a fortnightly service, owing to what they perceived as an attendant increase in rates. There would be no impact on rates from the change of rubbish collection frequency as the bag collection and disposal costs are all recovered from sale of bags and not via rates.

4.20. Four other individual comments were made related to: waste bins not encouraging recycling; that ‘compost’ bins should be optional; the current system was flexible and met people’s needs; one standard service was easier and more cost effective to manage and avoided waste.

4.21. One submitter suggested that the Council encourage home composting, and one said there should be “more localised composting facilities to encourage localised use and save on waste”. One submitter stated they did not know anything about the subject.

**Bin Services**

4.22. On the basis of this strong support for Option A, staff recommend including the "your choice" kerbside collection service in the 2018-28 Long Term Plan.

4.23. The Solid Waste Activity Management Plan and the Waste Management & Minimisation Plan will be amended to include this level of service. The final version of the Waste Management & Minimisation Plan will be presented to Council for adoption in July 2018. The aim is to have the new kerbside collection contract commence on 1 July 2019.

**Other Matters**

*Education and engagement around waste minimisation*

4.24. Additional to the option choice a number of submitters, including the RACB, also requested that the Council increase its level of education and engagement with the community to encourage residents to change habits and attitudes toward waste and waste minimisation.
4.25. The RACB expressed concern that there appear to be no (Council) arrangements in place to minimise waste. They noted that the Enviroschools programme has been particularly successful, as have been local campaigns to minimise waste, but that there appears to be no complementary Council initiative or overt stance in this regard. They asked the Council to address this as a matter of urgency. The Toimata Foundation acknowledged the Council’s support of the Enviroschools programme in our District and requested that the Council maintains that supporting role.

4.26. One submitter endorsed construction of a permanent education centre, as is proposed as part of the expansion of the recycling and reuse area at Southbrook. Another suggested the Council runs a social media campaign to remind people what can be recycled in order to reduce the amount of illegal dumping around the district.

4.27. In response to these submissions, particularly the comments by the RACB, staff will work to increase the visibility of Council’s education programmes, and will increase the level of engagement through social media in support of our other waste minimisation programmes. The main programme is provided by EcoEducate, and Lesley Ottey – the waste minimisation educator – works both in schools and in the community.

4.28. The Solid Waste department funds the Enviroschools programme in the District, as we consider that their principles around sustainable schools and communities align well with the goals in our Waste Management & Minimisation Plan. We fund the Sustainable Living Programme (SLP) in the District, which allows Waimakariri residents to access the learning resources on the SLP website. This programme, like Enviroschools, covers several topics beyond solid waste and aims to help people learn “future living skills: to make them more resilient and to live on a lower carbon footprint.

4.29. We engage Kate Meads to deliver two “waste free parenting/living” workshops a year, and earlier this year hosted “The Rubbish Trip” at the Town Hall. We will continue to look at alternative ways to spread the waste minimisation messaging out to our communities.

4.30. The department also provides support for community-led programmes, including Plastic-Straw-Free Rangiora and Boomerang Bags, and other initiatives such as local community gardens and Satisfy Food Rescue. To date support has been limited to promotion of these initiatives and financially limited to under $500 per initiative; this funding has been used to cover costs for printing posters and bag labels, and for booking facilities for working bees.

4.31. The EcoEducate school programme includes in-class sessions, practical assistance at schools to set up composting, recycling and other diversion systems, and out-of-school visits to the transfer station and resource recovery park.

4.32. At the adult engagement level, this programme includes composting workshops at community gardens; recycling programmes at Southbrook resource recovery park; t-shirt bag-making and stuffed toy repurposing workshops for community groups and school children; and information stands at various community events that promote recycling, waste minimisation, and in support of the national Love Food Hate Waste campaign.

4.33. If the Council were to support extending the Enviroschools programme into more schools, funding would have to be increased. Because the Enviroschools programme is not just focused on waste minimisation Council could consider widening the funding pool to other departments for example 3-Waters (water conservation), Greenspace (biodiversity), Roading (sustainable transportation options), or alternatively the Council could fund the programme from a ‘corporate’ level.

4.34. Staff seek Council’s approval to increase the amount of community engagement that the solid waste department and our waste minimisation educator undertake. We also seek
Council’s endorsement to provide a greater level of support for local waste minimisation initiatives that are led by businesses and community groups.

**Commercial and construction waste**

4.35. The Woodend-Sefton Community Board (WSCB) raised concerns about arrangements for commercial waste arising from new businesses, and how waste from these businesses could be minimised. The Board also asked whether the Council could ensure that construction materials such as plastic wrap, polystyrene and plasterboard be contained on-site and not become a litter issue, potentially through penalty clauses in either the building consent or resource consent process.

4.36. The Council has access to Christchurch City Council’s Target Sustainability programme, which could provide consultant time to audit businesses and provide advice on reducing waste, water and electricity use. EcoEducate can also assist interested businesses with waste audits and provide advice on waste minimisation. There is some budget available to assist businesses with the costs of these audits.

4.37. There would need to be some investigation into whether it would be feasible and practicable to require better waste and litter management by developers and building companies through building and other consenting processes. This matter should be referred to the appropriate consenting departments and agencies.

**Provision of services outside collection areas**

4.38. Of the submissions in support of an option, 16 were from residents who lived outside the Council’s kerbside collection areas. Of these, 7 asked to have this service provided to their area or property and 7 were opposed to the provision of Council collection services. One submitter objected to paying the collection cost of the Council-branded bag when they didn’t receive the collection service.

4.39. One rural submitter requested that the Council provide recycling depots closer to rural communities. Two separate submissions were also received from residents wanting collection services, one that lives on Oxford Rd near Cust, and one from several kilometres outside the collection area boundary.

4.40. The collection areas cover specific towns and the adjacent properties along some of the roads between the collection areas. To date this has not included properties along Oxford Rd between Rangiora and Cust, and from Cust to Oxford as there has been little demand for the service. It would be feasible to add properties along Oxford Rd to the collection area, as long as the collection truck drivers can pull off the road out of the live traffic lane to make the collections and safely pull back out into the live lane, and any such collection wouldn’t impact on the overall efficiency of the service provision.

4.41. Each property would be considered on a case-by-case basis. The final request for service would have to be made by the property owner, as this would trigger the addition of the kerbside collection rate onto the property’s rate.

4.42. With regards to any extensions to the collection area, the Council would need to confirm if it would be cost-effective to undertake the collection (i.e. at least 7 properties rated per km of truck travel), if there are no H&R risks from providing the collection and that there is all-weather access along the road and where the truck is to turn (if necessary), and also have agreement from the greater majority (more than 75%) of the residents in an area to joining the collection and being rated for the service. Again each extension application would be considered on a case by case basis.
4.43. Staff are currently in the process of starting a trial recycling drop-off facility for the rural community in the Cust area. Once this trial has been undertaken the Council will be in a position to consider whether it would be feasible to continue with this service and also if it would be practicable to provide recycling drop-off services into other rural areas.

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

4.45. The Solid & Hazardous Waste Working Party discussed this report at a meeting on 15 May 2018 and supported the recommendations.

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. Groups and Organisations

Presentations were made to groups and organisations during the WMMP and LTP consultation processes.

5.2. Wider Community

The WMMP consultation documentation went out to all serviced properties, and over 1,300 submissions were received. The Consultation Document included the “your choice” bin collection service as a theme, and there was considerable community engagement undertaken during the LTP consultation process. This resulted in 371 submissions being sent in about the kerbside collection service.

6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1. Financial Implications

There will be an impact on the rates for those households that choose to use the offered bin service(s). The amount of that effect will vary considerably depending on the service options chosen by the household. Furthermore, the effect on the household costs for waste services may be different than the effect on rates, for the same household. This has been well communicated during the WMMP and LTP consultation processes.

6.2. Community Implications

There is an expectation from many residents that this service will be provided, and a wish for it to be provided sooner rather than later.

6.3. Risk Management

The biggest risk to Council in introducing additional waste services relates to market share. Under the current arrangements, Council provides a service that is also offered by the private sector for waste collection services: at present Council has approximately 35% of the market. Offering households the option of taking up any new Council services that might be offered means that Council would be affecting the private sector’s market share for those services. Not having the full market also makes any collection operation less efficient.

Uncertainty about the Council’s potential market share creates a number of risks. At the procurement phase, an estimate of the expected market share will need to be made, and a contract signed up to collect from a specific number of households, which will fix the costs.
The fact that Council is required to fix its fees and charges in advance in the LTP, provides private collection companies with an opportunity to undercut Council’s prices and to boost their market share. If the market share is lower than estimated, the Council faces fixed costs to provide the services, and a lower than anticipated income.

If large numbers of households decide to stay with a bag collection, there is the potential for those using the bin system to be subsidising those using bags. This could be checked in the future from time to time and an adjustment made to the pricing structure of rates and bags if required.

Having a differential rate for different sized bins, and allowing ratepayers to choose not to be rated for one or two bins will be more administratively complex than the current system. Retaining bags will continue to require administration time around ordering, sale of and invoicing supermarkets for the bags. However rural ratepayers will still be able to purchase the bags and dispose of them at no additional cost at our disposal sites therefore should not feel disadvantaged by the Council moving to a bin service.

6.4. Health and Safety

Continuing to offer bag collection services has some risk from the health and safety aspect. It is well documented that manual kerbside collections are riskier operations than automated wheelie bin collections, and in general, the industry is keen to move away from them. However, the proposed joint bag and wheelie bin collection proposal, which operates in Selwyn District, offers a lower level of risk than the current bag-only collection.

7. CONTEXT

7.1. Policy

This matter is a matter of significance in terms of the Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.

7.2. Legislation

Local Government Act (S101 Financial Management)

Waste Minimisation Act (S42: Territorial authorities to encourage effective and efficient waste management and minimisation; S46 Funding of plans)

7.3. Community Outcomes

k. Core utility services are provided in a timely and sustainable manner

- Council sewerage and water supply schemes, and drainage and waste collection services are provided to a high standard. 1,4
- Waste recycling and re-use of solid waste is encouraged and residues are managed so that they minimise harm to the environment. 1,3,4

7.4. Delegations

The Council has the delegated authority to set rates and gate charges, and amend budgets during the LTP and Annual Plan process.
Kitty Waghorn
Solid Waste Asset Manager
Recommendation for Section: Kerbside Collection Services - Please select the option you prefer and tell us why?

Group: General

**Officer recommendations**

**Group: A: Council's preference - 'Your Choice' collection service**

20182028.3.1 in Submission 20182028.3 by Mr Simon Green
20182028.15.1 in Submission 20182028.15 by Mr James Girvan

**Summary:** This is one initiative that makes perfect sense.

20182028.17.1 in Submission 20182028.17 by Mr Daniel Thompson

**Summary:** I think this is a better option than the current bags.

20182028.18.1 in Submission 20182028.18 by Mr Tony Kean

**Summary:** We need options to suit people who take their own steps to reduce their waste such as composting.

20182028.20.1 in Submission 20182028.20 by Mr Ross & Ellie and Mrs Williamson

**Summary:** We favour the three bin service having seen it work so well in Christchurch. Why would the Council add costs by offering plastic bags for rubbish, (status quo) this would entail a separate truck from the bin pick up, adding to costs, plus keeping plastics going to landfill!

**Relief Sought:** Keep plastics out of landfill, don't offer bags for rubbish, there should be no alternative to the bins.

20182028.24.1 in Submission 20182028.24 by Mrs Phillipa Rickerby

**Summary:** Services for rural areas, or a recycling centre at Cust / Oxford

20182028.31.1 in Submission 20182028.31 by Ms Karen Lees
20182028.33.1 in Submission 20182028.33 by Mr E A Carr
20182028.34.1 in Submission 20182028.34 by Rebecca Leggatt
20182028.35.1 in Submission 20182028.35 by Mrs Karen Friedauer
20182028.39.1 in Submission 20182028.39 by Ms Barb Warren

**Summary:** If the Council wants to realise a more sustainable future it will have to encourage residents to change their habits and attitudes toward waste minimisation. Any initiative from Council that encourages a genuine 'greener' approach to waste is to be applauded. I also support this statement from your plan: " Provision of a permanent education centre, and possibly a community garden-type area, will provide better opportunities for community education and will encourage the necessary change in attitudes."

20182028.40.1 in Submission 20182028.40 by Mr Rhys and Ms Alice

**Summary:** Environmental benefits - reduced landfill.

20182028.41.1 in Submission 20182028.41 by Mr John Crawley
20182028.42.1 in Submission 20182028.42 by Mr Cathy and David and Mrs Price

**Summary:** and either reduce the cost of the rubbish bags which have collection included in the cost of
the bag or collect it from pick up areas if you are not on the main roads. It is unfair to expect us to pay for collection when we have to drive over 20KM one way to drop of our rubbish bags.

20182028.46.1 in Submission 20182028.46 by Mr Neil Wilkinson

Summary: I currently use another provider to take green waste and this would save this cost and be more efficient.

20182028.47.1 in Submission 20182028.47 by Mr Chris Bacon
20182028.49.1 in Submission 20182028.49 by Mr Miles Dalton
20182028.50.1 in Submission 20182028.50 by Ms May Young

Summary: Much more tidy. No concerns about bags being torn and rubbish strewn on the streets.

20182028.52.1 in Submission 20182028.52 by Mr Ian Sissons

Summary: I still think you will be making more revenue over winter re the organics bin. During the winter months lawns are not growing, so needs mowing less say every 4 weeks if that. Gardens also not doing much, so no extra cuttings or old plants in bins. Why should we pay for a service over winter that is not require as often as it is over spring,summer and autumn.

Relief Sought: A fair way is to charge for only a monthly rate over winter, or get the bins chipped so it is a fairer option for those of us that will only use this organic bin occasionally. Remember a large percentage of your population are on fixed incomes and they do not increase at the same rate as you the council like to increase rates.

20182028.53.1 in Submission 20182028.53 by Mrs Kelly Bint

Summary: We do not use a collection service so support a user pays system that encourages less land-fill rubbish and a considered approach to our own waste levels.

20182028.54.1 in Submission 20182028.54 by Mr Anonymous Anonymous
20182028.56.1 in Submission 20182028.56 by Mr Alex Vermuelen

Summary: Fix immediately.

20182028.57.1 in Submission 20182028.57 by Mrs Samantha Plows
20182028.60.1 in Submission 20182028.60 by Mr Ali Azi
20182028.62.1 in Submission 20182028.62 by Ms Andrea Clinick

Relief Sought: Been waiting for several years for change. Rubbish bags are environmentally unfriendly and we need to change our bad habits.

20182028.64.1 in Submission 20182028.64 by Mr Luke Saunders

Summary: I like to have input, get varied and experienced opinions.

20182028.65.1 in Submission 20182028.65 by Mr Joshua Lees
20182028.66.1 in Submission 20182028.66 by Mr Caleb Oliver
20182028.67.1 in Submission 20182028.67 by Ms Holly Maxwell
20182028.68.1 in Submission 20182028.68 by Mr Cameron Scott
20182028.69.1 in Submission 20182028.69 by Mr Pete Johnson

Summary: Bit of a no brainer this one in my opinion. Great options for people to choose from. Let's divert as much waste from landfill as we can.
20182028.81.1 in Submission 20182028.81 by Mr Liam O'Connell
20182028.86.1 in Submission 20182028.86 by Mr Antony Oosthuysen

Summary: Please enter the 20th Century - bring in bins. Just do it.

20182028.87.1 in Submission 20182028.87 by Mrs Rianna Oosthuysen
20182028.88.1 in Submission 20182028.88 by Mr Ian MacDonald
20182028.94.1 in Submission 20182028.94 by Miss Tanya Whiteford

Summary: We don’t get any service as rural delivery, but are happy to take stuff to recycling.

20182028.95.1 in Submission 20182028.95 by Mr Trevor Wright

Summary: This is a continuation of the ‘user pays’ choice like we have with the bags.

20182028.96.1 in Submission 20182028.96 by Mr Anonymous Anonymous
20182028.99.1 in Submission 20182028.99 by Mrs Karen Johnson
20182028.113.1 in Submission 20182028.113 by Mr Nathan Punton

Summary: Example A is good. I do wonder how difficult and time consuming it will be for WDC to manage all the different 14 options proposed. I would like to see a 240L recycling, 140L rubbish and 80L organics that mirror the CCC programme. We currently pay $282 a year to get our 240L rubbish emptied. We are unable to afford a separate organic bin, therefore our garden waste is just going to land fill.

20182028.117.1 in Submission 20182028.117 by Mr Gerard Power and Ms Olive Ualesi
20182028.118.1 in Submission 20182028.118 by Mrs Colleen McDonald

Summary: Green waste bins would be great. The recycling system is working well.

20182028.124.1 in Submission 20182028.124 by Community College North Canterbury
20182028.170.1 in Submission 20182028.170 by Mr Anonymous Anonymous
20182028.172.1 in Submission 20182028.172 by Mr Anonymous Anonymous
20182028.173.1 in Submission 20182028.173 by Mr Don Robertson
20182028.174.1 in Submission 20182028.174 by Mr Stuart Priddy
20182028.179.1 in Submission 20182028.179 by Mrs Anita Ward

Summary: I hate using rubbish bags. They are messy and rip. Cats tear them up and they are heavy to carry out to the gate. We are definitely happy to pay for a red bin. This was the first thing we noticed when moving from Christchurch. I thought the bins were stolen it was like going from a 5 star hotel to a 1 star.

20182028.181.1 in Submission 20182028.181 by Dr G Matthews
20182028.182.1 in Submission 20182028.182 by Mr Will Kirk
20182028.183.1 in Submission 20182028.183 by Mr Peter Ward

Summary: Having moved to the Waimakariri from Christchurch after earthquake I cannot wait to have bins again. Rubbish bags are dangerous for a lot of waste and I am sick of making trips to the dump for green waste.

20182028.184.1 in Submission 20182028.184 by Mrs Olga Kuznetsova
20182028.187.1 in Submission 20182028.187 by Mrs Alexandra Ireland

Summary: As a family of 4 who recycles, composts food and garden waste we have one garbage bag per month. We would like to see the ‘user pay’ system rather than having to get more bins at a cost which we may hardly ever use. However it is more important that people dispose their garbage responsibly. We support the ‘Your Choice’ collection if this achieves that.

20182028.189.1 in Submission 20182028.189 by Mr Matt James
20182028.190.1 in Submission 20182028.190 by Mr Stewart Milne
20182028.191.1 in Submission 20182028.191 by Mrs Kerry Jenkinson
20182028.192.1 in Submission 20182028.192 by Mrs Stephanie Eldred

Summary: Option A would suit our needs more.
Summary: I agree with the Council's preference and that being able to have separate bins for green waste and general waste will be good. In fact it will be cheaper for me than the private bin collection I currently pay for.

Relief Sought: This service should start as soon as possible, say by December 2018.

Summary: A no brainer.

Summary: I have never used the 1 standard service.

Summary: Wheelie bins plus public education to reduce waste going to landfill.

Summary: We live in Oxford we need a 'green bin' it is ridiculous we have to pay for dumping compost just to buy it again later on.

Relief Sought: Please give us the three bins.
Relief Sought: For the Church, Hall and Minister's Residence we would like example 2 but with a 140L rubbish bin we only have 1 bin to share.

20182028.285.1 in Submission 20182028.285 by Mrs Tascha Lawry

Summary: N/A Rural.

20182028.286.1 in Submission 20182028.286 by RightTech
20182028.287.1 in Submission 20182028.287 by Netright
20182028.288.1 in Submission 20182028.288 by Mr Kevin Medri
20182028.289.1 in Submission 20182028.289 by Mrs Esther Small

Summary: This is the most flexible choice to suit everyone's needs. It will help reduce the rat and ant problem in Rangiora and encourage people to think about plastics and other recycling.

20182028.292.1 in Submission 20182028.292 by Mr Howard and Lynette and Mrs Fowler
20182028.293.1 in Submission 20182028.293 by Mr Les and Sharon and Mrs Holdem
20182028.294.1 in Submission 20182028.294 by Mr Fergus Shirtcliff
20182028.295.1 in Submission 20182028.295 by Ms Emmy Saxton
20182028.297.1 in Submission 20182028.297 by Mr John and Carole and Mrs Houghton

Summary: Green bin would be very useful.

20182028.305.1 in Submission 20182028.305 by Ms Gail Ross

Summary: It is flexible and fair and should meet everybody's specific requirements.

20182028.327.1 in Submission 20182028.327 by Mr A Bashford

Summary: Green waste bin would be great.

20182028.332.1 in Submission 20182028.332 by Ms Tania Walls
20182028.335.1 in Submission 20182028.335 by Mr Stephen Power

Summary: User pays is the way to go I think.

20182028.337.1 in Submission 20182028.337 by Mr Tim Bloomfield

Summary: We need 3 bins like in Christchurch.

20182028.342.1 in Submission 20182028.342 by Mr Eddy van Til

Summary: Considering we live on a lifestyle block, where refuse collection is not a Council provided facility, we already 'enjoy' a self-choice approach. Considering there is considerable disparity in pricing between the top & bottom options, the self-choice approach makes sense, though possibly a logistical nightmare.

None of the 4 concepts in the LTP will provide white elephants. They are all forward thinking, and if our predecessors had not used their funds in the past to provide for us now, where would we be? We trust our elected Council members and Council employees/consultants to come up with plans that will benefit as many in their communities as possible, and not 'ride' any hidden agendas.

20182028.343.1 in Submission 20182028.343 by Ms Debbie Booth

Summary: Great idea. In this day and age we need bins rather than bags. Much cleaner, safer and tidy.

20182028.344.1 in Submission 20182028.344 by Ms Trish Keen

Summary: I would be absolutely stoked to see us move ahead with the 3 bin system as I hate seeing the rubbish strewn all over the place after cats and dogs have been on the loose. I also will find it cost neutral as I use an additional bin now.

20182028.345.1 in Submission 20182028.345 by Mr Kelvin Ashby
Summary: There are sufficient options that everyone should be able to find one that suits them.

20180208.346.1 in Submission 20180208.346 by Mr Thomas Bedford

Relief Sought: My Wife and I prefer the following option: 240L bin for recycling 80L bin for rubbish and 80L bin for organics. We do not require a 140L for rubbish and organics as we do not produce enough to fill these size bins.

20180208.349.1 in Submission 20180208.349 by Mrs Charmaine McGregor
20180208.351.1 in Submission 20180208.351 by Mrs Melanie Wildermoth

Summary: Bins better we need to cut down on plastic bags also stops cats getting into the bags.

20180208.352.1 in Submission 20180208.352 by Mr Brian Heron
20180208.353.1 in Submission 20180208.353 by Mrs Annette Williams

Summary: I feel it is better for our environment.

20180208.354.1 in Submission 20180208.354 by Mrs Shara Kelsey-Ross
20180208.356.1 in Submission 20180208.356 by Mr John Forrest
20180208.357.1 in Submission 20180208.357 by Mr Ray Freitag

Summary: Money well spent, Affects everybody.

20180208.358.1 in Submission 20180208.358 by Mr James A Ryan

Summary: I welcome this choice, however will wait until final service choices are made.

20180208.364.1 in Submission 20180208.364 by Ms Jodie O’Shea
20180208.375.1 in Submission 20180208.375 by Ms Toni Slemint

Summary: Would be great to include Loburn and other rural areas.

20180208.377.1 in Submission 20180208.377 by Mr Nigel Seaton
20180208.381.1 in Submission 20180208.381 by Mr Bill Byers

Summary: The addition of a Green Bin (Organics bin) would be acceptable.

20180208.386.1 in Submission 20180208.386 by Waimak Football Club
20180208.388.1 in Submission 20180208.388 by Mr Greg Matthews
20180208.389.1 in Submission 20180208.389 by Ms Amy Johnston
20180208.391.1 in Submission 20180208.391 by Mr James McRobb
20180208.396.1 in Submission 20180208.396 by Mr Chris Cleminson
20180208.397.1 in Submission 20180208.397 by Mr Ray Parkinson
20180208.398.1 in Submission 20180208.398 by Ms Jane Roberts
20180208.399.1 in Submission 20180208.399 by Ms Monique Murray
20180208.400.1 in Submission 20180208.400 by Mr Gary Powell
20180208.401.1 in Submission 20180208.401 by Mrs Julie McCartney
20180208.405.1 in Submission 20180208.405 by Mr Bruce Morriss
20180208.407.1 in Submission 20180208.407 by Mr Jim and Ann and Mrs Martin
20180208.408.1 in Submission 20180208.408 by Ms Sarah Hosking

Relief Sought: We need to get rid of plastic bags - better recycling and bins are well overdue. Also we need better facilities for soft plastic recycle - make sure this can go into the bin that we can choose.

20180208.409.1 in Submission 20180208.409 by Mrs Mary Gerard

Summary: All bins.

20180208.410.1 in Submission 20180208.410 by Ms Linda Pocock
20180208.412.1 in Submission 20180208.412 by Mr Jim Gerard

Relief Sought: Need to ensure transition for those who already use a private operator.
20182028.418.1 in Submission 20182028.418 by Ms Lorraine Dempsey
20182028.419.1 in Submission 20182028.419 by Mrs Drucilla Kingi Patterson

Summary: Example 1.

20182028.420.1 in Submission 20182028.420 by Mr Steve Lewis
20182028.422.1 in Submission 20182028.422 by Mr Jon Kiripatea

Summary: All 3 bins (red, green and yellow).

20182028.423.1 in Submission 20182028.423 by Mrs Kim Kiripatea

Relief Sought: We should have red and green bins also, and bi-yearly organics recycling/kerbside collection.

20182028.426.1 in Submission 20182028.426 by Ms Megan Macefield
20182028.432.1 in Submission 20182028.432 by Mr Jackson Lewis
20182028.435.1 in Submission 20182028.435 by Mr Glen McDonald

Summary: We are forever growing we need to keep up with Christchurch City.

20182028.441.1 in Submission 20182028.441 by Mr Eddie Bassett
20182028.442.1 in Submission 20182028.442 by Mrs Kay Bassett
20182028.445.1 in Submission 20182028.445 by Mr Dean Lewis
20182028.446.1 in Submission 20182028.446 by Ms Michelle Murdoch
20182028.457.1 in Submission 20182028.457 by Mr A J McLachlan
20182028.461.1 in Submission 20182028.461 by Mr Beccy & Joe and Mrs Creswick

Relief Sought: Should be no option. Make it bins only, just like Christchurch City Council.

20182028.470.1 in Submission 20182028.470 by Mr Gary Lotz
20182028.472.1 in Submission 20182028.472 by Mr G Thomas

Summary: Cost of rubbish bags.

20182028.474.1 in Submission 20182028.474 by Mr P McAllister
20182028.476.1 in Submission 20182028.476 by Ms Angela Coutts
20182028.477.1 in Submission 20182028.477 by Ms Caroline Hingston
20182028.478.1 in Submission 20182028.478 by Ms Gesine Putama
20182028.479.1 in Submission 20182028.479 by Mrs Karen Sewell
20182028.480.1 in Submission 20182028.480 by Mr Matt Sewell
20182028.485.1 in Submission 20182028.485 by Mr Shayne Dear
20182028.486.1 in Submission 20182028.486 by Ms Robyn Thompson
20182028.487.1 in Submission 20182028.487 by Mrs Kylie Schaare
20182028.488.1 in Submission 20182028.488 by Mr Gary Phillips

Summary: Want flexibility.

20182028.489.1 in Submission 20182028.489 by Mrs Sian Phillips

Summary: Green waste would be great.

20182028.492.1 in Submission 20182028.492 by Ms Julia Morris
20182028.494.1 in Submission 20182028.494 by Mrs Elaine H B Cole

Summary: Support this option because of flexibility and provision for organic waste.

20182028.503.1 in Submission 20182028.503 by Mr Duncan Lees

Summary: About time we had the choice for all options for recycling.

20182028.504.1 in Submission 20182028.504 by Ms Michelle Conchie Osborne
20182028.507.1 in Submission 20182028.507 by Miss Sarah Carmody
20182028.508.1 in Submission 20182028.508 by Mr Iain Doody
20182028.511.1 in Submission 20182028.511 by Mr Mark Kenny
20182028.512.1 in Submission 20182028.512 by Mrs Angela Lamont
20182028.514.1 in Submission 20182028.514 by Mr Peter Devlin
20182028.516.1 in Submission 20182028.516 by Ms Catherine Batchelor
20182028.517.1 in Submission 20182028.517 by Mr Johnny Carter
20182028.521.1 in Submission 20182028.521 by Ms Greer Smith
20182028.522.1 in Submission 20182028.522 by Mrs Sarah Smith
20182028.524.1 in Submission 20182028.524 by Mr Rodney Butt

Summary: Extend kerbside collection areas especially recycling.

20182028.530.1 in Submission 20182028.530 by Mr Stuart Smith

Summary: Happy how the system works.

20182028.531.1 in Submission 20182028.531 by Mr Rodger Welsh

Relief Sought: Compostable - that bin would be to small for us. Personal preference is to use the Resource Centre to dispose of green material.

20182028.534.1 in Submission 20182028.534 by Mr Adam Gleave
20182028.535.1 in Submission 20182028.535 by Mr Chris Garrick

Summary: Chance to opt out and continue to use independent contractors etc.

20182028.536.1 in Submission 20182028.536 by Ms Jenefer Bimler
20182028.537.1 in Submission 20182028.537 by Mr Tim Paterson
20182028.538.1 in Submission 20182028.538 by Mrs Michelle Deedman
20182028.539.1 in Submission 20182028.539 by Mr Marcus Deedman
20182028.541.1 in Submission 20182028.541 by Mr Grant Stephens

Summary: I used to live in Christchurch and remember when we had plastic bags etc and transferred to the new system. There was much talk that it was a waste of money and time. However in the following years I personally saw our rubbish levels drop and recycling and green waste able to be used grow which was great. It comes at a cost but in the end is so much better that I think it would be a shame if the council did not approve it. I would like though for it to be the residents choice rather than the owner as we rent in Rangiora and I worry that even if it is approved we wont get bins as it is cheaper for the owner to continue to make us pay for the bags. I would be happy to cover the rise in rates on our property through my rent if necessary but may not be given the option.

20182028.544.1 in Submission 20182028.544 by Mrs Wendy Howe
20182028.548.1 in Submission 20182028.548 by Mrs Judith Schumacher

Summary: Looking forward to having 3 bins.

20182028.549.1 in Submission 20182028.549 by Ms Helen Field
20182028.550.1 in Submission 20182028.550 by Mr Jacob LaValley

Summary: Strongly support having the option to choose as desired.

20182028.552.1 in Submission 20182028.552 by Mr Andrew Hegarty

Summary: Good options for individuals to choose.

20182028.558.1 in Submission 20182028.558 by Mrs Gillian Giller

Summary: The 'Your Choice' option provides flexibility for residents. They would have an opportunity to minimise their costs for an essential service. This option would also provide the District with the opportunity to minimise waste to landfill.

20182028.559.1 in Submission 20182028.559 by Ms Nancy Sutherland
Summary: Allowing householders to choose which kerbside collection service they want enables each household to decide which method best suits it; for example, some households have little or no compostable material for collection as they compost on-site whereas others do not have composting facilities on their properties.

20182028.560.1 in Submission 20182028.560 by Ms Linda Stewart

Summary: Option A in my view will work if the service offered is one choice only. A 3 bin system. Reason: It cannot offer a competitive price and still be tailor-made and be a competitive price cost to ratepayers.

20182028.562.1 in Submission 20182028.562 by Miss Sherrianne Nation

Relief Sought: I am all for the three bin selection, however I strongly oppose the multiple choice options. It should be everyone has the three bins or we don't have them at all. We need to be consistent across the district for all the ratepayers. Trying to manage so many options is a waste of money and resources.

20182028.563.1 in Submission 20182028.563 by Mrs Lesley Ottey

Summary: I don't need a green waste bin, I compost everything plus my neighbours and the street leaves.

20182028.566.1 in Submission 20182028.566 by Mr Murray Aitken
20182028.569.1 in Submission 20182028.569 by Mr Harry Apes
20182028.572.1 in Submission 20182028.572 by Mr Mike and Beng Choo and Mrs Battersby
20182028.602.1 in Submission 20182028.602 by Mr K J Claxton

Relief Sought: Don't bring it into rural lifestyle areas which at present don't have it. We don't want another (tax) rate burden.

20182028.603.1 in Submission 20182028.603 by Ms Jo Kane

Summary: Support councils preference?your choice collection services but question both the administration and ongoing operational costs to deliver these services.

20182028.605.1 in Submission 20182028.605 by Ms Janet Collier

Summary: My only concern is that it could put people out of work who already collect rubbish.

20182028.606.1 in Submission 20182028.606 by Mr Peter Cooper
20182028.616.1 in Submission 20182028.616 by Mr Christopher Storm

Summary: I fully support the "You choose" rubbish plan 100%. Make it happen ASAP.

20182028.618.1 in Submission 20182028.618 by Mr Jun Zhu
20182028.620.1 in Submission 20182028.620 by Ms Gendie Woods
20182028.627.1 in Submission 20182028.627 by Woodend School
20182028.644.1 in Submission 20182028.644 by Mr C Pocock
20182028.645.1 in Submission 20182028.645 by Ms Elizabeth Brocherie
20182028.646.1 in Submission 20182028.646 by Woodend School
20182028.647.1 in Submission 20182028.647 by Woodend School
20182028.648.1 in Submission 20182028.648 by Woodend School
20182028.649.1 in Submission 20182028.649 by Mr D Shekleton
20182028.650.1 in Submission 20182028.650 by Woodend School
20182028.651.1 in Submission 20182028.651 by Woodend School

Summary: Extend to Ashley rural.

20182028.660.1 in Submission 20182028.660 by Dr Kate Grundy
20182028.663.1 in Submission 20182028.663 by Ms Diane Evans
20182028.667.1 in Submission 20182028.667 by Federated Farmers of New Zealand

Relief Sought: Recommends that Council proceeds with this fair and progressive waste management.
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20182028.670.1 in Submission 20182028.670 by Ms Evelyn Zuberbuhler

**Summary:** Crucial to reduce rubbish going into landfills. If we’re serious about our environment then we need to ensure people are given options so that rubbish to landfill is reduced.

20182028.674.1 in Submission 20182028.674 by Frames & Trusses NZ Ltd
20182028.675.1 in Submission 20182028.675 by Ms Lucy French
20182028.679.1 in Submission 20182028.679 by Ms Jo George

**Summary:** Love if there was a ‘Rubbish’ bin like the recycled on, Green collection would be good, but Rubbish better.

20182028.681.1 in Submission 20182028.681 by Mr Steve Glen-Osborne
20182028.682.1 in Submission 20182028.682 by Mr Yan Yan Gong
20182028.685.1 in Submission 20182028.685 by Mr NP & AE and Mrs Gregory

**Summary:** This issue is dragging on too long, surely with the latest votes a decision can be made soon.

20182028.688.1 in Submission 20182028.688 by Ms Phillipa Hunt
20182028.694.1 in Submission 20182028.694 by Ms Jan Gill
20182028.701.1 in Submission 20182028.701 by Ms Charmaine Kane
20182028.709.1 in Submission 20182028.709 by The Brook Bar

**Summary:** Can you please incorporate Threlkelds road.

20182028.717.1 in Submission 20182028.717 by Mr Nathan & Tabitha and Mrs Lang
20182028.721.1 in Submission 20182028.721 by Mr Jesse Leen

**Summary:** Nice work.

20182028.724.1 in Submission 20182028.724 by Lillybrook Motel
20182028.725.1 in Submission 20182028.725 by Ms Joan Lumber

**Summary:** Would be great to put out instead of getting bags out in morning to try and stop them being torn open by animals.

20182028.730.1 in Submission 20182028.730 by Mrs Jennie Marsh

**Summary:** We can’t see how 2 bins (example 2) @ $181 per year can go to 3 bins (example 1) @ $321 per year. Interesting calculations.

20182028.731.1 in Submission 20182028.731 by Ms Tonya Bristow

**Summary:** Let’s get this going please, it is long overdue. Like that there are options for all people.

20182028.735.1 in Submission 20182028.735 by Mr N Cossar
20182028.736.1 in Submission 20182028.736 by Mr Sam Royds
20182028.745.1 in Submission 20182028.745 by Mr Yizhou Jiang
20182028.751.1 in Submission 20182028.751 by Mr Gavin and Mrs Dorothy McRae
20182028.749.1 in Submission 20182028.749 by Mr Greg Robinson
20182028.754.1 in Submission 20182028.754 by Restore Natural Health
20182028.755.1 in Submission 20182028.755 by Woodend Community Association
20182028.759.1 in Submission 20182028.759 by Ms Holly Rae
20182028.760.1 in Submission 20182028.760 by Ms Penelope Price
20182028.772.1 in Submission 20182028.772 by Ms Fiona P Roberts
20182028.775.1 in Submission 20182028.775 by Mr Glen Osborne & Mrs Robyn Osborne

**Summary:** Currently only recycles why not waste/green too.

20182028.795.1 in Submission 20182028.795 by Ms Catherine George
20182028.804.1 in Submission 20182028.804 by Mr Philip Beare
Summary: Services provided should be 'needs' based.

20182028.811.1 in Submission 20182028.811 by Ms Noie G Cervantes
20182028.815.1 in Submission 20182028.815 by Mrs Melanie Marryatt
20182028.817.1 in Submission 20182028.817 by Ms Mel Fortuin
20182028.827.1 in Submission 20182028.827 by Mrs Kylie Steele
20182028.828.1 in Submission 20182028.828 by Ms Mary Meethan
20182028.833.1 in Submission 20182028.833 by Mrs Lisa Hetherington

Summary: Having previously lived in Christchurch and having a 3 bin system was much better than bags, cleaner and easier to use.

20182028.836.1 in Submission 20182028.836 by Ms Rachael Gavid
20182028.837.1 in Submission 20182028.837 by Mr John Z Henry
20182028.840.1 in Submission 20182028.840 by Woodend School
20182028.841.1 in Submission 20182028.841 by Woodend School
20182028.842.1 in Submission 20182028.842 by Mr B Fordyce

Summary: Extended to Ashley Rural.

20182028.845.1 in Submission 20182028.845 by Ms Jillian May
20182028.847.1 in Submission 20182028.847 by Mr Anonymous Anonymous
20182028.849.1 in Submission 20182028.849 by Mr Anonymous Anonymous
20182028.499.1 in Submission 20182028.499 by Oxford-Ohoka Community Board

Summary: The Board supports the consultation via the LTP process and that relevant households may exercise choice.

20182028.850.1 in Submission 20182028.850 by Ms Deb Riach
20182028.496.1 in Submission 20182028.496 by The Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board

Relief Sought: The Board supports the introduction of a 2 bin (recyclables and residual waste) waste collection for the proposed Waste Management and Minimisation Plan, and opposes the introduction of a Green Waste bin service. Supports the range of options being made available to households. The board seeks assurances that given that there is both choice and an opt-out provision that the Council will still actively seek to monitor and minimise costs. The Board further seeks assurances that the health and safety impact of retaining the black bag collections will be minimised (including trip hazards, content hazards for collectors, content spill and associated environmental contamination due to animal activities) and that all steps are taken to address environmental consequences associated with the continued use of plastic bags.

20182028.498.1 in Submission 20182028.498 by Rangiora-Ashley Community Board

Summary: The Board supports the choices that are being presented in the Long Term Plan for consultation and feedback by those most directly affected. The Board remains concerned as identified in its specific submission the matter that there could be a consequential cost burden to the Council depending on the contractual arrangements and the vagaries of the cost and administration of the Opt In and Out processes. The Board is only supportive of the proposals on the basis that any service is guaranteed to be cost neutral in perpetuity.

Should the proposal be accepted the Board seeks close attention to the arrangements for the transition period that needs to be undertaken, in conjunction with households switching to the new scheme and the private operators to ensure that any such transition is again cost neutral for the householder and that any opt in to the system does not carry any contractual charge/cancellation fee with the current service provider. The Board notes that there are a number of providers and that each household may have a differing contract but that it is clearly important not to have the householder bearing two costs at transition and that this transition may need to be staged accordingly.

Relief Sought: The Board remains concerned that there appear to be no arrangements in place to minimize waste and asks that the Council addresses this as a matter of urgency. The EnviroSchool programme has been particularly successful (the Board notes North Loburn School as an exemplar) as
well as local campaigns to reduce rubbish and waste in general but there appears to be no complementary Council initiative or overt stance in this regard.

20182028.497.1 in Submission 20182028.497 by The Woodend-Sefton Community Board

Summary: The Board supports the Council in offering choice and consultation through the LTP process. The Board queries the arrangements for businesses especially new businesses and how this ‘commercial’ waste can be minimised. The Board also urges strong action and enforcement of developer activities and associated waste — for example polystyrene and wall board. There are numerous instances of polystyrene pollution of green spaces, waterways and drainage channels situated near to both large and small building sites and developments. The Board suggests that penalty clauses be considered as a part of the consenting processes which are then strictly enforced.

20182028.852.1 in Submission 20182028.852 by Mr Ian Riach
20182028.858.1 in Submission 20182028.858 by Ms C J Young

Summary: Good to see choices.

20182028.871.1 in Submission 20182028.871 by Pegasus Residents Group
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**Group: B: No change - 1 standard service**

**20182028.13.1 in Submission 20182028.13 by Ms Kathryn Robertson**

**Summary:** Having bins for general waste do not encourage people to recycle. However, if waste and compost bins are introduced, they should definitely be optional, so that people who compost at home and do not require more than the occasional rubbish bag do not have to pay for additional services.

**20182028.14.1 in Submission 20182028.14 by Mrs Sarah Shore**

**Summary:** Localised collection depots for recycling for the many ratepayers who don't receive a council collection service.

**20182028.22.1 in Submission 20182028.22 by Mrs Jane Cochrane**

**Summary:** Superannuitants can't afford any rate rise.

**20182028.29.1 in Submission 20182028.29 by Mr Michael Bate**

**Summary:** What we have works. Most cost effective. More important things to spend money on.

**20182028.37.1 in Submission 20182028.37 by Miss Keighley Robertson**

**Summary:** I don't know anything to do with this.

**20182028.38.1 in Submission 20182028.38 by Mr Quintin Jane**

**Summary:** I am happy with the service I currently get.

**20182028.43.1 in Submission 20182028.43 by Mrs Emma McCracken**

**Summary:** We don't have this available to us so n/a.

**20182028.48.1 in Submission 20182028.48 by Mr Aaron Clark**

**Summary:** Do not change - it is not broken no need to fix it.

**20182028.51.1 in Submission 20182028.51 by Mrs Bella Whaley**

**Summary:** Two pensioners in house so present service good.

**20182028.72.1 in Submission 20182028.72 by Mrs Linda Marion McKitterick**

**Summary:** Two pensioners in house so present service good.

**20182028.119.1 in Submission 20182028.119 by Mr Anonymous Anonymous**

**Summary:** Happy with the way it is.

**20182028.120.1 in Submission 20182028.120 by Mrs Suzanne Thurlow**

**Summary:** There is a flexibility in how many bags are used. Therefore the cost can be less for a small household, regarding the number of bags used.

**20182028.121.1 in Submission 20182028.121 by Woodend Combined Friendship Club**

**Summary:** Green waste is put in Village bins and moved to Council refuse centre by the Gardner. I only put out my bag 3/4 weeks as I have little household rubbish. Any other option I would be paying for something I don't need.

**20182028.123.1 in Submission 20182028.123 by Mr Anonymous Anonymous**

**20182028.185.1 in Submission 20182028.185 by Mrs Tarryn Tawart**
Summary: I find the current service adequate and that I don't have enough space for extra bins.

Summary: This suits me.

Summary: Don't get it not fair.

Summary: I'm a council rentals tenant.

Summary: Happy the way it is.

Relief Sought: By composting my household scraps my weekly rubbish fits into one supermarket plastic bag. I for one have no need or space to have more bins.

Summary: Our very good and capable caretaker looks after our rubbish and recycling at River Town Villas.

Summary: It's good now.

Summary: Recycling bin fortnightly works well.

Summary: Very happy with what we have now.
Relief Sought: Encourage residents to compost.

Summary: It works well here in Oxford.

Relief Sought: I would use my bin only bimonthly and use a rubbish bag maybe monthly. Maybe have more localised green waste facilities to encourage localised use and save on waste.

Summary: This system suits me well as with composting and large gardens nearly everything is recycled.

Relief Sought: I would use my bin only bimonthly and use a rubbish bag maybe monthly. Maybe have more localised green waste facilities to encourage localised use and save on waste.

Summary: Avoids dumping waste. Same rule for all easier to manage. Environmental - goes where sposed to go to.

Summary: We live rural so take our rubbish to the tip and recycling to the tip.

Summary: After thorough consultation between our organisation and Council staff, the view is unchanged for the reason that the financial pressure on mostly fixed incomes is unacceptable. The “Your Choice” options are too expensive to be tailored to requirement. Proposals should consider reducing the cost option to one size fits all. Only the bin sizes should be tailored between small or standard to suit single living and refuse?minimalist residents.

Summary: Fine as is.

Summary: Council are changing kerbside collections to once a fortnight. It should be the status quo. By changing to a fortnightly service means doubling the rates on collections.

Summary: Please we now have high enough rates without adding more to them. I totally disagree having to pay more each year. A choice please.
Summary: Convenient for my family now.

Summary: Happy with current service.

Summary: Being a retired couple with very little rubbish we prefer to stay as we are.

Summary: Example 4. As previous submissions, we compost and recycle - only put out 1 bin every 6 weeks and 1 bag every 4 weeks. Council have recognised different households have different rubbish requirements.

Summary: Keep Option B rubbish collection at $86/year - people are on tight budgets already.

Officer recommendations

Pending: 20182028.13.1, 20182028.14.1, 20182028.14.1, 20182028.22.1, 20182028.23.1, 20182028.29.1, 20182028.37.1, 20182028.38.1, 20182028.43.1, 20182028.45.1, 20182028.48.1, 20182028.51.1, 20182028.72.1, 20182028.85.1, 20182028.97.1, 20182028.119.1, 20182028.120.1, 20182028.121.1, 20182028.123.1, 20182028.185.1, 20182028.201.1, 20182028.242.1, 20182028.244.1, 20182028.247.1, 20182028.255.1, 20182028.262.1, 20182028.291.1, 20182028.301.1, 20182028.324.1, 20182028.367.1, 20182028.393.1, 20182028.395.1, 20182028.411.1, 20182028.413.1, 20182028.414.1, 20182028.416.1, 20182028.417.1, 20182028.424.1, 20182028.425.1, 20182028.431.1, 20182028.438.1, 20182028.440.1, 20182028.469.1, 20182028.471.1, 20182028.473.1, 20182028.481.1, 20182028.505.1, 20182028.506.1, 20182028.528.1, 20182028.546.1, 20182028.547.1, 20182028.551.1, 20182028.553.1, 20182028.561.1, 20182028.570.1, 20182028.573.1, 20182028.583.1, 20182028.586.1, 20182028.595.1, 20182028.600.1, 20182028.624.1, 20182028.632.1, 20182028.641.1, 20182028.654.1, 20182028.657.1, 20182028.667.1, 20182028.680.1, 20182028.683.1, 20182028.692.1, 20182028.718.1, 20182028.722.1, 20182028.723.1, 20182028.727.1, 20182028.737.1, 20182028.741.1, 20182028.743.1, 20182028.748.1, 20182028.822.1, 20182028.824.1, 20182028.843.1, 20182028.844.1, 20182028.848.1, 20182028.851.1, 20182028.861.1, 20182028.863.1, 20182028.864.1, 20182028.867.1
1. **SUMMARY**

1.1 This report presents the solid waste staff submission to the Long Term Plan budgets.

**Impacts of Recycling Market Prices**

1.2 All of our commingled kerbside recycling, and some of the recycling from Southbrook resource recovery park (RRP) and Oxford transfer station (TS), is sent to EcoCentral Ltd (ELC) for processing and sale.

1.3 At the time of LTP budget preparation ECL’s advice was that they did not send materials to the Chinese markets. While there had been a drop in market prices since the announcement of this policy this had not greatly impacted on the rebate the Council received from them. The budgets were prepared on that basis. Recycling market prices have fallen drastically since the Chinese Government implemented its National Sword Policy in January this year.

1.4 In February 2018, EcoCentral Ltd (ELC) advised the Council that as from April 2018 the Council would not receive a rebate for the commingled recycling sent to ECL for processing. ECL further advised that they may have to charge the Council for processing of recyclables and that any charge would be notified in April.

1.5 Staff have received advice from ECL that they would be applying a $65/tonne processing charge as from 1 May 2018, and that it was likely to continue at that level for the next year. This will impact on the kerbside collection and disposal accounts operating costs and incomes.

1.6 Staff recommend the following:

a. Increase the targeted rate for kerbside collection by $17.00 incl. GST per property;

b. Reduce the transfer from the Kerbside Account to the Disposal Account from $380,000 to $340,000;
c. Charge commercial collection companies the $65.00/tonne excluding GST ($74.75/tonne including GST) processing charge for their recyclable materials; and
d. Increase the general rate funding to the Disposal Account from $732,000 to $883,498
   Notes that the increase in the General Rate will fund the cost of processing recycled
   materials delivered directly to the transfer stations by members of the public

Capital Works

1.7 Staff are requesting that the following capital works project be carried over.
a. Southbrook Recycling Compactor Shed: Carry over $226,300 to 18/19.

1.8 Staff request that the following capital works projects be removed from the 17/18 budget
   and be put into the 19/20 budget:
b. RPZ installation (backflow protection) Southbrook: $50,000.

1.9 Staff request that the $1,488,000 for Land Purchase for Future Upgrades be from the 17/18
   budget and that:
a. $400,000 for Land Purchase for Screening be added to the 19/20 budget
b. $1,385,000 for Land Purchase for Future Upgrades be added to the 22/23 budget

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180509051042.

(b) Approves that the kerbside collection targeted rates be increased as follows in the 18/19
    year:
   i. Recycling and Refuse Area: $103.00 including GST
   ii. Recycling-only Area: $93.00 including GST

(c) Notes that this is a $17.00 increase on the targeted kerbside collection rate

(d) Approves reducing the transfer from the Collection Account to the Disposal Account by
    $40,000: from $380,000 to $340,000

(e) Approves increasing the general rate funding to the Disposal Account by $151,498 in the
    19/20 year which will increase the General Rate from $732,000 to $883,498

(f) Notes that the increase in the General Rate will fund the cost of processing recycled
    materials delivered directly to the transfer stations by members of the public

(g) Approves charging commercial collection companies the $65.00/tonne excluding GST
    ($74.75/tonne including GST) processing charge for their recyclable materials

(h) Notes that staff will bring a report to the Council to request approval to adjust the
    recyclables charge in the event that EcoCentral Ltd advises a change in the processing
    charge

(i) Approves the following capital works carry-over:
i. Southbrook Recycling Compactor Shed: Carry over $226,300 to 18/19.

(j) Approves removing the following capital works from the 17/18 budget and including these capital works in the 19/20 budget:

i. RPZ installation (backflow protection) Oxford: $43,900

ii. RPZ installation (backflow protection) Southbrook: $50,000

(k) Approves removing the $1,488,000 budget for Land Purchase for Future Upgrades from the 17/18 budget and including the following capital works in the LTP budget:

i. In 19/20: $400,000 Land Purchase for Screening

ii. In 22/23: $1,385,000 Land Purchase for Future Upgrades

3. **BACKGROUND**

**Impacts of Recycling Market Prices**

3.1 To date, the Council has received a small rebate from EcoCentral Ltd (ELC) for commingled recycling, which is dependent on market prices. In 2017 the Chinese Government announced its National Sword Policy which would come into effect in 2018, which caused some nervousness in international recycling markets.

3.2 The policy means that as from 1 January 2018 China would stop buying 24 types of plastic and paper recyclables. Shipments of materials that were not banned would only be accepted by China’s inspectors if they contain less than 0.5% contaminated product in plastic bales, 1% in ferrous and nonferrous metals and 1.5% in scrap paper.

3.3 At the time of LTP budget preparation ECL’s advice was that they did not send materials to the Chinese markets. While there had been a drop in market prices since the announcement of the National Sword policy, which had caused the rebate to be decreased slightly, there was no indication that this would change significantly. The budgets were prepared on that basis.

3.4 The National Sword Policy came into effect on 1 January 2018, which resulted in many recyclers sending their materials to other markets, resulting in a drastic fall in recycling market prices. As a result of this fall, on 27 February 2018 ELC advised the Council that we would not receive a rebate for the commingled recycling sent to them for processing as from 1 March 2018.

3.5 ECL further advised that they would have to charge the Council for processing of recyclables if there was no improvement in market prices, and that they would notify the Council of the actual charge in April. An indicative figure of $60/tonne was given.

3.6 Staff and management met with ECL to discuss this matter, and were assured that ECL have already reduced their own processing costs to the best of their ability. They also stated that Council has been receiving a rebate even when income has not been sufficient to cover ECL’s costs. With the severe drop in paper and cardboard market prices the company therefore will have no option but to pass this cost on to the Council.

3.7 At that time it was decided to wait until we received the later letter from ECL before formally bringing this matter to the full Council, although the implications were discussed by the Utilities & Roading Committee at its March meeting.
3.8 The increased cost of recycling impacts not only the kerbside collection, where about 4,400 tonnes are collected per annum, it also affects the operation of the transfer stations as members of the public and commercial operators drop-off in excess of 1,000 tonnes per annum of recycled material.

**Capital Works**

3.9 **Southbrook Recycling Compactor Shed: Carry Over $226,300 to 18/19.** This project has incurred a number of delays which were outside staff control. A building consent application has been submitted to the WDC Building Unit and we anticipate the physical works will commence in July/August 2018. Completion is due by December 2018. Council previously approved reallocating budget for this project from three other capital projects, and staff are requesting that the total budget be carried over into the 18/19 financial year.

3.10 **RPZ installation (backflow protection) Oxford: remove $43,900 from 17/18 and insert in 19/20.** This project will be undertaken by the Water Unit, which has had resourcing constraints and a high workload this year. Staff will work with the Water Unit to prepare a design that will minimise the costs of this work, and will bring a report to the Utilities & Roading Committee once the design and cost estimates are completed.

3.11 **RPZ installation (backflow protection) Southbrook: remove over $50,000 from 17/18 and insert in 19/20.** This project will be undertaken by the Water Unit, which has had resourcing constraints and a high workload this year. Staff will work with the Water Unit to prepare a design that will minimise the costs of this work, and will bring a report to the Utilities & Roading Committee once the design and cost estimates are completed.

3.12 **Land Purchase for Future Upgrades: remove $1,488,000 from 17/18 and insert $400,000 in 19/20, and $1,385,000 in 22/23.** This land purchase has not progressed to a point where it is considered likely to be completed in the upcoming financial year.

4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

**Impacts of Recycling Market Prices**

4.1. The Council has received a letter dated 1 May 2018 which advises that ECL will charge a processing fee of $65/tonne exclusive of GST. ECL state that, in the interests of transparency and with the assurance of confidentiality, they will share the results their next tender round of fibre product (paper and cardboard).

4.2. Further, ECL advise that it would be prudent to assume a processing cost of similar magnitude when preparing our 18/19 budgets. Unfortunately the budgets were originally prepared using a low return and not a cost for recyclables processing, as outlined in Section 3.2, and the LTP Consultation Document was prepared with the kerbside rates figures based on this assumption.

4.3. The financial implications of this charge on the kerbside collection and disposal accounts, and on rates and gate charges, are discussed in Section 6.1.

4.4. Staff have looked at charging “domestic” customers at Southbrook RRP and Oxford TS for disposal of recyclables but consider that it would not be practicable to implement because the process would cause customers a significant amount of frustration, be a barrier to recycling, and would further increase operational costs as discussed below:

4.4.1. An up-front charge would be a barrier to people bringing in their recycling separated from their rubbish: there would be a risk that customers would put recycling with their rubbish and pay to dump it all in the pit. The current situation with electronic waste is a point in case, where some customers consider it to be
easier to dump small electronic items such as small household appliances and gaming consoles rather than pay $3-$4 to recycle it.

4.4.2. There is also no easy way to measure the weight of individual loads of recycling, in order to charge customers by weight. Many residents bring in a small amount of materials every week or two, with only a minority bringing in a trailer load every few months. The weighbridge scales at Southbrook RRP, while they are calibrated, only measure to 10kg; this would not be accurate enough to weigh smaller loads of recycling. There is no weighbridge at Oxford TS.

4.4.3. Making customers go over the weighbridge to weigh in before going back to the recycling and reuse area then return to pay would significantly delay all customers, particularly when the kiosk is already very busy at weekends.

4.4.4. There is a risk that customers who weigh recycling in would not return to weigh out and pay.

4.4.5. If staff were use scales to weigh and charge at the recycling area, additional staff resourcing would likely be needed to undertake this work. The scales would also have to be calibrated in order to charge by weight. This would further add to the operational costs.

4.4.6. Weighing recyclables on scales would be difficult because some customers bring their materials in loose, some in sacks, and some in a variety of containers, which would complicate the operation.

4.5. The following options have been considered:

4.5.1. **Option 1**: increase targeted kerbside rate by $19.70/property (including GST) from $86 to $105.70 (+22.9%) and $76 to $95.70 (+25.9%), and increase the general rate from $732,000 to $858,448 (up 17.3%). Ratepayers would be subsidising commercial operations as this option does not pass on the costs for recyclables processing to commercial customers.

4.5.2. **Option 2**: increase targeted kerbside rate by $17.00/property (including GST) from $86 to $103 (+19.8%) and $76 to $93 (+22.4%), reduce the account transfer by $40,000, and increase the general rate from $732,000 to $898,448 (up 22.7%). Ratepayers would be subsidising commercial operations as this option does not pass on the costs for recyclables processing to commercial customers.

4.5.3. **Option 3**: increase targeted kerbside rate by $19.70/property (including GST) from $86 to $105.70 & $76 to $95.70, increase the general rate from $732,000 to $843,498 (up 15.2%), and charge commercial collection companies the $65.00/tonne + GST processing cost for their recyclable materials.

4.5.4. **Option 4**: increase targeted kerbside rate by $17.00/property (including GST) from $86 to $103 & $76 to $93, reduce the account transfer by $40,000, increase the general rate from $732,000 to $883,498 (up 20.7%), and charge commercial collection companies the $65.00/tonne + GST processing cost for their recyclable materials.

4.6. **Option 4 is the preferred option** as it sheets home more of the recycling and recovery area operational costs and processing costs to all ratepayers through a general rate increase, reduces the targeted rate increase for those ratepayers inside the collection area, and passes on the processing costs to commercial customers.

**Capital Works**

4.7. **The Southbrook Recycling Compactor Shed** project has been delayed owing to factors outside Council’s control. A building consent application was submitted to the WDC
Building Unit in early May. We anticipate the physical works will commence in July/August 2018 with completion due by December 2018.

4.8. Removal of recyclables from the rubbish pit will have the following benefits:

4.8.1. It will reduce pressure on the pit and compactor: this area currently operates at capacity in peak times from October to March.

4.8.2. It will reduce the possibility of cross-contamination of the recyclables from pit operations or customers deliberately throwing their waste into the stored recycling.

4.8.3. There has been an increase in public dissatisfaction at seeing the recycling in the rubbish pit. When questioned staff do explain that these materials are kept separate from the rubbish and get sent to ECL for recycling, but it would be better for the recycling to be stored and processed away from the rubbish.

4.9. Staff are therefore requesting that the $226,300 budget for this project, which includes the approved additional budget that was reallocated from other capital works this year, be carried over to the 2018/19 financial year.

4.10. Both RPZ installation projects need to be carried out by the Water Unit. This unit has experienced staff resourcing issues in conjunction with a high workload, which has resulted in a significant delay in the RPZ work. Staff consider it to be prudent to reallocate these project budgets to the 19/20 year. This will allow the Water Unit to schedule resources to carry out the necessary investigations, design work and cost estimates which will be brought to the Utility & Roading Committee for approval prior to the work commencing.

4.11. If it is possible to undertake either or both of the RPZ installations in the 18/19 year, staff will bring a report to the Council requesting for the budget to be brought forward.

4.12. Land Purchase for Future Upgrades. At our initial approach, the property owner preferred to sell an entire strip of land and not the desired portion of land from one corner. Other Council departments were asked to consider their future land requirements in the Southbrook area to determine if this would be possible. No other need was identified by any other part of Council.

4.13. As the owner will not sell the area staff consider will be most suited for future expansion, and no other department wishes to acquire land in this area for Council purposes, the current ‘do minimum’ option is to purchase a 20m wide strip along the south boundary of Southbrook RRP. This would allow the Council to incrementally remove the poplar trees and carry out planting for screening and wind shelter purposes.

4.14. This option will not future-proof the site for expansion, but we note that it may be possible to purchase that land in the event that the neighbouring site is developed in future, although this may result in a higher purchase price. We will be reviewing short-term and long-term site requirements during the 18/19 year, in preparation of the upcoming site upgrades. This review may identify other site expansion alternatives than the need to procure additional land.

4.15. If negotiations with the property owner are successful in 18/19 and the purchase can be completed earlier than expected, staff will bring a report to the Council requesting for one or both budgets to be brought forward.

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

4.17. The Solid & Hazardous Waste Working Party discussed this report at a meeting on 15 May 2018 and supported the recommendations.
5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. Groups and Organisations

All consultation for the Waste Management & Minimisation Plan has been made with the assumption that there will be no change to the current kerbside rate, which primarily covers the kerbside recycling contract costs plus Council’s operating costs.

5.2. Wider Community

All consultation for the Waste Management & Minimisation Plan, and the Long Term Plan, has been made with the assumption that there will be no change to the current kerbside rate. Council has not signalled that it would charge commercial customers for recyclables: they currently are not charged for bringing commingled recycling in to Southbrook RRP.

6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1. Financial Implications

Collection Account

In the Collection Account, a closing balance surplus of $226,900 is projected for 18/19. The surplus will be necessary to alleviate funding and cost uncertainties around the number of properties that would ‘opt in’ to the proposed bin collection service for 19/20.

Staff estimate that 4,386 tonnes of comingled recycling would be collected in 18/19. A $65/tonne charge for processing would increase costs by $285,090: the total additional cost to the account, including Council overheads, would be $307,612.

This increased cost in 2018/19 would result in the Collection Account moving from the projected $226,900 surplus to an $80,766 deficit. Staff recommend that the Council should maintain the projected surplus while the proposed new collection service is being bedded in, in the 19/20 year.

Options 1 and 3 consider an increase in targeted collection rates funding of around $19.70 per property to retain the forecast surplus. This would increase the rate from $86.00 to $105.70 in the urban areas (+23%), and from $76.00 to $95.70 in the Ohoka recycling area (+26%). This would not impact any further on the Disposal Account.

Options 2 and 4 consider a $17/property targeted collection rate increase and reducing the transfer to the Disposal Account from $380,000 to $340,000. This would increase the rate from $86.00 to $103.00 in the urban areas (+19.8%), and from $76.00 to $93.00 in the Ohoka recycling area (+22.4%). This would impact on the Disposal Account income stream and this is discussed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection Account</th>
<th>Draft Budget</th>
<th>Options 1 and 3</th>
<th>Options 2 and 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tonnes recycling to ECL</td>
<td>4,386</td>
<td>4,386</td>
<td>4,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. properties rated</td>
<td>17,990</td>
<td>17,990</td>
<td>17,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total additional cost at $65/t + overheads</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$307,612</strong></td>
<td><strong>$307,612</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer to Disposal Account</td>
<td>$380,000</td>
<td>$380,000</td>
<td>$340,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Account closing balance, no extra funding</td>
<td>226,900</td>
<td>(80,712)</td>
<td>(40,712)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in rates to recover all costs (incl. GST)</td>
<td>$19.70</td>
<td>$17.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rates: ‘Urban’ level of service</td>
<td>$86</td>
<td>$105.70</td>
<td>$103.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rates: Ohoka recycling-only</td>
<td>$76</td>
<td>$95.70</td>
<td>$93.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing balance with extra funding</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td><strong>$227,400</strong></td>
<td><strong>$225,173</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The recycling rate would be sustainable at that level for a number of years, assuming the processing cost will remain at around that level, i.e. the recycling markets don’t improve. If markets improve and costs reduce the Council would be in a position to reduce the kerbside recycling rate accordingly during the Annual Plan budget rounds.

Disposal Account

A closing surplus of $41,089 is projected in the 18/19 draft Disposal Account budget, and the budget currently includes an income allowance of $30,705 for recyclables sales.

Staff project that “domestic” customers will bring in 1,135 tonnes to both Oxford transfer station and Southbrook RRP per annum. The increased cost due to the $65/tonne processing charge plus Council overheads would result in a $79,620 increase in costs. Overall the loss in recycling sales income and extra costs equates to $110,325. As discussed in Section 4.4 charging domestic customers for each individual load of recycling by weight is considered to be impractical for a number of reasons plus it would in all likelihood increase operational costs.

Staff estimate that commercial collectors will bring in 230 tonnes of recyclables, for which they are not currently charged. The increased cost due to the $65/tonne processing charge plus Council overheads would result in a $15,300 increase in costs.

In total 1,365 tonnes would be sent to ECL for processing from the transfer station. The total effect of the increased costs and loss in income would be $125,625 including Council overheads.

Without an increase in the additional funding to offset these additional costs Options 1 and 3 would result in an account deficit of $85,359. In Options 2 and 4, if the Disposal Account income were to be reduced by $40,000 owing to a reduction in the account transfer, the deficit would increase to $125,359.

Staff recommend that commercial collectors be charged $65.00/tonne excluding GST ($74.75 including GST) for disposal of the recycling to fund the processing costs of their materials (this is included in Options 3 and 4).

Charging for disposal of recyclables could result in the companies ceasing their recycling services. This could result in an increase in rubbish tonnages brought in by those collectors, or alternatively an increase in the amount of domestic recycling. The commercial customers are not charged for operating costs at the pit for compacting the materials into containers for transport into ECL for handling their recyclables but their refuse gate charges cover site handling costs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disposal Account</th>
<th>Draft Budget</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
<th>Option 4 Preferred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tonnes domestic recycling</td>
<td>1,135</td>
<td>1,135</td>
<td>1,135</td>
<td>1,135</td>
<td>1,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost at $65/tonne + overheads</td>
<td>$79,620</td>
<td>$79,620</td>
<td>$79,620</td>
<td>$79,620</td>
<td>$79,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonnes commercial recycling</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost at $65/tonne + overheads</td>
<td>$15,300</td>
<td>$15,300</td>
<td>$15,300</td>
<td>$15,300</td>
<td>$15,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total additional costs</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$94,570</td>
<td>$94,570</td>
<td>$94,570</td>
<td>$94,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income from kerbside recycling sales</td>
<td>$30,705</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income from commercial charges</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$14,950</td>
<td>$14,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer from Collection Account</td>
<td>$380,000</td>
<td>$380,000</td>
<td>$340,000</td>
<td>$380,000</td>
<td>$340,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total additional cost &amp; lost income</td>
<td>$125,275</td>
<td>$165,275</td>
<td>$78,815</td>
<td>$118,815</td>
<td>$118,815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing balance w/out extra funds</td>
<td>$41,089</td>
<td>$(85,359)</td>
<td>$(125,359)</td>
<td>$(85,359)</td>
<td>$(125,359)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income from commercial charges</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$14,950</td>
<td>$14,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Rate increase to fund extra costs &amp; retain account surplus</td>
<td>$126,448</td>
<td>$166,448</td>
<td>$111,498</td>
<td>$151,498</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing balance with extra funds</td>
<td>$41,089</td>
<td>$41,089</td>
<td>$41,089</td>
<td>$41,089</td>
<td>$41,089</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Council could consider reducing the additional general rate funding and reducing the projected account surplus. The surplus is currently less than 1% of the income staff consider it prudent to aim for a small surplus rather than break-even or a deficit in this account to allow for some of the uncertainties around waste forecasting.

**Capital Works**

**Southbrook Recycling Compactor Shed**: Carrying over the $226,300 budget for the recycling compactor shed into 18/19 will increase the total capital expenditure for 18/19, but the effects are considered to be minor. This defers loan repayment and depreciation costs until 19/20.

**RPZ installation (backflow protection) Oxford & Southbrook**: Removing the $43,900 and $50,000 budget allowances for the Oxford and Southbrook RPZ projects from the 17/18 budget, and adding these budgets into the 19/20 budget will not impact adversely on the 18/19 budgets. Deferring this expenditure will enable staff to carry out investigations and design for the RPZ projects during 18/19. This will provide a greater certainty of the project costs, which will be included in the 19/20 Annual Plan draft budgets.

**Land Purchase for Future Upgrades**: Removing the $1,488,000 for land purchase from the 17/18 budget, and adding a $400,000 budget into the 19/20 financial year and $1,385,000 into the 22/23 financial year will not impact adversely on the 18/19 budgets. Deferring this expenditure will enable staff to continue to negotiate the possible purchase of a 20m strip of land during 18/19.

Note that both budgets allow for a modest increase in land values and each budget includes valuation, survey, legal and resource consent fees and a contingency sum. This has increased the total overall cost of the land purchase. As discussed in 4.16 the assessment of future site needs may identify other site expansion alternatives than the need to procure additional land. The desired block of land may also come available during development of the site. Staff will report back to Council on these matters.

### 6.2. Community Implications

Increasing the targeted rate directly conflicts with the consultation document which outlined no change to these costs.

Imposing a disposal charge on commercial customers also conflicts with the draft LTP, which did not signal such a charge.

It is important to note that this increase in cost has been driven by factors external to the Council. It is an international issue that has emerged and the Council is in a position where it needs to respond.

There could be considerable backlash from the community and commercial industry from this late change. Communications around this increase would have to be carefully managed.

### 6.3. Risk Management

The targeted rate increase could be delayed until 19/20 as the collection account is forecast to have reasonable surplus in 18/19. This level of surplus will provide a financial buffer to ensure that the uncertainties around the uptake of the proposed bin services, which will almost certainly affect income and costs in 19/20, do not send this account into a deficit balance. Deferring this rate for one year would erode the financial buffer and would result in a larger rate increase when the proposed new collection service is implemented.

There is a risk that commercial customers would cease providing recycling services to their customers owing to the charge; or that if they pass on the cost, their customers would not want to
pay the additional cost. In either situation there may be an increase in the tonnage going to landfill: this would be less than a 1.5% increase with current commercial tonnages of 230t.p.a.

Deferring the RPZ installations until 19/20 will mean that the transfer station sites will not comply with the Council’s Water Supply Bylaw for two years. Deferring the RPZ installations until 19/20 is unlikely to put the public water supply at risk given that the transfer station sites have non-return valves at all fire hose reels, and these valves are regularly checked and maintained.

6.4. Health and Safety

Deferring the RPZ installations until 19/20 is unlikely to put public health of operational staff at risk given that the transfer station sites have non-return valves at all fire hose reels, and these valves are regularly checked and maintained. Other proposed changes do not have an impact on Health and Safety.

7. CONTEXT

7.1. Policy

This matter is a matter of significance in terms of the Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.

7.2. Legislation

Local Government Act (S101 Financial Management)

Waste Minimisation Act (S42: Territorial authorities to encourage effective and efficient waste management and minimisation; S46 Funding of plans)

7.3. Community Outcomes

k. Core utility services are provided in a timely and sustainable manner

- Council sewerage and water supply schemes, and drainage and waste collection services are provided to a high standard. 1,4
- Waste recycling and re-use of solid waste is encouraged and residues are managed so that they minimise harm to the environment. 1,3,4

7.4. Delegations

The Council has the delegated authority to set rates and gate charges, and amend budgets during the LTP and Annual Plan process.

Kitty Waghorn
Solid Waste Asset Manager
1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to provide a request for changes to the 2018-28 Long Term Plan regarding the Roading and Drainage components of the Earthquake Recovery budgets.

1.2. The changes are outlined as follows:

1.3. **Roading**

1.4. The draft LTP allows for a budget of $580K to rebuild Jones St in east Kaiapoi. The expenditure is budgeted across the 18/19 and 19/20 financial years, with the bulk of the expenditure planned in 19/20.

1.5. It is now proposed to complete the project entirely in 18/19, requiring the budget to be brought forward to the 18/19 year. This proposed change only affects the timing and not the amount of expenditure.

1.6. The current draft and proposed final Roading budgets are shown in tables 1 and 1A respectively.

1.7. **Drainage**

1.8. The draft LTP allows for a budget of $2.6M to construct Stormwater Management Areas (SMAs) in the Beswick and Feldwick catchments and to install reticulation in Jones Street. The expenditure is budgeted across the 18/19 and 19/20 financial years.

1.9. There are three principal changes to the Drainage budgets, as follows:

1) An overall increase in the budget by approximately $181K, to allow for additional identified risks associated with potential contaminated land and a high groundwater table in the area of the SMAs. Note this increase is more than offset by savings of approximately $400K made with the east Kaiapoi wastewater project.
2) The Jones St reticulation works have been brought forward to align with the Roading budget.

3) The Beswick and Feldwick SMAs have been split into separate projects to make managing the costs easier and more transparent.

1.10. The current draft and proposed final Drainage budgets are shown in tables 2 and 2A respectively.

1.11. A summary report will be brought to the August Council meeting outlining progress on the overall programme and providing an updated programme cost estimate. The report is expected to confirm that all water and wastewater projects will be complete by the end of July 2018, and that the total programme costs have reduced due to some savings on two key wastewater projects.

Table 1: DRAFT LTP Budget for Roading Earthquake Recovery Works

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Spent to End 17/18</th>
<th>Draft LTP Budget</th>
<th>Total Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100472.000.5134</td>
<td>Jones St EQ Roading</td>
<td></td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$530,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$530,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$530,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal

Table 1A: PROPOSED Final LTP Budget for Roading Earthquake Recovery Works

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Spent to End 17/18</th>
<th>Proposed Final LTP Budget</th>
<th>Total Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100472.000.5134</td>
<td>Jones St EQ Roading</td>
<td></td>
<td>$580,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$580,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$580,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal

Table 2: DRAFT LTP Budget for Drainage Earthquake Recovery Works

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Spent to End 17/18</th>
<th>Draft LTP Budget</th>
<th>Total Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100469.000.5124</td>
<td>Beswick / Feldwick redzone</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$680,000</td>
<td>$1,406,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100987.000.5124</td>
<td>Jones St Pipework</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$498,000</td>
<td>$523,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$705,000</td>
<td>$1,904,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal

Table 2A: PROPOSED Final LTP Budget for Drainage Earthquake Recovery Works

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Spent to End 17/18</th>
<th>Proposed Final LTP Budget</th>
<th>Total Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100469.000.5124</td>
<td>Beswick SMA</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$982,000</td>
<td>$1,082,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100987.000.5124</td>
<td>Beswick - Jones St Reticulation</td>
<td>$520,000</td>
<td>$520,000</td>
<td>$520,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Project Code</td>
<td>Feldwick SMA</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>$1,029,000</td>
<td>$1,099,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Project Code</td>
<td>Feldwick Reticulation</td>
<td>$89,000</td>
<td>$89,000</td>
<td>$89,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,572,000</td>
<td>$1,118,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal

References:
None
2. **RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No 180518054681.

(b) **Approves** bringing the Earthquake Recovery budget for Jones Street road and drainage works forward from 2019/20 to 2018/19, as outlined in tables 1, 1A, 2, and 2A of this report.

(c) **Approves** an increase to the Drainage component of the Earthquake Recovery budget of $181,000, as outlined in tables 2, and 2A of this report, to cover additional risks associated with potentially contaminated land and high groundwater table in the area of the SMAs.

(d) **Notes** that the Wastewater component of the Earthquake Recovery budget is on track to be underspent by in excess of $400,000 at the end of the 2017/18 year, with all projects being complete, which will more than offset the $181,000 increase in the Drainage budget.

3. **BACKGROUND & ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

3.1. **Jones Street Road Reconstruction**

3.2. This report seeks to bring forward the reconstruction of Jones Street in east Kaiapoi from 19/20 to the 18/19 year.

3.3. The rationale for completing this section of road in the 18/19 year is as follows:

1) It would complete the roading component of the Earthquake Recovery Programme, and provide an improved linkage between the remaining east Kaiapoi properties and the Kaiapoi Town Centre.

2) It is a natural progression following the programmed completion of the new Feldwick Drive road alignment in late June 2018.

3) It is the last project receiving NZTA funding for earthquake recovery works. NZTA have budgeted the expenditure in 2018/19 and delaying further could risk the subsidy being paid to Council.

4) Members of the Regeneration Steering Group have signalled a desire for the project to be completed quickly.

5) It would take advantage of the institutional knowledge within the Earthquake Infrastructure Recovery Steering Group, which is about to be disbanded.

3.4. Staff have secured the resourcing to commence design in July and are satisfied the project can be delivered.

3.5. There is a report going to the U&R Committee seeking direction on the design standard for the road. Staff are comfortable that the proposed budget will cover the final design standard.

3.6. **Beswick and Feldwick Stormwater Management Areas**

3.7. Testing undertaken as part of the investigations for the SMAs and bulk earthworks contract for the Kaiapoi East Regeneration Area have highlighted some risks associated with contaminated land (principally low levels of asbestos) and high groundwater table.
3.8. Staff have reviewed the risks and feel the budget for the SMAs should be increased by approximately $200K to help mitigate those risks.

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

4. COMMUNITY VIEWS

4.1. Groups and Organisations

4.2. Members of the Regeneration Steering Group have signalled a preference to see the Jones Street road works completed as soon as possible.

4.3. Wider Community

4.4. The community has been consulted widely over the earthquake recovery works and over the Regeneration Plan. The community have been kept informed over the progress of specific projects. No consultation is planned regarding the timing of the Jones Street works, but it is expected there would be widespread support for completing the works as soon as possible.

5. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

5.1. Financial Implications

5.2. The proposed changes to the LTP budgets are shown in tables 1, 1A, 2, and 2A.

5.3. No additional funding is sought for the Roading component of the budget, rather the change is one of timing.

5.4. There is a proposed increase in the Drainage budget by approximately $181K, to allow for additional identified risks associated with potential contaminated land and a high groundwater table in the area of the SMAs. However, this increase is more than offset by savings of approximately $400K made with the east Kaiapoi wastewater project.

5.5. Community Implications

5.6. The community implications associated with these projects are improved transport links and improved Stormwater management.

5.7. Risk Management

5.8. The principal risks associated with the proposed changes:

1) Some of Jones St may need to be excavated in the future to install services for the mixed use business area. The change in this risk by bringing the construction forward one year is minimal.

2) The amount budget to manage the risks with the SMAs may be too much or too little. Staff feel the proposed budgeting is appropriate given our current understanding of the risks.

5.9. Health and Safety

5.10. All works will be managed in accordance with the U&R Department’s H&S practices relating to safety in design, engaging contractors, and overseeing construction works.
6. **CONTEXT**

6.1. **Policy**

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

6.2. **Legislation**

6.3. The Greater Christchurch Regeneration Act, Land Transport Management Act, Local Government Act are all relevant in this matter.

6.4. **Community Outcomes**

6.5. The following community outcomes are relevant in this matter:

- There are wide ranging opportunities for people to contribute to the decision making that effects our District
- There is a safe environment for all
- Core utility services are provided in a timely and sustainable manner
- Transport is accessible, convenient, reliable, affordable and sustainable.

6.6. **Delegations**

6.7. The Council has the delegated authority to add or amend budgets.

Gary Boot

Senior Engineering Advisor
1. **SUMMARY**

1.1. This report seeks direction from the Council about its preferred approach to provide budget for dredging the Kaiapoi River. This report notes an option to combine budgets for two dredging projects in the Kaiapoi River:

- Dredging a proposed navigation channel; and
- Dredging the marina basin to enable berthing at the proposed new floating pontoons.

1.2. A combined total budget of $500,000 (including contingency) is estimated in this report to undertake both dredging projects together as one physical works contract. This estimate is subject to review, following the procurement process for selecting a dredging contractor.

1.3. It is planned to undertake the dredging works in the period from June through 15 August 2018, subject to obtaining resource consents and procuring the dredging contractor.

1.4. There is a risk of delays in obtaining all of the required consents needed to undertake both of these projects. Each dredging element has its own resource consent application due to having variations in the assessment of potential environmental effects. Failure of obtaining either consent before the end of June will preclude construction this year. Failure of obtaining the navigational channel dredging consent before June this year will preclude that particular component of the dredging; and either hold up all dredging works, or otherwise not allow for both dredging projects to be combined into one dredging contract (although the marina basin dredging would potentially still go ahead).

1.5. If all approvals were to be obtained in a timely manner, there remains a possibility of undertaking both projects prior to commencement of the 2018 white-baiting season (starting 15 August). A budget proposal for this scenario is therefore outlined in this report for consideration. Alternative options to undertake the dredging for either or both projects are: December 2018 or, from 1 June to 15 August 2019. These alternative options would not achieve the intended completion of the marine precinct projects (including the floating pontoon) by the end of the 2018 calendar year.
2. **RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180514052211.

(b) **Notes** an existing budget of $250,000 is available for the marina basin dredging to enable berthing at the proposed new floating pontoons.

(c) **Notes** a budget of $50,000 has been allocated by the Waimakariri District Council in 2018/19 as part of the river rehabilitation programme, intended to be used to contribute to the costs of dredging of the navigation channel.

(d) **Notes** a total estimated budget of $500,000 is likely to be required to undertake the combined marina basin and navigation channel dredging projects, based on a 50% cost share from each project.

(e) **Approves** staff approaching Environment Canterbury to request a 50% share ($125,000) of the navigation channel dredging project costs ($250,000).

(f) **Approves** an additional budget of $200,000 to fund the navigation channel budget shortfall of $200,000 from a district wide rate, which covers the immediate need and includes underwriting the suggested Environment Canterbury cost share until repaid by ECan.

(g) **Notes** details of the current and proposed funding are included in tables in Section 6.

(h) **Notes** the proposed $500,000 combined budget may need to be revised following completion of the procurement process with the selected contractor.

(i) **Circulates** this report to all the Community Boards, and the Regeneration Steering Group.

3. **BACKGROUND**

Marina Basin Dredging

3.1 The Council currently has a $250,000 budget allocation set aside for capital dredging of the marina basin to enable berthing at proposed new floating pontoons in the marine precinct. This budget allocation is a part of the greater Kaiapoi Wharf and Marine Precinct programme budget ($4.7M in 2018/19 year for the full programme including Murphy Park). The marina basin capital dredging budget allocation was outlined in a report (TRIM ref 180321030331) to the Regeneration Steering Group (9 April 2018) and Council (1 May 2018). This budget sits in the wider Earthquake Recovery, Recreation activity.

River Rehabilitation Programme & Navigational Channel Dredging

3.2 At Council meeting on 1 May 2018, staff were authorised “to proceed with design, consenting and work programming of dredging for a minimum 1.5m depth (low tide) navigation channel in the Kaiapoi River, from the Williams Street Bridge to the Waimakariri confluence”. The rationale for undertaking the navigation channel dredging is outlined within a staff report to the Council meeting on 1 May (TRIM ref 180315027535).

3.3 In summary, the proposed navigation channel would be created by excavating out several existing “high points” in the river bed. This will improve safety for all vessels using the river at low tide, but particularly for Coastguard operations. It would also extend the tidal window for any deeper draught vessel that may in future use the Kaiapoi River.
3.4 The navigation channel dredging proposal is based on recommendations in a report titled "Kaiapoi River Navigation Channel concept Design" 2016, prepared by Marico Marine, an independent harbour management consultant. Marico Marine was engaged by the Kaiapoi River Rehabilitation Working Party (the Working Party) in 2016 to investigate options to improve navigation in the Kaiapoi River (see TRIM 160513044101).

3.5 Marico Marine found that the Coastguard are currently able to use the river at all stages of the tide, but must navigate very carefully at low water. They note “having such minimal under-keel clearance is not ideal from a safety of navigation perspective, with the risk of grounding en-route to a rescue. Other river users currently restrict their passage when the tide is higher, if limited by their vessels draught…” (Marico Marine 2016, p.21).

3.6 The report also notes that “the Coastguard reported their ideal operational depth would be a minimum of 1.5m water depth. This provides a small safety margin to prevent engine or propeller damage…” (Marico Marine 2016, p.8).

4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1. This section of the report does not cover the full dredging issues and options, but highlights some key elements that affect decisions around potential combination of the two dredging projects.

4.2. The method proposed to dredge the Kaiapoi River is cutter-suction dredging. This method was recommended to the River Rehabilitation Working Party by Environment Canterbury staff during its October 2017 meeting.

4.3. This method, in the view of Waimakariri District Council staff, is able to be implemented with minimal disruption to aquatic species habitat within the river and birdlife on its margins. It is also understood to minimise sediment discharge into the river during dredging. This method is also the basis used in the resource consent application for both elements of the dredging works.

4.4. The use of this method is however subject to identifying a suitable spoil dewatering approach on available open land near the river. It will also require careful management of levels of suspended sediment discharging with the dewatering water back into the river. The associated constraints, options and trade-offs with this method are discussed in further detail in this report.

4.5. Suction dredging requires abstraction of river water and spoil as a “slurry” mix from the river bed. The spoil is then discharged into sedimentation basins for dewatering on land near the river. These basins are optimally located close to the dredging abstraction points to minimise the risk of the dredging discharge line blocking. The close location of dewatering basins to the dredging abstraction areas also maximises effectiveness of pumping slurry to the basins.

4.6. It is proposed to locate temporary spoil dewatering basins at the Corcoran Reserve and/or on Council or Environment Canterbury land inside or outside the stopbanks at 1 Ferry Road, near the Kaiapoi River mouth. Following completion of dewatering, spoil is proposed to be reused as fill at a variety of locations in the Kaiapoi East Regeneration area. Alternatively, spoil could be reused for final disposal in areas inside the stopbanks. The latter option is subject to further discussion with Environment Canterbury through the consent process. Two potential locations are identified, due to the geographic spread of the in-river dredging sites (particularly for the navigation channel dredging which is over a wider area).
4.7. Following confirmation of an agreed approach, a communications programme will be undertaken to update the public about access to affected areas of land adjoining the river during the dredging and spoil dewatering period. Navigation and fishing access within the river itself will be temporarily affected. Access restrictions will be short term and ideally occur during mid-winter and so avoid peak recreational summer use of the river. It is envisaged that pedestrian access around each dewatering basin and along the top of the stop-banks will continue to be provided during the spoil dewatering process, although temporary fencing may be required for safety reasons.

4.8. If the two projects are combined, the financial implications section of this report outlines a proposal to "bring forward" and increase the current River Rehabilitation budget to $250,000 in the 2018/19 year, for the navigation channel dredging works. This means the river rehabilitation budget would then match the current marina basin dredging budget, providing a ‘combined’ budget of $500,000. A 50% share of the river rehabilitation/navigation channel dredging works cost, would be sought from Environment Canterbury.

4.9. However, it is possible that only the marina basin dredging project will achieve consent approval within a sufficient timeframe prior to the 15 August white-baiting season commencement. A likely cut-off deadline date for award of contract and commencement of dredging project is the end of June 2018, in order to be able to achieve dredging this calendar year. A procurement process is now underway and the budget proposals in this report will be updated once an agreed procurement approach is identified with the selected contractor and costs and fees further identified.

4.10. It is also possible that neither dredging project will obtain all of its necessary consents within a sufficient timeframe prior to 15 August 2018. This scenario would occur if public notification is required for any of the consents, or if the consent processing period extended beyond the statutory timeframes for any reason (which is looking likely). It would mean that dredging for both projects would need to be undertaken at a later date. The alternative dredging windows are either December 2018, or more likely 1 June through 15 August 2019 (i.e. one year deferment).

4.11. The recommended timing options for dredging are proposed to avoid both the white-baiting harvest and spawning seasons. The timing options also need to be confirmed through the consent process.

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

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

Groups and Organisations

5.1 The Kaiapoi River Rehabilitation Working party and the Regeneration Steering Group (and its predecessor the Kaiapoi Riverbank Steering Group) have developed these dredging proposals. These groups comprise key stakeholders including Ngai Tuahuriri, the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board, Environment Canterbury, the Waimakariri Water Management Zone Committee and the Waimakariri District Council.

5.2 A Cultural Impact Assessment has been provided on behalf of Ngai Tuahuriri which covers the dredging proposals outlined in this report. This CIA recommends various sediment control measures and options for use in the river during dredging. The possible presence of a cultural monitor during the works will also be discussed.

5.3 As a part of the consent preparation the Council has written to the Department of Conservation and the North Canterbury Fish and Game Council to seek specific advice on effects of dredging on fish passage and spawning sites. The Council has assessed the
concerns noted in the resulting submission from the Department of Conservation. Staff are of the view that the various issues raised by the Department will be able to be effectively mitigated as part of the dredging proposals already submitted to Environment Canterbury. No response to date has been received from the North Canterbury Fish and Game Council.

Wider Community

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

6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

Financial Implications

6.1 The marina basin dredging to enable berthing at the floating pontoons is estimated to cost $250,000. The high level estimate includes barge deployment, disestablishment and an estimate of spoil extraction costs per cubic metre, but excludes contingency. These estimates are still to be confirmed with the contractor once a procurement process is undertaken.

6.2 The Kaiapoi River Rehabilitation Working Party has, at the current time, recommended an ongoing budget of $25,000 per annum be provided from each of the Waimakariri District Council and Environment Canterbury for river rehabilitation. In the 2018/19 and 2019/20 years these respective budget contributions have been combined and allocated to navigation channel dredging. The River Rehabilitation programme, and the associated Council budget contribution, currently sits under the Council’s Drainage Activity Management plan.

6.3 Staff have been working on an option to ‘cost share’ between the marina basin dredging at the Kaiapoi Wharf, and the River Rehabilitation dredging to establish the minimum 1.5m depth proposed navigation channel. If the dredging projects were combined, this would be let as a single contract; and simply funded from two budget sources.

6.4 Combining the investigations for the two projects to date has achieved cost savings in the following areas:

a) dredge and spoil dewatering design concepts; and

b) resource consenting and Assessment of Environmental Effect (AEE) preparation.

6.5 Further rationalisation and cost efficiencies could be achieved if the dredging projects are combined, due mainly to combining the following:

a) hydrographic surveying immediately before and after dredging;

b) reduced duplication of deployment and disestablishment of the barge and dredge in the river, and associated preliminary and general contract costs;

c) use by one or both projects of the temporary spoil dewatering sedimentation basins i.e. can potentially afford to build two basins, in more optimal locations for pumping and treatment.
d) funding of additional services such as cultural monitor (if required).

A combination of the two dredging projects would also then build in a contingency of approximately 20% into the overall combined dredging contract/project.

6.6 It is noted Environment Canterbury has not yet confirmed its river rehabilitation budget for 2018/19. If Environment Canterbury continues to provide its funding share over the next two years as requested by the Working Party, then a budget of $100,000 is theoretically available for the navigation channel dredging. This combines the 2018/19 and 2019/20 river rehabilitation budgets from both Councils. This is illustrated in the following table.

6.7 **Existing Funding Kaiapoi River Dredging (Table 1)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Waimakariri District Council</th>
<th>Environment Canterbury</th>
<th>Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018/19</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Marina Dredging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Kaiapoi Wharf and Marine Precinct programme)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000 (TBC)</td>
<td>Navigation Channel Dredging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(River Rehabilitation programme)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019/20</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000 (TBC)</td>
<td>Navigation Channel Dredging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(River Rehabilitation programme)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$50,000 (TBC)</td>
<td>Combined Dredging Projects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.8 It is now proposed to “bring forward” and increase the river rehabilitation budget for navigation channel dredging to match the budget provided for the pontoon dredging. This would bring the total available budget for the combined dredging projects to $500,000 in the 2018/19 financial year, to meet the current estimated total expenditure.

6.9 The total combined dredging project budget of $500,000 is a high level estimate which includes a contingency.

6.10 Staff recommend adoption of a cost sharing approach for the navigation channel dredging component (estimated cost of $250,000) with Environment Canterbury. A proposed $125,000 total net contribution will be requested from Environment Canterbury based on current estimates. The proposed new budget and cost sharing arrangement is illustrated in the following table 2.
6.11 **Proposed New Funding Combined Kaiapoi River Dredging Pontoons and Navigation (Table 2)**

(Note: Proposed new budgets *in italics*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Waimakariri District Council</th>
<th>Environment Canterbury</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Proposed Rating Method (WDC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018/19</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Marina Dredging (Kaiapoi Wharf &amp; Marine Precinct)</td>
<td>EQ Recovery (unchanged from existing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Navigation Channel Dredging</td>
<td>Kaiapoi Urban Drainage Investigations (unchanged from existing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$125,000 (TBC)</td>
<td>Navigation Channel Dredging (River Rehabilitation programme)</td>
<td>District Wide Rate (ECan share also underwritten by WDC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$375,000</td>
<td>$125,000 (TBC)</td>
<td>$500,000 (Total combined dredging projects)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.12 It is recommended that the Waimakariri District Council fund the total navigation channel cost share of $250,000. Staff would then seek future reimbursement of the $125,000 Environment Canterbury share. This is illustrated in the above table.

6.13 It is recommended the Waimakariri District Council fund the Navigation Channel additional recommended funding of $200,000 via a new district wide “Navigation Rate”. Of this sum, $125,000 will be requested to be reimbursed from Environment Canterbury. Assuming that Environment Canterbury agree to this cost share for navigational dredging, the net additional cost to Council (over and above existing budgets) would be $75,000, based on the dredging estimates.

6.14 This recommended cost split between the Kaiapoi Urban Drainage Investigations budget and the proposed new district wide rate recognises the potential benefits both to the immediate Kaiapoi community and to the wider district of dredging a minimum depth navigation channel for all those who rely on Coastguard services.

6.15 The additional recommended budget allows for some contingency to address components of the proposal/s still to be agreed between the Council, Contractor, Environment Canterbury, Ngai Tuahuriri, Department of Conservation and North Canterbury Fish and Game Council. These include:
• Additional stop-bank protection associated with spoil dewatering basins (if needed)
• Fish salvage (if needed)
• Addition of a flocculent to ensure effectiveness of spoil dewatering (if needed)
• Odour control mitigations required during spoil stockpiling (if needed)

The consent applications note that some of these measures are not currently considered necessary. It is recommended that all of these options be retained as required as possible mitigations through the consenting process to address emerging issues during operations and to ensure compliance with consent conditions.

6.17 There are some other included items which have yet to be finalised costs, that will need to be confirmed through the detailed design. These are:
• Hydrographic surveys
• Excavation of spoil dewatering basins
• Erosion and sediment control measures for the spoil dewatering basins
• In-river habitat protection and sediment control
• Funding for a cultural monitor

6.18 Various sediment control options and monitoring arrangements are being discussed with Environment Canterbury and other stakeholders. These include a Ngai Tuahuriri cultural monitor to provide input into sediment control and habitat protection at commencement on each site. Potential protective measures in the river include the use of silt curtains to screen significant habitat areas. Alternatively a floating hose with attached silt curtain around the dredge itself may be provided. Fish salvage prior to dredging may also be required.

6.19 Each of these aspects will be determined through negotiation of consent conditions and through management of on-site operations. Costs will not be certain until consent is obtained and the effectiveness of the proposed spoil dewatering method is evaluated. For instance, addition of a flocculent may be required to accelerate dewatering.

6.20 Possible additional costs which would be met by the proposed increased budget include undertaking more extensive hydrographic surveys of the river bed at commencement and completion; particularly along the length of the depended channel for navigability. Estimates provided by surveying firms are approximately $15,000 per survey. Hydrographic survey is recommended by the Contractor as a basis to determine fee payment by recording river bed levels at commencement and completion, which determines actual quantities abstracted. It will also enable the Council to publish the resulting navigable channel dimensions which it can then use for future marketing and development. A basic level of survey is already included in the cost estimate for the standalone marina basin dredging, if this were to proceed independently.

6.21 Staff will discuss costs with Environment Canterbury as they are refined. The Council is asked to consider whether it is prepared to pre-fund the Environment Canterbury share of the navigation dredging and recover this cost from Environment Canterbury in future years as its share of the Kaiapoi River rehabilitation funding.

Community Implications

6.22 The previous report to Council in May noted some concern among the Kaiapoi community about the level of saline intrusion in the Kaiapoi River. There is also concern among river users about safety of navigating the Kaiapoi River. Some members of the community are seeking a higher ‘level of service’ in general for river navigability. There appears
agreement on the need to improve water quality and habitat in the Kaiapoi River, and promote the fishing resources and other forms of active and passive recreation.

6.23 These various factors were each taken into account by the Council during its May meeting. At that time it instructed staff to continue to progress the navigation channel dredging proposal. Aspects of the dredging proposals which are further considered in the wider issues and options include: a) protection of cultural values; b) protection of aquatic habitat in the river and margins whilst dredging; c) enhanced opportunities for recreation and navigation available at completion; and d) protection of fishing, amenity and public access during dredging as far as is practicable.

6.24 This report notes that some usage of the land adjoining the Kaiapoi River will be required to implement the spoil dewatering that is associated with cutter-suction dredging. The dredging will require dewatering basins and discharge of dewatering water back to the Kaiapoi River. Some temporary disruption to land use on the Corcoran Reserve is proposed. The disruption will be temporary and will be mitigated by the benefits to the community of improved navigation safety and access at completion of the works.

Risk Management

6.25 Risks to public safety when navigating the Kaiapoi River have been identified and potential options and responses will be developed jointly with the consultant team and the contractor. There will be some disruption to users of the river, due to the presence of the dredging barge, and the dredging discharge hose.

6.26 There is a risk that costs of the proposed dredging works will be different from those currently estimated. Staff intend to negotiate actual dredging rates and other costs of associated works with the selected contractor and will advise Council once final costs have been determined. Allowances included within this report are high level estimates only.

6.27 There is a risk that Environment Canterbury will not provide the requested funding for the navigation channel dredging. In this instance the Waimakariri District Council would underwrite the costs of the navigation channel dredging project without reimbursement.

6.28 There is a risk that the necessary resource consents for the respective dredging works components will not be received in time to achieve the desired dredging works in the ideal period of 1 June 2018 to 15 August 2018. If the marina basin dredging in particular is not achieved in this timeframe, this will hold up subsequent projects including the construction and installation of the floating pontoons, and the completion of the current phase of the marine precinct development adjacent to the Riverview terraces and boardwalk.

Health and Safety

6.29 The proposal to dredge the Kaiapoi River minimum depth navigation channel was prioritised by the Kaiapoi River Rehabilitation Working Party at its meeting in October 2017 because it will “improve the safety of all vessels using the river, but particularly for Coastguard operations” (see report from Marico Marine 2016, p.7).

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

7 CONTEXT

7.1 Policy

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

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

7.3 Community Outcomes

This report considers the following outcomes:

**There is a safe environment for all**
- Harm to people from natural or man-made hazards is minimised.
- Our district has the capacity and resilience to quickly recover from natural disasters and adapt to the effects of climate change

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

7.4 Delegations

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

Janet Fraser          Duncan Roxburgh
Utilities Planner     Implementation Project Manager - District Regeneration
1. SUMMARY

1.1 This report identifies some potential risks and opportunities regarding government funding of Council’s transport programme as a result of the draft Government Policy Statement on Land Transport (GPS).

1.2 An increased emphasis on safety and access, funding for footpath maintenance, and a reduced emphasis on transport efficiency have all been signalled in the draft GPS.

1.3 It also indicates that a second stage GPS (GPS2) is likely to be released in 2019. GPS2 is expected to further develop the priorities of safety and access, with a particular emphasis on rapid transit for the urban areas of Auckland, Wellington and Christchurch. A rapid transit corridor between Christchurch and Rangiora is likely to be considered in a wider rapid transit programme. It is possible that funding may be required for a local share of some rapid transit infrastructure.

1.4 There have been suggestions that Funding Assistance Rates (FARs) may be reviewed, and that variable FARs may be introduced. Higher FARs could be available for activities which are more consistent with the priorities of the GPS, with lower FARs for those activities which are less consistent with the GPS.

1.5 Outside of the GPS process, NZTA has also indicated that the 85% subsidy for updating streetlighting to LED lights has been extended. Staff will investigate options and develop a programme to update streetlighting, and report to Council at a later date.

1.6 NZTA’s indicative continuous programme approval is $471,000 less than the $32M Council requested. Staff are preparing further information to enable further funding from NZTA’s “enhanced” funding allocation.

1.7 Consequently, there is some uncertainty regarding government funding for Council’s transport programme.

1.8 It is recommended that Council makes no changes to the draft LTP to address this uncertainty at this stage for the following reasons:

   a) The nature and magnitude of any funding changes for Council are currently unclear.
b) With one exception, the projects in Council’s funding bid to NZTA appear to be consistent with the priorities of the draft GPS

c) Some funding is allocated for park and ride facilities which could be transferred to other public transport infrastructure to support rapid transit if necessary

d) Most, if not all, of the funding shortfall indicated in NZTA’s indicative investment approvals is expected to be met from the enhanced funding.

e) Any changes would be made after consultation on the draft LTP has been completed. Public feedback on these changes is therefore not available.

Attachments:

i. Council Submission on GPS (TRIM No 180410038725)
ii. Draft Regional Transport Committee submission on the GPS (TRIM No 180426045025)

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180426044997.

(b) Makes no changes to the draft LTP as a result of the GPS.

(c) Notes that a second GPS is expected to be released in 2019.

(d) Notes that the uncertainty regarding government funding of transport projects may require variations to the LTP in future years.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1 The draft Government Policy Statement on Land Transport 2018/19 - 2027/28 (GPS) was released on 14th March. The draft GPS, and supporting documentation can be found at the following link:

https://transport.govt.nz/ourwork/keystrategiesandplans/gpsonlandtransportfunding

3.2 The role of the GPS is defined as:

“…The GPS outlines the Government’s strategy to guide transport investment over the 10 years. It also provides guidance to decision-makers about where the Government will focus resources…”

“The GPS influences decisions on how money from the National Land Transport Fund (the Fund) will be invested across activity classes, such as state highways and public transport. It also guides the NZ Transport Agency and local government on the type of activities that should be included in Regional Land Transport Plans and National Land Transport Programme.” (Section 1.1 of the draft GPS)

3.3 Engagement on the draft GPS closed on 2nd May. Council has submitted on the GPS, along with the Canterbury Regional Transport Committee, and other Canterbury Councils. The submissions of Council and the Regional Transport Committee are attached.

3.4 NZTA’s Draft Investment Assessment Framework for the 2018-21 National Land Transport Programme (IAF) was released on 16th April. This document gives effect to
the GPS, and is used by NZTA to assess and prioritise projects put forward for funding by Approved Organisations, such as local authorities.

3.5 Feedback on the draft IAF is open until 18th May. Both the GPS and IAF are due to be finalised by 30th June.

3.6 The draft GPS indicates that a second stage GPS (GPS2) is likely to be required due to an inability to include some items in the GPS due to time constraints and a dependence on other work currently under way, such as a review of rail and the development of a new road safety strategy. Timing of the release of GPS2 has not been confirmed yet. However, Ministry of Transport staff have indicated that they expect it to be released “in about a year.” There have also been some indications that a draft GPS2 may be released before the end of 2018.

3.7 The draft GPS signals a change in emphasis for transport funding. Safety and Access are the two key strategic priorities. These are supported by the priorities of Environment and Value for Money.

3.8 The Access priority has a new focus on improving access to opportunities and markets, with an emphasis on:

- Urban centres
- Regional development
- Nationally important freight and tourism connections
- A continued focus on resilience

3.9 The draft GPS indicates that Footpath maintenance is likely to be funded from the National Land Transport Fund in future. Currently footpath maintenance is fully funded locally.

3.10 The priority on transport efficiency which was present in previous GPS’ is not reflected in the current document.

3.11 The draft GPS indicates that GPS2 is likely to:

- Reflect a new safety strategy
- Promote public transport through rapid transit options for Auckland, Wellington, and Christchurch and improved affordability
- Consider all modes, including rail and coastal shipping.

3.12 Funding Assistance Rates (FARs) are the rates at which NZTA funds transport projects. Waimakariri’s FAR is currently 51% for all activities. Comments from NZTA staff appear to suggest that there is some appetite to consider variable FARs for different activity classes, with higher rates for those activities which are consistent with the GPS.

3.13 NZTA has also announced that the cut-off date for the 85% subsidy to update streetlights to LEDs will be extended.

3.1 NZTA released their indicative Investment Levels for continuous programmes. Their indicative approval for WDC is $471,000 less than the $32M requested.
4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1. Council’s LTP needs to be finalised before a number of significant decisions regarding NZTA funding are able to be made. This results in some uncertainty regarding funding of some components of the roading programme in the LTP.

4.2. Based on a review of the draft GPS and IAF, the following possible impacts on Council’s LTP have been identified:

**Key Strategic Priorities: Safety and Access**

4.3. The draft GPS signals an increased emphasis on safety and access, and reduced emphasis on transport efficiency. This is likely to result in projects which predominantly provide safety and access benefits being more likely to receive funding, whilst those with predominantly efficiency benefits are less likely to receive funding.

4.4. The primary benefits in most of the projects in Council’s NZTA funding are safety and / or access. The only exception is a project to improve traffic throughput on Southbrook Road. The primary benefit identified from this project is an improvement in traffic efficiency. Road safety has been identified as a secondary benefit of this project.

4.5. This project may be more likely to attract funding if the emphasis is changed to providing improved travel time for public transport and / or safety improvements.

**Rapid Transit**

4.6. A funding band of $1.9b to $4.8b has been allocated to rapid transit over the 10 year life of the GPS. These rapid transit projects are expected to be predominantly in the Auckland, Wellington, and Christchurch urban areas. Christchurch rapid transit corridors are likely to include a corridor to the southwest to Rolleston, and one to the north to Rangiora.

4.7. Typically, rapid transit systems operate in corridors which are partially, or totally, separated from general traffic. They are generally heavy rail, light rail, or bus-based systems (or a combination of systems). The draft GPS does not indicate what modes are being considered for rapid transit in each of New Zealand’s main cities.

4.8. In the short term, it is expected that significant investigations will be required to identify and assess options to provide a viable rapid transit system to the north of Christchurch. These investigations are expected to occur during FY2018/19. Under normal circumstances, a local share may be required from Council to fund these investigations. No provision has been included for this in the draft LTP.

4.9. However, it is considered that these are not normal circumstances, and we would argue that it is unrealistic to expect Councils to make a significant contribution to any investigations after LTPs have been finalised.

4.10. In the longer term, the construction of a rapid transit system serving the Waimakariri District may require some local share to fund the construction of specific local infrastructure. Whilst there is no specific funding allocation for rapid/ transit infrastructure in the draft LTP, $4M has been allocated for Park and Ride facilities in 2022 to 2024. It is considered that this funding could be diverted to fund local rapid transit infrastructure if necessary.
Footpath Maintenance Funding

4.11. The draft GPS includes a proposal to allow footpath maintenance to be funded from the National Land Transport Fund. Details of how that funding will be implemented are not currently available. It is, however, considered likely that this funding will cover both maintenance and renewals. The IAF indicates that “The opportunity will be provided to include footpath maintenance within local road maintenance programmes.” This may suggest that footpath maintenance could be funded at the same FAR as road maintenance.

4.12. $600k to $700k per annum has been allocated for footpath reconstruction in the draft LTP. Assuming a 51% FAR for footpath maintenance, Council could be eligible for additional annual revenue in the region of $300k to $350k from the NLTF for footpath maintenance. However, as noted above, it is not certain that this is how any footpath maintenance funding will be implemented. It is therefore possible that the actual figure could differ from this.

Variable FARs

4.13. Changes to FARs could result in increased funding being available from NZTA for some projects, and reduced funding for others. As noted above, the vast bulk of Council’s roading projects have safety and access benefits. If variable FARs are implemented, it is likely that these projects would receive more funding from NZTA than is currently anticipated.

Streetlighting

4.14. Whilst not in the GPS process, NZTA has announced that the cut-off date for the 85% subsidy for replacing existing street lights with LED lamps will be extended.

4.15. The potential impacts on the draft LTP are twofold. Replacing existing lamps is likely to have an initial up front cost in the short term. In the longer term, the LED lamps are likely to result in significantly reduced ongoing electricity and maintenance costs.

4.16. Staff will investigate options for streetlight upgrade, identify a suitable programme for the work, and report to Council at a later date.

NZTA Indicative Funding Approval

4.17. NZTA released their indicative Investment Levels for continuous programmes. Their indicative approval for WDC is $471,000 less than the $32M requested.

4.18. The work categories where the indicative approval is less than the amount requested are listed in Table 1.

Table 1 Requested from NZTA vs Indicative Approval

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Requested</th>
<th>Indicative Approval</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operational Traffic Management</td>
<td>$91,500</td>
<td>$73,500</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Maintenance</td>
<td>$1,634,000</td>
<td>$1,514,900</td>
<td>$119,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Services Renewal</td>
<td>$1,947,000</td>
<td>$1,760,000</td>
<td>$187,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resurfacing</td>
<td>$6,388,000</td>
<td>$6,243,200</td>
<td>$144,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Safety Promotion</td>
<td>$570,000</td>
<td>$568,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$470,900
4.19. The total investment is made up of NZTA’s funding assistance (currently 51%) plus WDC’s local share.

4.20. In addition to the indicative approvals, NZTA has "enhanced" funding available. This funding is subject to further information being provided. Staff are preparing further information in response to the indicative approvals. It is expected that most, if not all, of the funding shortfall will be met from enhanced funding.

Options

4.21. The options for addressing the potential issues identified in the draft GPS, IAF, and Indicative Funding approval consist of making no changes to the draft LTP, or making changes to the LTP allocations to address some potential funding changes. It is recommended that Council makes no changes to the draft LTP at this stage for the following reasons:

a) The magnitude of any funding changes for Council are currently unclear.

b) With one exception, the projects in Council’s funding bid to NZTA appear to be consistent with the priorities of the draft GPS.

c) Some funding is allocated for park and ride facilities which could be transferred to other public transport infrastructure if necessary.

d) Most, if not all, of the funding shortfall indicated in NZTA’s indicative investment approvals is expected to be met from the enhanced funding.

e) Any changes to the LTP would be made after consultation on the draft LTP has been completed. Public feedback on these changes is therefore not available.

4.22. However, it is also recommended that Council notes that the uncertainty regarding government funding of transport projects may require variations to the LTP in the future.

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

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. Groups and Organisations

5.2. Wider Community

5.3. The draft LTP has been the subject of extensive public consultation in recent months. Possible changes as a result of the draft GPS have not been able to be included in that consultation.

6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1. Financial Implications

Expenditure changes as a result of the GPS are likely. The nature and magnitude of these changes is as yet unclear.

6.2. Community Implications

Changes to transport outcomes are likely as a result of the GPS. The nature and magnitude of these changes is as yet unclear.
6.3. **Risk Management**

As noted above, there are some potential risks and opportunities associated with the GPS. It is intended to mitigate these by working with our regional and Greater Christchurch partners to maximise the opportunities for the District arising from the GPS.

Council will be kept informed of the results of any ongoing investigations, and of any funding changes which result from changing Government policy.

6.4. **Health and Safety**

As outlined in this report, there are potential road safety implications resulting from the GPS. There are no other health and safety implications for Council.

7. **CONTEXT**

7.1. **Policy**

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

7.2. **Legislation**

The GPS informs funding decisions for transport.

7.3. **Community Outcomes**

*Transport is accessible, convenient, reliable and sustainable*

- The standard of our District’s roads is keeping pace with increasing traffic numbers. ¹,³,⁴
- Communities in our District are well linked with each other and Christchurch is readily accessible by a range of transport modes. ¹,³
- Public transport serves our District effectively. ¹,³
- Opportunities to increase the occupancy of commuter vehicles is actively encouraged. ³

7.4. **Delegations**

Any changes in expenditure resulting from changes in Government policy or implementation will be within appropriate delegations.

Submission by
Waimakariri District Council

2 May 2018

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

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

Specific comments on the GPS 2018 are offered as follows.

2. **Strategic direction**

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

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

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

The Council welcomes that the second stage GPS is likely to include input from the Zero Carbon Bill consultation / development process, the independent Climate Change Commission and the Productivity Commission’s work on transitioning to a low emissions economy, to ensure consistency with the overall emissions reductions target and strategy.

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

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

3. **Safety**

As noted above, the Council supports Safety as a key strategic priority (Section 2.2).

In particular, the safety of people, particularly vulnerable road users like walkers and cyclists, is a critical aspect of this priority. The Council supports the further development of and investment in urban and rural cycleway networks as identified in point 25. We agree that further investment in cycleways and footpaths, especially between the District’s main towns, would support safe and healthy travelling options for cyclists and pedestrians.

Whilst we support implementation of the Speed Management Guide (point 35), we consider that effective changes in operating speeds will require more than a simple change in speed limit. The Waimakariri District rural road network contains a large proportion of long, straight roads.

The Speed Management Guide suggests that 80km/h is a safe and appropriate speed for most of these roads. We consider that a significant change in road user mindset is required before 80km/h is accepted as appropriate by many users of those roads.

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

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

The Council supports Access as a key strategic priority (Section 2.3).

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

We agree with point 51, that the creation of public places that integrate walking and cycling, can help to make safer and attractive, accessible urban environments that allow land use and transport to work better together. As increasingly more of this District’s working population chooses lives and works within the District, we agree with point 52 that providing better access, using travel demand management, to enable more people to travel by walking and cycling, public transport or by higher occupancy vehicles.

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

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

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

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

5. Future development of state highway network

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

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

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

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

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

The Woodend bypass will therefore be a transport investment that is consistent with the safety and access priorities of the draft GPS. It will also be consistent with environment, the third strategic priority in the GPS. That is, localised environmental impacts on the Woodend community such as air pollution will be reduced.

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

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

6. Transitional rail funding

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

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

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

7. Coastal shipping and network resilience

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on GPS 2018. The Council wishes to be heard in respect of this submission.
2 May 2018

GPS Policy Team
Ministry of Transport
PO Box 3175
Wellington 6140
GPS2018@transport.govt.nz

Dear Sir or Madam

Canterbury Regional Transport Committee submission on the draft Government Policy Statement on Land Transport 2018

1. The Canterbury Regional Transport Committee (RTC) welcomes the opportunity to make a submission on the draft Government Policy Statement (GPS) on Land Transport 2018, released on 3 April 2018.¹

2. We welcome and strongly support the step change signalled in the draft GPS, particularly:
   - consideration of the holistic benefits that a well-designed transport system offers for our communities, economy and the environment
   - the key strategic priorities of safety and access, to be addressed with full regard to the supporting strategic priorities of environment and value for money
   - effective delivery of these priorities through the themes of transitioning to a mode neutral approach to transport planning and investment; using transport to shape urban form and create liveable cities; and greater leverage of technology and innovation.

3. Canterbury’s transport strategy as articulated in the draft Regional Land Transport Plan (RLTP) is well aligned with the new direction outlined in the draft GPS. However, there will be some challenges in flowing the new strategic direction through to the regional programme of transport activities in a timely manner.

4. The core recommendation of the RTC’s submission is that central government engages with local government to identify mechanisms to enable Canterbury to respond rapidly to the step change signalled in the draft GPS, including developing an agreement on transport’s role in the future development of Greater Christchurch.

5. A number of other recommendations are also made in relation to the key components of the draft GPS, as set out below.

Working in partnership to explore mechanisms to support rapid implementation of the GPS in the Canterbury region

6. The alignment between the draft GPS and draft Canterbury RLTP creates significant opportunities for the region, including:

¹ See the appendix for information about the Canterbury Regional Transport Committee.
freight mode optimisation to support the significant freight growth projected for Canterbury, while reducing the social and environmental impact of freight;

- using transport to help shape urban form, particularly in greater Christchurch;
- creating innovative, fit-for-the-future public transport solutions for Greater Christchurch;
- increasing community and economic resilience through appropriate transport infrastructure and planned alternatives for high risk routes and supply chains;
- improving road safety, particularly on our rural roads; and
- accelerating the transition to a low emissions transport system.

7. Due to the nature and extent of the changes signalled in the draft GPS, many of the implementation details are still to be worked through. This, coupled with the incongruent timing of the GPS, RLTP, and Long Term Plan processes, implies a lag of at least a year for alignment between the investment priorities in the GPS and the funding requested through RLTPs and allocated in councils’ annual plans.

8. Some councils may be in a position to use their reserves to effect change more quickly; however, many Canterbury councils are not in this position, having used their reserves over recent years to maintain levels of service following the disruption posed by the earthquakes.

9. The RTC recommends that Government work with us to identify funding mechanisms which will enable Canterbury to overcome these constraints and respond rapidly to the draft GPS, including ‘quick win’ initiatives which demonstrate the potential offered by this new direction for transport policy in New Zealand.

10. The draft GPS signals that the second stage GPS will involve developing local and central government agreements on transport’s role in the future development of metro areas such as Christchurch.

11. The RTC strongly supports the proposed development of a local and central government agreement on transport's role in the future development of Greater Christchurch. Investment to improve public transport services and lift patronage in the short term, coupled with development of rapid transit solutions, will help to shape urban form and avoid the need to retrofit public transport into a car-centric city as congestion reaches unacceptable levels due to projected population growth.

Feedback on key components of the draft GPS

12. We strongly support the overarching direction of the draft GPS, including the four investment priorities and the three themes.

13. Outlined below are our key points on:

- investment priorities
- themes
- activity classes and funding allocations
- investing in outcomes.
Investment priorities

14. Safety:

- We recommend the Government engages with local government on efficient, collaborative approaches to implementing NZTA’s speed management guidelines.
- We recommend that road safety promotion campaign collateral is developed nationally in collaboration with local government, as a more cost-effective approach than individual councils designing campaigns in isolation.
- To achieve improved safety at rail level crossings, we recommend clarifying responsibility for level crossing improvements.

15. Access:

- The draft GPS proposes enabling lead investment to access serviced land for development in high growth areas. We recommend that the GPS 2018 also enables lead investment to improve public transport services, as a way of improving access, driving demand, and hence enabling greater cost recovery over time.
- There is an acknowledged trade-off between travel time and access for public transport services; a focus on travel time results in direct services being provided on a smaller number of routes, whereas a focus on access results in more extensive geographical coverage with greater travel times. The general shift in priority from travel time to access therefore has major implications for the design of public transport services in Canterbury:
  - We recommend that Government work with local government to increase access to public transport for urban and rural communities, and also to those persons with an impairment who experience particular mobility challenges.
  - We also recommend that the objectives of amenity and increased mode share are not compromised by an exclusive focus on coverage as opposed to balancing coverage with other factors such as frequency, reliability, and travel duration.
- We recommend travel time reliability be included in the GPS 2018 as an element of access. Travel time reliability is a very different concept from actual travel time and is a vital aspect of people’s ability to access goods and services, and opportunities. When travel time reliability is low on a particular route, this creates uncertainty about the time it takes to move between points on that route. It is difficult for people to manage significant and unpredictable delays, and those delays can have adverse social and economic impacts on individuals and businesses. In particular, freight transport relies on meeting time schedules and missing transit deadlines can increase costs. Travel time reliability is a key component of increasing the attractiveness of public transport.
- We recommend that Greater Christchurch be recognised under Section 2.3.1 ‘Results: Metropolitan and high growth urban areas are better connected and accessible’. Christchurch is the second largest city in New Zealand and the Greater Christchurch sub-region is facing significant population growth with a projected increase of 33% over the next 30 years.
• We **recommend** clarifying what the rapid transit activity class covers, including whether it covers rail.

• We **recommend** that the GPS clearly supports and enables investment in risk mitigation, especially for natural hazard risk and climate change adaption. For example, the North Canterbury earthquake highlighted the importance of investment in alternative routes, to maintain access for communities and freight. However, it is not reasonable or realistic to expect small territorial authorities to cover the cost of maintaining a regional or local road to a standard suitable to act as an alternative route to a state highway.

16. Environment:

• The increased focus on reducing the environmental impact of transport is strongly supported, noting the opportunity the draft GPS creates for investment to mitigate New Zealand’s greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions.

• We **recommend** that the Government (through the Climate Change Commission and development of the second stage GPS) engage with RTCs and industry on mechanisms to achieve a rapid reduction in GHG emissions from transport. Examples could include enabling freight shift from road to rail and shipping; the roll out of electric vehicle charging infrastructure; and national and regional transport pricing mechanisms which account for externalities. We also **recommend** that the Government engage with local government to explore the potential for nationwide bulk purchase of electric buses to deliver a step change in public transport, environmental and service level outcomes, while obtaining the best value for money.

• We **recommend** that the national funding model recognise that electric vehicles will have an impact on revenue from Road User Charges and Fuel Excise Duty.

17. Value for Money:

• We **recommend** that the GPS 2018 is clarified so that the value for money outcome clearly includes non-economic benefits, such as improved wellbeing and environmental outcomes.

• We **recommend** that the 50% farebox recovery measure for public transport services be reviewed. This measure creates difficulties for bus services in Greater Christchurch and Timaru, where we do not have adequate demand density from the working population as a consequence of the earthquakes or geographically constrained transport routes. Farebox recovery does not recognise, and can counter, improvements in access to public transport, and the numerous other social and economic benefits of public transport services.

• We **recommend** that the Government lead the development of a nationwide data, modelling and analytics toolset, for use by central and local government to support transport planning, development and review of investment priorities and business cases, project benefits realisation, and outcomes reporting. A centralised approach will be cost effective and provide greater consistency, including in the consideration of holistic benefits and externalities in transport planning and investment.
18. Mode neutrality:

- To implement the principle of mode neutrality, we recommend that road, rail and coastal shipping are brought into a decision-making framework that enables integrated land use and multi-modal transport planning and investment.

- South Island RTCs are collaborating on work to optimise freight modes, and we recommend that Government engage with South Island RTC Chairs Group on opportunities to align this work with related initiatives. The re-establishment of the South Island Freight Governance Group may provide a useful mechanism to bring together key public and private sector stakeholders from across the South Island.

- Similarly, we recommend that any proposed passenger rail solutions are considered in the context of the wider transport network and urban environment.

19. Technology & innovation

- Transport systems are expected to fundamentally change over the coming years, driven by new technologies, markets, and societal expectations and norms. A future-focused and adaptive approach to transport planning, investment and delivery will be critical to leverage new developments and avoid poor investment decisions.

- We recommend the Government ensure that the GPS 2018 supports funding of innovative approaches and pilot projects. The ability to pilot new technology and approaches is critical to both test the effectiveness of interventions, and to support community buy-in and encourage behaviour change. A significant constraint on innovation to date has been the inability to gain adequate grant funding and support for research and development and trial activities. Providing mechanisms that enable faster and easier access to financial and technical support for innovation initiatives will aid the accelerated delivery of modern, state of the art solutions for transport.

20. Integrating land use and transport planning and delivery

- We strongly support the intention to improve the integration of land use and transport planning, in particular the premise that transport services should be an early service provision to shape new land use development and enable community access and use of public and active transport modes as soon as possible within a development cycle. This approach requires a “Loss Lead Investment” approach. Historical transport investment policy has been largely driven by financial measures, farebox recovery and service efficiency, and investment from a public transport perspective has had to take a “lag investment” or demand-based approach.

- We recommend the Government continue to explore opportunities to enable greater integration of land use and transport planning. There are strong links between the draft GPS and the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity (acknowledged in the draft GPS); greater alignment of the processes and timelines for NPS-UDC implementation and transport planning cycles may be helpful.

*Activity classes and funding allocations*
21. We **strongly support** the signalled increase in investment for public and active transport, travel demand management, local and regional roads, and the new activity class and funding for rapid transit.

22. The current funding model for infrastructure and services relies on a large local share component. If councils are required to match fund at current FARs then it may be difficult to effectively implement the draft GPS. We particularly **recommend** an enhanced FAR for public transport, which will be critical to support the priority of increasing access to services.

23. We **recommend** that the activity class “road safety promotion and demand management” be titled “demand management and road safety promotion” to make it clear that demand management is not limited to safety initiatives.

24. We note the percentage increases quoted in the “Government Policy Statement on land transport (GPS) 2018 Questions and Answers” are different than the percentage increases calculated directly from the table of activity classes and proposed funding ranges.

*Investing in Outcomes*

25. We consider there is a need to recognise and address the following matters, in order to achieve the desired outcomes:

- Government leadership and resourcing will be imperative to implement the ambitious programme of work presented in the draft GPS as follows. We **recommend** that government leadership and resourcing is provided in areas where there is a strong national dimension, where nationwide consistency is required, or where solutions are likely to require government action. For example:
  - We **recommend** that the Government invest in centralised data, analytics and information systems, designed for use by central and local government to more effectively target investment and monitor effectiveness. For the step change in road safety to be achievable, high quality and consistent information is needed to ensure issues are appropriately identified and prioritised, and interventions effectively targeted.
  - Visitor journeys are another area that would benefit from central government leadership. To address the needs of tourists and help disperse the benefits of tourism across and within regions, we **recommend** the Government lead the alignment of planning and investment from the tourism and transport sectors.

- We support the increased emphasis in the draft GPS on monitoring, evaluation and reporting, and the role of central government in developing and overseeing these measures. We **recommend** reported measures be drillable to regional and territorial authority level, and councils be given access to the data sets, methods and tools to enable us to further analyse, interpret and report on these, and hence both support investment cases and ensure we also deliver on regional and local outcomes.

- We **recommend** the Government investigate transitioning to a model in which investment cases are based on the delivery of specific outcomes and objectives, agnostic of mode or activity.
• We **recommend** the timing of the GPS be better aligned with other significant planning and funding documents, in particular long term plans and RLTPs, to support timely alignment and implementation of the GPS. This would also reduce the number and cost of managing variations and associated additional consultation. In particular, we **recommend** that the second stage GPS be timed to inform councils’ annual planning processes.

26. We hope you find the matters raised in this submission useful for the development of the final GPS 2018.

27. We commend the Government on the new direction that has been signalled in the draft GPS. We look forward to working alongside central government to accelerate the implementation of the final GPS 2018 and so deliver the envisaged step change in transport outcomes for our communities.

Yours sincerely

Steve Lowndes,

Chair, Canterbury Regional Transport Committee
Appendix 1: Information about the Canterbury Regional Transport Committee

The Canterbury RTC is a statutory body constituted under the Land Transport Management Act 2003. The Act requires Environment Canterbury to appoint a councillor from each territorial authority, as well as a representative from the New Zealand Transport Agency. Two councillors must also be appointed from Environment Canterbury as the Chair and Deputy Chair.

The map below shows the councils which are within the Canterbury region (however, note that the Waitaki District Council’s transport activities are included in the Otago Regional Land Transport Plan, not the Canterbury Regional Land Transport Plan).

Under section 106 of the Land Transport Management Act 2003, the functions of the Canterbury RTC are:

- to prepare for approval by the Regional Council a Regional Land Transport Plan or any variation to the Plan
- to provide the Regional Council with any advice and assistance it may request in relation to its transport responsibilities
- to adopt a policy that determines significance in respect of variations to the Regional Land Transport Plan and activities included in the Regional Land Transport Plan.
In addition, the Canterbury RTC will also:

- develop, advocate for, and implement the Transport Workstream of the Canterbury Regional Economic Development Strategy (CREDS), in conjunction with the lead Canterbury Mayor for this Workstream
- engage directly with Ministers and the Government to influence national policy.

CREDS represents Canterbury’s commitment to maximising the region’s economic growth, by ensuring the region makes co-ordinated, optimal investment and development decisions that position it for long-term, sustainable growth. Transport is one of seven core workstreams in CREDS. The objective of this workstream is integrated transport planning across modes (air, rail, shipping and road transport) that:

- enables the efficient movement of people and freight into, out of and within the Canterbury region
- improves social connectedness and wellbeing, supports regional visitor strategies and improves road safety.
1. SUMMARY

1.1 This report is to brief Council on noise concerns raised by residents in the Silverstream subdivision, and primarily along the existing Butchers Road frontage.

1.2 Staff have received a number of complaints regarding road noise and requests for asphalt surfacing on the new road, as well as requests for replacement of existing fencing.

1.3 Four submissions requesting asphalt surfacing have been received as part of the Long Term Plan process and have been heard by Council.

1.4 The New Arterial Road in the 60km/h section (currently Butchers Road and Giles Road) will be resurfaced with asphalt in the next three to five years, depending on traffic volumes and how the existing surfacing performs.

1.5 There is no funding currently allocated for either asphalt surfacing or replacement fencing.

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180511051676;

(b) Approves resurfacing of the northern half of the New Arterial Road from the Kaiapoi River bridge north along Butchers Road to the 60/80km speed limit change at the northern end of the development with an asphalt surface at a cost for $250,000, and;

(c) Approves the reallocation of $250,000 from the Waikuku to Pegasus Connection budget of $605,000 to allow for the funding of the asphalt surfacing.

(d) Approves the resurfacing of the southern half of the New Arterial Road (from west of Island Rd to the Kaiapoi River bridge) with an asphalt surface in the next 3 to 5 years, with staff to submit a request for funding in the 2021-24 NZTA funding bid and 2021-31 LTP.

(e) Notes that if Council does reallocating budget from the Waikuku to Pegasus Connection budget that it is not subsidised by NZTA.
(f) **Notes** that this is unlikely to qualify for NZTA subsidy because it does not yet meet NZTA Guidelines or Council Policy requirements, and the final NZTA 'bid' for the 2018-21 period has already been submitted and assessed.

(g) **Notes** that if Council decides to resurface Butchers Road adjacent the existing houses it will come under pressure to seal the remainder of the New Arterial Road in the 60km/h area when the new houses are built and occupied.

3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1 The New Arterial Road project was overseen by a Project Control Group (PCG) which included staff from Council’s Utilities & Roading Team, Project Delivery Unit, Planning Team and also included the Developer.

3.2 Noise was considered as part of the design process and it was agreed that this would be managed by using the smallest sized chip seal and a lower speed limit in an effort to minimise noise.

3.3 The PCG considered the appropriate surface for the New Arterial Road and concluded that a two coat chip seal (Grade 4&6) was appropriate. This is the same surfacing used in urban streets.

3.4 The existing fence along the Butchers Road frontage was a requirement of the resource consent for the subdivision and has specific design requirements which are consent noticed on the property titles.

3.5 It is noted that the road was shown on the Outline Development Plan and as such all property purchasers were made aware of the road.

3.6 The District Plan exempts noise from having to be considered for the New Arterial Road as set out in clause 31.12.2.4. This exemption was approved as part of LURP Action 47 which was issued by the Minister of Earthquake Recovery.

3.7 Cost was a factor as the project budget did not allow for a quieter asphalt surface.

4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1. It is acknowledged that as traffic volumes increase and in particular as more heavy vehicles use the route, an asphalt surface will be required at some stage in the future. NZTA have guidelines for assessing noise and when a low noise surfacing can be justified.

4.2. Council policy is that all Arterial and Strategic urban roads in residential areas will be surfaced with asphalt surfacing when they are next resurfaced. That means that when Butchers Road is due for a reseal it will be resealed with asphalt. Butchers Road adjacent to the houses is considered an urban road and as the current speed limit of 60km/h, is less than the 70km/h speed limit which is required to define an urban road.

4.3. In the “business as usual” sense the trigger for resurfacing Butchers Road with an asphalt surface is when the road is next due for resurfacing. A two coat chip seal surface would be expected to last at least 5 years depending on traffic volumes and heavy vehicle use. Meeting NZTA guidelines depends on traffic growth and it is estimated it would be at least 3 years before that would be met.

4.4. It is important to note that the asphalt surfacing will help reduce tyre noise from vehicles travelling along the road, however it will not have any impact on engine noise coming from vehicles utilising the road.

4.5. The existing properties along Butchers Road have a 1.5m high wooden paling fence along the road frontage. This fence was a requirement of the resource consent which was issued for the subdivision.
4.6. The resource consent for the subdivision required a fence to be constructed to a specified design and that a consent notice be registered on the title of each property fronting the road.

4.7. The existing fence has been raised to a height of 1.8m at the southern end of Butchers Road where the new road ramps up to the bridge over the Kaiapoi River. It was agreed to raise the fence in this location as the new road was lifted significantly adjacent to three properties, which resulted in a significant reduction in privacy for the property owners. Staff have also been agreed to raise the fence for the four properties at the northern end of Silverstream for the same reason.

4.8. The options available to Council are as follows:

   a) **Option One – Programme Resurfacing**
      This option would involve programming the asphalt resurfacing work in the next 3 to 5 years, with staff to submit a request for funding in the 2021-24 NZTA funding bid and 2021-31 LTP.

   b) **Option Two – Asphalt Surfacing (Along Butchers Road frontage)**
      This option would involve Council agreeing to overlay the new road with a layer of asphalt from the Kaiapoi River Bridge through to the northern end of the subdivision on Butchers Road.

      To achieve this Council would need to add $250,000 to the LTP to resurface this part of Butchers Road with asphalt. This is unlikely to qualify for NZTA subsidy because it does not yet meet NZTA Guidelines or Council Policy requirements and the final NZTA 'bid' for the 2018-21 period has already been submitted and assessed.

   c) **Option Three - Asphalt Surfacing (Along full length adjacent to Silverstream)**
      This option would involve Council agreeing to overlay the new road with a layer of asphalt from the Island Road intersection through to the northern end of the subdivision on Butchers Road.

      To achieve this Council would need to add $500,000 to the LTP to resurface the length of the New Arterial Road adjacent to Silverstream with asphalt. This is unlikely to qualify for NZTA subsidy because it does not yet meet NZTA Guidelines or Council Policy requirements and the final NZTA 'bid' for the 2018-21 period has already been submitted and assessed.

   d) **Option Four – Replacement of Fencing along the Butchers Road Frontage**
      This options would involve Council agreeing to replace the existing paling fence along the Butchers Road frontage. As noted above this would include the need to secure a resource consent for the change to the fencing and legal costs associated with the change in consent notices which would be required on the affected lots.

      The cost to replace the fencing is estimated as being $100,000 for the removal of the existing fences and construction of new fences and estimated $50,000 to $100,000 in costs for the consenting and legal work associated with the changes to the consent notices. Therefore Council would need to add $200,000 to the LTP for replacement fencing.
e) **Option Five – Full Length Asphalt Surfacing as well as Replacement of Fencing along the Butchers Road Frontage**

This would be a combination of Options Three and Four with a total cost of approximately $700,000, which would need to be added to the LTP.

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

5. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

5.1. **Groups and Organisations**

5.2. No specific consultation has been undertaken on this matter.

5.3. **Wider Community**

5.4. A number of complaints have been received regarding road noise along with four submissions to the Long Term Plan deliberations.

6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**

6.2. There is no budget allocated for asphalt surfacing or replacement fencing.

6.3. The budget included in the LTP and the NZTA programme does not allow for resurfacing Butchers Road with asphalt in the next three years.

6.4. If Council decided to approve additional funding it is unlikely to qualify for NZTA funding as it does not meet the necessary triggers. Also the NZTA final bid has been submitted / assessed and it is very unlikely additional funding would be approved at this late stage. The best chance of obtaining NZTA subsidy would be by including it in the 2021-24 programme bid.

6.5. The estimated cost of resurfacing Butchers Road adjacent to the existing houses is $250,000. The estimated cost of resurfacing the full length in the 60km/h area is $500,000. To put that into context the total annual resurfacing budget for the whole district is $1.95m.

6.6. Cost was a factor as the project budget did not allow for a quieter asphalt surface or for fencing replacement.

6.7. The estimated cost to raise the remainder of the fences along Butchers Road is approximately $200,000. A resource consent would be required to allow for the fence to be changed and the consent notice on the lots to be changed. The estimated cost of fencing includes the physical replacement as well as legal costs associated with changes to consent notices.

6.8. The current budget allocated to the Waikuku to Pegasus Cycleway Upgrade is $605,000. The budget was originally approved for connectivity projects including the sealing of Kaiapoi Pa Road. Consultation was carried out and it was concluded that sealing of the road was not a desired outcome for the community. It was agreed to instead upgrade and seal a walking and cycling link between Waikuku and Pegasus. The total approved tender cost for this work was $178,000. The Pegasus developer had paid a financial contribution of $140,000 towards the sealing of Kaiapoi Pa Road, which will need to be paid back as this work is not proceeding. This will leave $278,000 which could be reallocated to allow for the asphalt surfacing on the New Arterial Road along the Butchers Road frontage.
6.9. **Community Implications**

6.10. Road noise can be affected by various factors including the road surface, vehicle type, tyre type, volume and the speed of traffic using a road.

6.11. The effect of road noise will vary between individuals and can cause annoyance.

6.12. **Risk Management**

6.13. Normal construction risks will apply.

6.14. **Health and Safety**

6.15. Should any physical works be required to be carried out then the contractor will be required to provide a Site Specific Health & Safety Plan for approval, prior to work commencing on site.

7. **CONTEXT**

7.1. **Policy**

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

7.2. **Legislation**

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

7.3. **Community Outcomes**

This report consider the following outcomes:

**There is a safe environment for all**
- Harm to people from natural and man-made hazards is minimised.
- Our district has the capacity and resilience to quickly recover from natural disasters and adapt to the effects of climate change.
- Crime, injury and harm from road crashes, gambling, and alcohol abuse are minimised.

**Transport is accessible, convenient, reliable and sustainable**
- The standard of our District’s roads is keeping pace with increasing traffic numbers.
- Communities in our District are well linked with each other and Christchurch is readily accessible by a range of transport modes.

7.4. **Delegations**

Council has the authority to approve works within the Road Reserve.

Gerard Cleary  Joanne McBride  
Manager, Utilities & Roading  Development Manager
1. SUMMARY

1.1 This report requests that the Council increases the application fees for Vehicle Entrance Applications and introduces a new fee for the re-inspection of failed inspections, to take effect from 1 July 2018.

1.2 This fee increase was not previously signalled in the Draft Long Term Plan as it was included in a by-law review that has not proceeded as quickly as anticipated.

1.3 Vehicle crossing applications and processing is due to go electronic as part of the Council's mobility programme. This made it appropriate to review the fee now so that the new fees can be incorporated into the electronic solution, thereby avoiding a change soon after the new process goes live.

Attachments:
  i. list of fees charged by other Councils

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180518054893.

(b) Approves an increase to the fees for vehicle crossing applications to take effect from 1 July 2018 as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Crossing electronic application</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Crossing paper application form</td>
<td>$160.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Crossing re-inspection fee</td>
<td>$80.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fees include GST
3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1 The bylaw was due for renewal in 2017 and preliminary discussions have taken place regarding a review. This is a cross department function and the review has not progressed to date as discussions continue as to whether a Bylaw is the best means of regulating this activity.

3.1. The current vehicle crossing application fee of $61.30 has been in operation since 2002 when it was introduced as a $60.00 fee. The only increase has been due to an adjustment to the rate of GST.

3.2. Prior to 2002 the vehicle crossing application and approval process was not widely enforced, and the introduction of the fee was accompanied by a new application, approval and inspection process.

The fee was deliberately not set at cost recovery to encourage compliance with the new process. This escaped review at the 2007 renewal of the bylaw and was earmarked for attention at the 2017 review. It was decided to seek review of the fee outside consideration of the bylaw so that the new mobility solution for application and processing could be set up with the new fees.

4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1. This proposed fee change was not included in the Draft Annual Plan. The bylaw review would have included a review of the fee, however this has been delayed. The implementation of a new electronic application process has prompted this request being made now.

4.2. Retaining the current fee is an option, however the amount is low and makes a minimal contribution towards cost recovery. When the fee was introduced it was set at a low amount to encourage compliance. This has been successful as there are now very few new builds where an application for a vehicle entrance is not received. It is now appropriate to increase the fee closer to cost recovery and to the fees that other Councils are charging.

4.3. Briefly, the process for approval of vehicle crossing applications is that the dimensions and proposed location of the crossing is checked by the Duty Planner for compliance with District Plan siting requirements for driveways. Customer Services staff load the application into the database, generate an invoice and the application is saved to the property file. Roading staff inspect the location and a permit is issued with conditions if required. Three further inspections are required at the excavation, base and final stages. Inspection results are updated in the database. The database is checked as part of LIM reports to ensure a vehicle entrance has been permitted and signed off on that site.

4.4. Fees charged by other Councils for the current year are included in the attached table. The new fees proposed in this report are in line with those charged by other Councils.

5. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

5.1. **Groups and Organisations**

Views have not been sought. This is an issue that will not greatly impact groups and organisations.

5.2. **Wider Community**
Views of the wider community have not been sought, due to this fee increase not being consulted in the Draft LTP. If the new fee is approved a separate advertising will take place.

6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**

Over the last three years an average of 253 applications have been received with an annual income of $13,487.43 (GST excl). The proposed fee would increase income to $33,000 based on a fee of $150. This does not include any allowance for re-inspection fees.

6.2. **Community Implications**

NA

6.3. **Risk Management**

NA

6.4. **Health and Safety**

NA

7. **CONTEXT**

7.1. **Policy**

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

7.2. **Legislation**

Local Government Act 1974, Section 335 Vehicle crossings

7.3. **Community Outcomes**

There is a safe environment for all.

- Harm to people from natural and manmade hazards is minimised

7.4. **Delegations**

NA

Maree Harris
Customer Services Manager
Attachment i)

Summary of Vehicle Crossing Fees (incl GST)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council</th>
<th>Application fee</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch City Council</td>
<td>$153.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Re-inspection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(of failed inspection) $90.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selwyn District Council</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retrospective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>application $200.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson District Council</td>
<td>$122.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurunui District Council</td>
<td>Corridor Access</td>
<td>Request $160.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Request $160.00</td>
<td>No specific vehicle crossing fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashburton District Council</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaikoura District Council</td>
<td>$320.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timaru District Council</td>
<td>Services consent</td>
<td>application $350.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inspection fee per inspection $175.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retrospective approval $175.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT FOR DECISION
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Joanne McBride, Roading & Transport Manager

SUBJECT: Staff Submission to recommend changes to the Roading Capital Works Budget in the 2018-28 Long Term Plan

SIGNED BY:

Department Manager

Chief Executive

1. SUMMARY

1.1. This report is to seek Council approval to make changes to the Roading capital works budgets in the 2018-28 Long Term Plan.

1.2. The purpose of the changes is primarily to minimise the risk of having to carry over funding at the end of the 2018/19 year. The changes will in no way impact on the planning and delivery of the projects.

1.3. Table 1 details the recommended changes.

1.4. The changes generally consist of moving budgets to outer years to create a higher degree of certainty that the Council will meet its annual Capital works budget and minimise carry overs. Some are the result of more accurate information now being available from when the draft LTP was developed.

1.5. These changes in no way reflect the importance with which these projects are viewed, and all effort will be made to bring projects in on or as close as possible to the original timeframe.

1.6. In particular Skewbridge Road Bridge improvements, Flaxton Road (Lineside Rd to Kingsford Smith Drive) improvements, and Main North Road improvements including the Waimakariri section of the Belfast to Kaiapoi cycleway are vital projects that need to be constructed to meet the expectations of the community and our partners.

1.7. Should project timeframes be met as originally planned, then staff will report back to Council with a request to have funding brought forward as required.

1.8. No changes are proposed to individual project budgets or to the overall capital budget as detailed in the draft LTP.

1.9. Summary of recommended changes are as follows:

- West Kaiapoi Mill Road / Skewbridge Road – some budget in 2018/19 moved to 2019/20. This will allow for planning, design and tendering in the 2018/19 year with construction in 2019/20. Flaxton Road (Lineside Rd to Kingsford Smith Drive) improvements (Southbrook ODP) – Budget now split between the 2018/19 year and the 2019/20 year. It is still planned to complete this project in 2018/19 due to the road condition but there is a small risk that
this may not be able to be achieved and it is preferred to be conservative with the estimated time frame.

- Main North Road improvements including the Waimakariri section of the Belfast to Kaiapoi cycleway – Some budget in 2018/19 moved out to 2019/20 to provide for planning, design and tendering in 18/19 and construction in 2019/20. It is vital this project is coordinated with the NZTA Northern Corridor project.
- Woodend Improvements in conjunction with NZTA PBC and Woodend Bypass – Some budget in 2018/19 moved to outer years to tie in with NZTA's expected programme. Community engagement / consultation and project planning will occur in 2018/19 with construction not likely until 2019/20.
- Rangiora Woodend Road improvements including Boys Road – Some budget in 2018/19 moved to outer years as it is anticipated that achieving a workable solution will take time and is likely to include the need for some property purchase. However other improvements within the existing road corridor will be progressed.
- West Rangiora ODP – Budget, except for the Oxford Road Urbanisation (north side of the road) including a footpath, has been moved from 2018/19 to outer years as it is not expected that development requiring this funding will occur in 2018/19.
- Silverstream Collector Rd (Adderley-Island). Some budget in 2018/19 moved to 2019/20 to reflect the fact property purchase is not yet complete and the construction is likely to be undertaken in two phases.
- Southbrook Road Improvements - Some budget in 2018/19 moved to outer years as it is likely only community engagement and project planning will be completed in 2018/19.
- Land Purchase - Designations for growth – Budget moved to outer years as no land purchases identified.
- Land Purchase – Improved LoS – Budget moved to outer years as no land purchases identified.

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180510051603.

(b) **Approves** the budget changes as shown in the Table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>LTP changes</th>
<th>18/19</th>
<th>19/20</th>
<th>20/21</th>
<th>21/22</th>
<th>22/23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Kaiapoi Mill Rd / Skewbridge Rd</td>
<td>Draft LTP</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>2,044,000</td>
<td>2,611,250</td>
<td>533,750</td>
<td>546,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed Changes</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>2,299,500</td>
<td>2,611,250</td>
<td>533,750</td>
<td>546,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbrook Outline Development Plan (Flaxton Rd Improvements)</td>
<td>Draft LTP</td>
<td>830,417</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed Changes</td>
<td>415,209</td>
<td>424,343</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main North Road improvements including Belfast to Kaiapoi cycleway</td>
<td>Draft LTP</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>766,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed Changes</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>919,800</td>
<td>52,225</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend Improvements in conjunction with NZTA PBC and Woodend Bypass</td>
<td>Draft LTP</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>255,500</td>
<td>130,563</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed Changes</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>255,500</td>
<td>208,900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Woodend Road Improvements including Boys Road</td>
<td>Draft LTP</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>306,600</td>
<td>156,675</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed Changes</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>153,300</td>
<td>261,125</td>
<td>160,125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. BACKGROUND & ISSUES AND OPTIONS

3.1. Some concerns have been expressed that the Roading Capital Works Budget as detailed in the 2018-28 LTP is too optimistic and there is a risk projects will not be delivered to meet the budgets in the timeframe previously indicated. Also more up to date information is now available from when the LTP was first developed.

3.2. As a consequence adjustments to the budgets are proposed. These are summarised in clause 1.9 above and detailed in Table 1 below.

3.3. It is recognised that some of these projects are of particular importance to Council and the Community and it is still hoped to bring these within the original timeframe, while others have a greater degree of uncertainty due to external party involvement, which cannot be confirmed at this early stage.

Should projects progress more quickly than indicated in the revised budget, Council will be requested to bring funding forward to ensure these are able to progress.

(c) Notes that budget may need to be brought forward if work progresses according to the original program.
### Table 1: Proposed Revised Roading Project Budget Timeframes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>LTP changes</th>
<th>18/19</th>
<th>19/20</th>
<th>20/21</th>
<th>21/22</th>
<th>22/23</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Kaiapoi Mill Rd / Skewbridge Rd</td>
<td>Draft LTP</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>2,044,000</td>
<td>2,611,250</td>
<td>533,750</td>
<td>546,050</td>
<td>The budget has been adjusted to allow for project planning, detailed design and tendering in the 2018/19 year with construction in the 2019/20 year. If work progresses quicker than anticipated then a request will be made to bring the funding forward.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed Changes</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>2,299,500</td>
<td>2,611,250</td>
<td>533,750</td>
<td>546,050</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbrook Outline Development Plan (Flaxton Rd Improvements)</td>
<td>Draft LTP</td>
<td>830,417</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>It is important that this project is completed in the 2018/19 year because the road surface and general appearance of the road environment is ‘untidy’ for a main arterial road. However project planning has only just started and stakeholder engagement will need to be undertaken and as such there is a risk the project may not be completed in 2018/19. A conservative approach has been taken to move some budget to 2019/20 however all efforts will be made to complete the project in 2018/19.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed Changes</td>
<td>415,209</td>
<td>424,343</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main North Road improvements including Belfast to Kaiapoi cycleway</td>
<td>Draft LTP</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>766,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This project is being planned and coordinated with NZTA and the Northern Corridor Project. It is essential this project is completed at the same time that the Northern Corridor and its associated cycleway so the Belfast to Kaiapoi cycleway is continuous from the day the new corridor is completed. Completion is expected by mid-2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed Changes</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>919,800</td>
<td>52,225</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend Improvements in conjunction with NZTA PBC and Woodend Bypass</td>
<td>Draft LTP</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>255,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>130,563</td>
<td></td>
<td>The funding in the 2018/19 to 2020/21 year is for local road improvements in conjunction with NZTA Main North Road improvements. It is anticipated that only project planning and community engagement and consultation will happen in the 2018/19 year and so the budget has been adjusted accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed Changes</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>255,500</td>
<td>208,900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Draft LTP</td>
<td>Proposed Changes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Woodend Road Improvements including Boys Road</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>306,600</td>
<td>153,300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>156,675</td>
<td>261,125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>160,125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The budget has been adjusted to allow for project planning and community engagement to happen in 2018/19 with construction later. It is anticipated some property purchase may be required to get a workable solution and so this will take time to work through. However improvements within the existing corridor will be investigated and implemented if they provided safety benefits.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Rangiora Outline Development Plan</td>
<td>$456,592</td>
<td>280,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$228,296</td>
<td>233,319</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>228,296</td>
<td>238,455</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>228,296</td>
<td>243,706</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>442,178</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The only work that is identified and committed for this budget is the Oxford Road Urbanisation (north side of the road) including footpath, so only sufficient budget to complete this work has been retained in 2018/19. The remaining budget is dependent on development in the west Rangiora area and at this stage no developments are planned for the 2018/19 year. Funding of $176,592 has been moved out to 2022/23 year (year 5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silverstream Collector Rd (Adderley-Island)</td>
<td>1,901,868</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>921,709</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property purchase is not yet complete and the construction is likely to be undertaken in two phases. Budget adjusted to reflect expected timing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbrook Road Improvements</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>255,500</td>
<td>51,100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>130,563</td>
<td>78,338</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>266,875</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>109,210</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some budget in 2018/19 moved to outer years as it is likely only community engagement and project planning will be completed in 2018/19.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Purchase - Designations for growth</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>106,750</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>104,450</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>109,210</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At this stage no property purchase requirements have been identified for 2018/19.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Purchase – Improved LoS</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>106,750</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>104,450</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>109,210</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At this stage no property purchase requirements have been identified for 2018/19.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1. Options are for the Council to either make no change to the original LTP funding or to accept the proposed changes.

4.2. No change to original LTP funding – this is not recommended because circumstances have changed since the LTP was developed and a more conservative approach to the budgeting is now recommended.

4.3. Accept proposed changes as detailed in Table 1 above – this is recommended because it is considered a more realistic budget and it will minimise carry overs at year end.

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

5. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

5.1. **Groups and Organisations**

5.2. Some projects will need to be timed to coordinate with projects being undertaken by other agencies.

5.3. **Wider Community**

5.4. No community feedback has been sought on these changes

6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**

6.2. See above.

6.3. **Community Implications**

6.4. Some projects may not commence or be completed in the originally expected timeframe.

6.5. **Risk Management**

6.6. Normal construction risks will apply.

6.7. **Health and Safety**

6.8. As per standard tendering process of any physical works, the contractor will be assessed for Health & Safety and required to provide a Site Specific Health & Safety Plan for approval prior to work commencing on site.

7. **CONTEXT**

7.1. **Policy**

This matter is a matter of significance in terms of the Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.
7.2. **Legislation**

The Land Transport Management Act and Local Government Act are relevant in this matter.

7.3. **Community Outcomes**

This report consider the following outcomes:

**There is a safe environment for all**
- Harm to people from natural and man-made hazards is minimised.
- Our district has the capacity and resilience to quickly recover from natural disasters and adapt to the effects of climate change.
- Crime, injury and harm from road crashes, gambling, and alcohol abuse are minimised.

**Transport is accessible, convenient, reliable and sustainable**
- The standard of our District’s roads is keeping pace with increasing traffic numbers.
- Communities in our District are well linked with each other and Christchurch is readily accessible by a range of transport modes.

7.4. **Delegations**

(d) The Council has the delegated authority to add or amend budgets.
1. SUMMARY

1.1. This report is to provide a request for changes to the 2018-28 Long Term Plan regarding Drainage budgets.

1.2. The following items are addressed:

Drainage:
- Drainage Improvements at West Station Road, Oxford.
- Siena Place and Sillano Place Drainage Improvements.
- Drainage Maintenance Contract, Project Management
- Maintenance Works Reserve Fund Ohoka, Central, Clarkville and Coastal Rural Drainage Rating Areas
- Zone Implementation Programme Minor Capital Works
- Flaxton Road Urbanisation.
- Pond C remedial works.
- Changes to Existing Capital Works Budgets
- Mandeville and Waikuku Beach Drainage Issues

Attachments:

i. Siena, Sillano Drainage Works Report (Trim: DRA-06-02-01 /180419042535 - V2)

ii. Draft LTP Drainage Commentary (Trim: 171124127869)

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180514052798.

(b) Approves a new capital works budget of $80,000 in 18/19 for drainage improvements at West Station Road (Main Street), Oxford under the Oxford urban drainage account.

(c) Notes that this has an increase on the Oxford Urban Drainage rate of $6.5% or $7.63 per property
(d) Notes that the following works, referred to in the draft LTP Drainage Commentary (Trim No 171124127869) are programmed to be undertaken in Oxford in 17/18 and 18/19 using existing approved drainage budgets.

- Matai Place Soakpit - 17/18 minor improvement works.
- Kowhai Ave Overland Flow - 18/19 minor improvement works

(e) Notes that flooding in Burnett Street will be investigated to determine the cause and extent of the problem. Drainage staff will request further budget from Council if required.

(f) Notes that improvements at Siena Place and Sillano Place, Mandeville, will be carried out in 18/19 under the existing Flood Response drainage account.

(g) Notes that improvements at Siena Place and Sillano Place, Mandeville will have no financial impact on the Ohoka Rural Drainage budgets.

(h) Notes that remaining portion of the improvements at Siena Place and Sillano Place, will be funded from existing approved Roading budgets.

(i) Approves additional annual budget of $96,000 from 18/19 to cover Project Management fees in the Drainage Maintenance Contract.

(j) Notes that additional annual budget of $96,000 from 18/19 to cover Project Management fees in the Drainage Maintenance Contract will increase drainage rates within the rural drainage schemes, by $5.00 per property.

(k) Approves new budgets on the Ohoka Rural drainage scheme of $15,500 p.a., Central Rural drainage scheme of $7,500 p.a., Coastal Rural drainage scheme of $8,500 p.a. and Clarkville Rural drainage scheme of $3,500 p.a. to build up a Maintenance Works Reserve Fund over 10 years. Notes that this has an increase per property on the Ohoka, Central, Coastal, and Clarkville Rural drainage schemes rates as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clarkville</td>
<td>19.06</td>
<td>18.38</td>
<td>17.31</td>
<td>16.22</td>
<td>15.13</td>
<td>14.19</td>
<td>13.28</td>
<td>12.49</td>
<td>11.64</td>
<td>10.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Rural</td>
<td>8.64</td>
<td>8.28</td>
<td>7.83</td>
<td>7.37</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.48</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>4.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(l) Approves a new budget of $100,000 in 19/20 and $100,000 in 20/21 of the LTP under the District Drainage account (previously referred to as the Flood Response account) for Zone Implementation Plan Addendum minor capital works.

(m) Notes that this has no overall impact on rates as existing Flood Response projects have been deferred as per recommendation (p).

(n) Approves a new capital works renewal budget of $100,000 in 18/19, for drainage upgrades as part of the Flaxton Road Urbanisation.

(o) Notes that this has an increase on the Rangiora Urban Drainage rate of 0.5% or $1.27 per property

(p) Approves an additional drainage maintenance budget of $190,000 in 19/20 for Pond C remedial works.
(q) **Notes** that this has an increase on the Rangiora Urban Drainage rate of $0.9% or $2.37 per property

(r) **Notes** this budget estimate is based on the sediment being uncontaminated and able to be taken to a local landfill site. If tests show that the sediment is contaminated the budget may need to be increased to allow for disposal at Kate Valley. This will cost considerably more money. Staff may need to request more budget from the Council if the sediment is found to be contaminated.

(s) **Approves** deferring the following drainage capital works budgets.

(t) **Notes** that a number of capital works and developer lead projects are being moved out to allow full project plans and investigations to be completed. Staff can manage this by reprioritising existing projects to better align with resource availability and Council long term infrastructure requirements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project ID</th>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Changes</th>
<th>New Budget Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>URD0012</td>
<td>Rangiora Urban</td>
<td>North Drain Ashgrove Park</td>
<td>Budget deferred for 3 years to 21/22</td>
<td>$300,000 each year in 26/27 and 27/28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URD0014</td>
<td>Rangiora Urban</td>
<td>Middlebrook Enhancement / Pond</td>
<td>Budget deferred for 3 years to 21/22</td>
<td>$180,000 in 21/22 and $200,000 in 26/27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URD0017</td>
<td>Rangiora Urban</td>
<td>Blackett St piping</td>
<td>Budget deferred for 4 years to 22/23</td>
<td>$50,000 in 22/23 and $323,500 in 23/24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URD0023</td>
<td>Rangiora Urban</td>
<td>Palmer / Church Pipework Upgrade</td>
<td>budget deferred for 3 years to 20/21</td>
<td>$70,000 in 20/21, $379,000 in 22/23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URD0031</td>
<td>Rangiora Urban</td>
<td>North Brook - Enhancement Work</td>
<td>Budget deferred for 3 year to 21/22</td>
<td>$50,000 in 21/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URD0037</td>
<td>Rangiora Urban</td>
<td>Todds Road SW Pond</td>
<td>Budget deferred for 2 years to 23/24</td>
<td>$935,000 in 23/24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URD0043</td>
<td>Coastal Urban</td>
<td>Pines Kairaki Upgrade</td>
<td>Budget deferred for 2 years to 21/22</td>
<td>$353,300 in 21/22, $125,000 in 22/23, $125,000 in 23/24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URD0044</td>
<td>Coastal Urban</td>
<td>East Woodend Detention Pond 2.5Ha</td>
<td>Budget deferred for 2 years to 21/22</td>
<td>$150,000 in 21/22,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URD0068</td>
<td>Kaiapoi Urban</td>
<td>Pond areas 1&amp;2; Land purchase</td>
<td>Budget deferred for 1 year to 19/20</td>
<td>$1.856 m in 20/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URD0071</td>
<td>Kaiapoi Urban</td>
<td>Parnhams Drain Catchment Improvements</td>
<td>Budget deferred for 4 year to 22/23</td>
<td>$600,000 in 22/23, $3.0 m in 23/24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URD001</td>
<td>Flood Response</td>
<td>Flood Response Rangiora - Lehmans Road Stage 2</td>
<td>Budget deferred for 3 years to 27/28</td>
<td>$375,000 in 27/28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URD002</td>
<td>Ohoka Rural</td>
<td>Wetherfield Lane Improvements</td>
<td>Budget partially deferred for 2 years to 20/21</td>
<td>$100 in 21/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URD003</td>
<td>Flood Response</td>
<td>Flood Response Rural Areas - Cones Road</td>
<td>Budget deferred for 2 years to 21/22</td>
<td>$100,000 in 20/21,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENTS AT WEST STATION ROAD, OXFORD

REASON IT WAS NOT INCLUDED IN THE LTP

3.1. Staff were aware of an issue in this area following the July 2017 flood event. At the time of the draft LTP it was noted that staff may need to request budget for works in the Oxford area.

3.2. Storm events in February and March 2018 (after the LTP) resulted in further flooding of at least three properties in the area.

RISK OF NOT ADOPTING THE RECOMMENDATION

3.3. Further flooding will occur on the three properties involved which may lead to further property damage.

ISSUES AND OPTIONS

3.4. Flooding has been reported at 150, 148 and 146 A, Main Street. Moderate storm events have resulted in flood water running in a south-easterly direction from the mill site through three private properties.
3.5. This area of Oxford has a history of flooding however previous attempts by the owner of the mill site to control stormwater runoff, were unsuccessful. There is an existing soak pit located in the southeast corner of the mill site which is not functioning properly. The owner of the mill confirmed that the existing soak pit was originally excavated to a depth greater than 3m, however free draining gravels were not encountered. It is unlikely that the soakpit has ever been successful.

3.6. The three houses affected by flooding are located in an overland flood flow path as shown by the blue shaded area. The flow is cut off by a low fence at the driveway of 146 A Main Street, where it runs down the drive to Main Street.
3.7. The elderly resident of 146 A Main Street, reported that her garage gets flooded regularly and the water is frequently around the house.

3.8. Drainage staff have investigated the flooding and have concluded that excavating another soak pit may be beneficial however it is unlikely to provide a permanent solution.

3.9. Investigations undertaken by the Project Delivery Unit have shown that a 300mm pipe could be installed from the southeast corner of the mill site to a new bubble up sump in Main Street, approximately 30m east of West Station Road.

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

COMMUNITY VIEWS

Groups and Organisations

3.11. No community groups have been consulted on this matter.

Wider Community

3.12. Recent flooding in Oxford has highlighted a number of drainage deficiencies in the town. A number of service requests relating to this issue, have been received after the Draft LTP was approved by Council.
FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

Financial Implications

3.13. The cost of installing a new 300mm Stormwater pipe is estimated at $73,000 including engineering fees and project Contingency. This would increase the Oxford urban Drainage Rate by rate of $6.5% or $7.63 per property.

3.14. Community Implications

3.15. This is not a private matter that can be resolved by the affected landowners. The community expect that the Council will take the lead in addressing the problem.

Risk Management

3.16. There is a risk that of further flood events which could cause damage to property.

Health and Safety

3.17. The project will undergo a ‘safety in design’ audit procedure to ensure the final design meets WDC Health and Safety standards.

CONTEXT

Policy

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

LEGISLATION

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

COMMUNITY OUTCOMES

3.20. There is a healthy and sustainable environment for all

3.21. Core utility services are provided in a timely and sustainable manner

DELEGATIONS

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

4. SIENA/SILLANO DRAINAGE WORKS

REASON IT WAS NOT INCLUDED IN THE DRAFT ANNUAL PLAN

4.1. This issue has been reported to Council at the 1 May 2018 Council Meeting. A copy of the report Trim No 180419042535(v2) is attached to this report.

4.2. Mandeville has been experiencing high ground water conditions since mid-2017. The problem is well known and being monitored by drainage staff. The water table has remained high throughout the summer months and unlikely to subside over winter, therefore drainage works are required to address the situation.
RISK OF NOT ADOPTING THE RECOMMENDATION

4.3. Concerns from the residents/landowners will not be addressed in a timely manner and further damage to the road surface is likely.

ISSUES AND OPTIONS

4.4. The Mandeville area was significantly affected by heavy rainfall events and high groundwater levels in June and July 2014, and again in July and August 2017. A number of Siena and Sillano Place residents have reported stagnant water and insects through the latter half of 2017 and into 2018.

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

4.6. In response to calls from residents, Council staff engaged Beca to investigate and report on a number of flooding and groundwater resurgence issues in the Mandeville area – refer Attachment i - Siena Place and Sillano Place Drainage Report. Trim No 180419042535 (v2)

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

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

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

COMMUNITY VIEWS

Groups and Organisations

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

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

4.12. Individual property owners will be consulted with, where the works directly relate to their property, before proceeding.

Wider Community

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

Financial Implications

The Cost estimate for this work and proposed funding split is shown in Table 1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Estimates</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction Estimate</td>
<td>$106,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Fees</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project contingency</td>
<td>$34,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$150,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Split</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ohoka Rural Drainage</td>
<td>$94,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roading WDC</td>
<td>$28,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roading NZTA</td>
<td>$28,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1

4.14. The Drainage portion of the work will be funded from existing approved flood response budgets therefore will have no rate implications.

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

Community Implications

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

Risk Management

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

Health and Safety

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

Policy

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

Legislation

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

Community Outcomes

4.21. There is a healthy and sustainable environment for all

4.22. Core utility services are provided in a timely and sustainable manner

Delegations

4.23. Council approval of the budget is not required as this is previously approved capital expenditure.

5. DRAINAGE MAINTENANCE CONTRACT PROJECT MANAGEMENT

REASON IT WAS NOT INCLUDED IN THE DRAFT ANNUAL PLAN

5.1. The draft drainage budget for the LTP was completed in September. At that point in time the contract documentation for the new drainage maintenance contract was still under development. With one of the objectives of the contract being to move responsibility for inspection and maintenance programming, and day to day direction of the work, away from staff and to the contractor, it was known that there would be some cost, but the quantum was unknown. Given the uncertainty at the time, a figure was not put into the budget as it would most likely have been incorrect, and therefore been the subject of this staff submission anyway.

5.2. A priced schedule was not finally received from the contractor until 20 February

RISK OF NOT ADOPTING THE RECOMMENDATION

5.3. The recommendations of the report to management team (TRIM 180213014265) seeking approval to expand the Sicon road maintenance contract to include rural drainage maintenance noted that if the application to Council for the additional funding was not successful “the scope of the work to be carried out by Sicon may have to be re-negotiated, under the constraint of the $550,000 budget”.

5.4. (The report was subsequently reported to Utilities and Roading Committee for information)

5.5. There are two potential areas of the contract that re-negotiation could focus on.

5.6. The first is the drain inspection and programming. The key objective of moving the responsibility for day to day management of the contract to the contractor was motivated by:
5.6.1. The increasing difficulties drainage staff were having in keeping on top of customer service requests. These have increased significantly over the past few years, and;

5.6.2. The body of other drainage work that increasingly was not being attended to. Most importantly the monitoring for consent compliance of the district’s stormwater management areas, which is not having sufficient time given to it, puts the Council at risk of not meeting its consent compliance performance indicators.

5.7. If the additional funds are not approved and the project management component of the contract is removed, this role remains with drainage department staff, and no progress will be made on consent compliance issues or in meeting levels of service with respect to customer service requests.

5.8. The second potential area for renegotiation is the amount of drainage maintenance carried out. If inspection and programming is to be funded from within the current contract budget of $550,000 per annum, then the amount of drainage maintenance carried out will be reduced by approximately 17%. As Sicon becomes familiar with the work required, it is anticipated that they will be able to make some efficiency gains, and this loss would be reduced, but it would be premature to try and estimate how much improvement would occur.

5.9. A 17% reduction in drain maintenance carried out per annum is significant and could be expected to mean that levels of service, expectations for which are increasing within the community anyway, would not be met.

5.10. It is worth noting that while the current contract budget has been set at $550,000 p.a., in responding to wet weather events the actual per annum spending has varied considerably from this amount. Post the 2014 flood event, expenditure rose considerably, and has been trending down since, but it is not expected to fall to the pre-2014 levels. This is driven by an increased sensitivity and expectation around levels of service that it is not anticipated to decrease in the future.

ISSUES AND OPTIONS

5.11. With the coming to the end of the previous drainage maintenance contract, the opportunity was taken to consider changing the way the contract was managed. Having staff directing the contractor on a day to day basis was not considered in the long term to be the best method of managing the drainage maintenance contract. Ultimately this change is going to come at a cost which has now been quantified.

5.12. If the funding is not approved, the contract will be renegotiated. The shortfall could be made up by either:

5.12.1. Removing the management component of the contract, which is the status quo option, and management of the contract would continue to be handled by drainage staff. Dealing with service requests would continue to be problematic, and risks would remain with consent compliance issues, or;

5.12.2. Reducing the amount of drainage maintenance carried out in the field, which would mean that current levels of service would be reduced.

5.13. Neither of these options would meet community expectations regarding drainage maintenance, and Council’s ability to respond promptly to customer service requests.

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

Groups and Organisations

5.15. No consultation has taken place regarding the additional funding required, but with respect to the contract itself, when it became known that the contract with Michael Stopforth Contracting was coming to an end, the Rununga and the Drainage advisory groups all expressed the view that Michael Stopforth Contracting had provided a high level of service, which they would not wish to see reduced. The final contract arrangement has Michael Stopforth Contracting acting as subcontractor to the new contractor, Sicon.

Wider Community

5.16. The Community expects a high level of service and the additional project management component of the contract better allows the drainage department to deliver this.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

Financial Implications

5.17. The additional funding sought is $96,000. Since the cost is to fund a contract overhead, it would be recovered across all the drainage schemes. The increase will amount, on average across the 19,300 properties within rural drainage schemes, to $5.00 per property.

Community Implications

5.18. There are no wider community implications. Affected ratepayers are only those within rural drainage scheme boundaries.

Risk Management

5.19. If the funding is not approved, risks to be managed include Council’s ability to meet existing levels of service, and risk of non-compliance with its drainage consents.

Health and Safety

5.20. There are no health and safety issues associated with this decision.

CONTEXT

Policy

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

Legislation

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

6. Community Outcomes

6.1. There is a healthy and sustainable environment for all

6.2. Core utility services are provided in a timely and sustainable manner
Delegations

6.3. As this is unbudgeted operational expenditure, Council approval of the budget through the LTP, is required for this work to proceed.

7. DRAINAGE MAINTENANCE INCREASED OVER 10 YEARS IN OHOKA, CENTRAL COASTAL AND CLARKVILLE RURAL DRAINAGE SCHEMES

REASON IT WAS NOT INCLUDED IN THE DRAFT LTP

7.1. The Draft LTP drainage budgets were presented to the Drainage Advisory Groups for their consideration and feedback. The Ohoka Rural, Central Rural, Coastal Rural and Clarkville committees requested that a Maintenance Works Reserve Fund be built up over 10 years.

7.2. RISK OF NOT ADOPTING THE RECOMMENDATION

7.3. There is a risk that adverse weather events such as rain and wind storms or warm wet conditions, will require increased maintenance works. There would be inadequate funds to carry out the required drainage maintenance and repairs within these drainage rating areas.

ISSUES AND OPTIONS

7.4. The Ohoka, Central Rural Coastal Rural and Clarkville Rural Drainage Maintenance Budgets are likely to be over spent this year given the warm wet conditions during the 17/18 summer. Rampant macrophyte growth has required some drains to be cleaned more frequently than usual. In addition to this, high water levels in the drains that Council maintains has increase the number of service requests from the public relating to drain cleaning.

Table 1 Maintenance Budget Expenditure as at March 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budgeted Expenditure</th>
<th>Actual Expenditure</th>
<th>Budgeted Expenditure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17/18</td>
<td>% Spent at March</td>
<td>18/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohoka</td>
<td>150,290</td>
<td>101%</td>
<td>159,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarkville</td>
<td>33,610</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>34,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Rural</td>
<td>83,360</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>84,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Rural</td>
<td>73,050</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>74,440</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.5. The Council could choose to adopt the drainage rates in the draft LTP however it is likely that there would be a deficit in the Ohoka drainage maintenance budget.

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

COMMUNITY VIEWS

Groups and Organisations

7.7. The Ohoka, Central Rural Coastal Rural and Clarkville Rural Drainage Advisory Groups have expressed a wish that the drainage rate is set such that the drainage maintenance account builds up to a credit approximately equivalent to 1 year’s drainage maintenance expenditure.

Wider Community
7.8. The wider community have not been consulted on this matter however there is widespread interest in the condition and health of waterways. Service request from members of the community have steadily increased over the last 5 years.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

**Financial Implications**

7.9. Adopting the recommendation to increase the Ohoka, Central Rural Coastal Rural and Clarkville Rural Drainage rates will increase the rate as follows:

**Table 1 – Current Average Rates for Ohoka, Clarkville, Coastal Rural and Central Rural**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>18/19</th>
<th>19/20</th>
<th>20/21</th>
<th>21/22</th>
<th>22/23</th>
<th>23/24</th>
<th>24/25</th>
<th>25/26</th>
<th>26/27</th>
<th>27/28</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ohoka</td>
<td>208.64</td>
<td>231.42</td>
<td>269.75</td>
<td>275.37</td>
<td>277.85</td>
<td>280.34</td>
<td>282.41</td>
<td>284.54</td>
<td>286.80</td>
<td>289.00</td>
<td>291.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarkville</td>
<td>244.78</td>
<td>251.82</td>
<td>256.44</td>
<td>262.16</td>
<td>267.79</td>
<td>273.08</td>
<td>278.13</td>
<td>278.01</td>
<td>278.20</td>
<td>278.62</td>
<td>279.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Rural</td>
<td>179.02</td>
<td>205.54</td>
<td>220.86</td>
<td>225.43</td>
<td>227.13</td>
<td>228.85</td>
<td>229.78</td>
<td>230.95</td>
<td>230.69</td>
<td>232.35</td>
<td>232.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Rural</td>
<td>111.41</td>
<td>135.42</td>
<td>122.19</td>
<td>121.50</td>
<td>121.16</td>
<td>121.01</td>
<td>120.86</td>
<td>120.86</td>
<td>121.01</td>
<td>121.20</td>
<td>121.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2 – Revised Average Rates for Ohoka, Clarkville, Coastal Rural and Central Rural (with Maintenance Works Reserve Fund)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>18/19</th>
<th>19/20</th>
<th>20/21</th>
<th>21/22</th>
<th>22/23</th>
<th>23/24</th>
<th>24/25</th>
<th>25/26</th>
<th>26/27</th>
<th>27/28</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ohoka</td>
<td>208.64</td>
<td>245.71</td>
<td>284.24</td>
<td>289.78</td>
<td>292.20</td>
<td>294.58</td>
<td>296.56</td>
<td>298.59</td>
<td>300.75</td>
<td>302.88</td>
<td>305.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarkville</td>
<td>244.78</td>
<td>270.88</td>
<td>274.82</td>
<td>279.47</td>
<td>284.01</td>
<td>288.21</td>
<td>292.32</td>
<td>291.29</td>
<td>290.69</td>
<td>290.26</td>
<td>290.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Rural</td>
<td>179.02</td>
<td>220.72</td>
<td>236.09</td>
<td>240.41</td>
<td>241.86</td>
<td>243.39</td>
<td>244.08</td>
<td>244.98</td>
<td>244.52</td>
<td>245.95</td>
<td>246.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Rural</td>
<td>111.41</td>
<td>144.06</td>
<td>130.47</td>
<td>129.33</td>
<td>128.53</td>
<td>127.91</td>
<td>126.92</td>
<td>126.65</td>
<td>126.46</td>
<td>126.46</td>
<td>126.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3 – Increase in Average Rates for Ohoka, Clarkville, Coastal Rural and Central Rural (with Maintenance Works Reserve Fund)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>18/19</th>
<th>19/20</th>
<th>20/21</th>
<th>21/22</th>
<th>22/23</th>
<th>23/24</th>
<th>24/25</th>
<th>25/26</th>
<th>26/27</th>
<th>27/28</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clarkville</td>
<td>19.06</td>
<td>18.38</td>
<td>17.31</td>
<td>16.22</td>
<td>15.13</td>
<td>14.19</td>
<td>13.28</td>
<td>12.49</td>
<td>11.64</td>
<td>10.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Rural</td>
<td>8.64</td>
<td>8.28</td>
<td>7.83</td>
<td>7.37</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.48</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4 – Percentage in Average Rates for Ohoka, Clarkville, Coastal Rural and Central Rural (with Maintenance Works Reserve Fund)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>18/19</th>
<th>19/20</th>
<th>20/21</th>
<th>21/22</th>
<th>22/23</th>
<th>23/24</th>
<th>24/25</th>
<th>25/26</th>
<th>26/27</th>
<th>27/28</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ohoka</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarkville</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Rural</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Rural</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Community Implications

7.10. There are no wider community implications. Affected ratepayers are only those within rural drainage scheme boundaries

Risk Management

7.11. There is a risk that the scheme will not have enough funds to carry out all of the required drainage maintenance there is a major storm event.

Health and Safety

7.12. The drainage maintenance contract is required to be ‘Site Wise’ accredited and operate under an approved Health and Safety Plan.

CONTEXT

Policy

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

Legislation

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

Community Outcomes

7.15. There is a healthy and sustainable environment for all

7.16. Core utility services are provided in a timely and sustainable manner

Delegations

7.17. The Council has delegated authority to approve rate changes.

8. ZONE IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAMME MINOR CAPITAL WORKS

REASON IT WAS NOT INCLUDED IN THE DRAFT LTP

8.1. At the time of the Draft LTP it was not clear how much budget needed to be allowed for minor drainage works identified in the Zone Implementation Programme (ZIP).

RISK OF NOT ADOPTING THE RECOMMENDATION

8.2. There is a risk that if this budget is not allowed for in the LTP Council will be unable to undertake works identified in the ZIP.

ISSUES AND OPTIONS

8.3. The Waimakariri Zone Committee are presently producing a Zone Implementation (ZIP) as part of implementing the Canterbury Water Management Strategy (CWMS) in the Waimakariri District. The ZIP recommends actions and approaches for integrated water management solutions to achieve the CWMS principles, targets and goals encompassing environmental, cultural, economic and social outcomes. Funding is required to carry out the works identified in the ZIP.
COMMUNITY VIEWS

Groups and Organisations

8.4. The Waimakariri Zone Committee will request that Council funds and undertakes physical works identified in the ZIP

Wider Community

8.5. The wider community have not been consulted on this matter however there is widespread interest in the condition and health of waterways.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

Financial Implication

8.6. Adopting the recommendation to approve $100,000 in 19/20 and $100,000 in 20/21 will have no impact on rates as the budget is coming from and existing approved budgets already allowed for in the Flood Response budget

Community Implications

8.7. There is a growing expectation in the community that Council should be more actively involved in protecting our waterways and biodiversity.

Risk Management

8.8. Staff will assess and report on risks to Council as projects are identified

Health and Safety

8.9. Safety in Design will be formally considered and documented as part of the design stage for construction works identified in the ZIP.

CONTEXT

Policy

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

Legislation

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

Community Outcomes

8.12. There is a healthy and sustainable environment for all

8.13. Core utility services are provided in a timely and sustainable manner

Delegations

8.14. The Council has delegated authority to approve budget changes.
9. FLAXTON ROAD URBANISATION

REASON IT WAS NOT INCLUDED IN THE DRAFT ANNUAL PLAN

9.1. The budget for this work will be requested in the 18/19 Annual Plan process

RISK OF NOT ADOPTING THE RECOMMENDATION

9.2. If the extra funding is not approved in the 18/19 Annual Plan the drainage work will not be incorporated into the larger Roading project and will need to be carried out at a later stage

ISSUES AND OPTIONS

9.3. The Roading Department are planning to undertake reconstruction and urbanisation of Flaxton Road from Todds Road to Kingsford Smith Drive, Rangiora.(Trim No 180424044820) As a result of the recent growth in Rangiora, and developments in Southbrook, the use of Flaxton Road has changed significantly. The aim of this project is to upgrade and improve Flaxton Road to meet the needs of the adjoining businesses and general road users including walking and cycling provision, street lighting and renewing the carriageway pavement An important part of the project involves enhancing the open drain which presently runs along the west side of Flaxton Road. Design and construction of the project is planned to be undertaken in 18/19.

9.4. Drainage staff request $100,000 budget for upgrading the Flaxton Road open drain in 18/19. A detailed cost estimate has not been prepared however it is likely to be in the order of $100,000.

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

COMMUNITY VIEWS

Groups and Organisations

9.6. No community groups have been consulted on this project yet, however the project plan will include specific consultation in regard to the Flaxton Road drain The Rangiora Keep New Zealand Beautiful Group have expressed an interest in the Project.

Wider Community

9.7. The Community have not been directly engage in consultation however the project will include specific consultation in regard to the Flaxton Road drain

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

Financial Implications

9.8. The cost of upgrading the Flaxton Road drain is likely to be in the order of $100,000. This would increase the Rangiora Urban Drainage Rate by rate of 0.5% or $1.27 per property in 18/19.

Community Implications

9.9. Flaxton Road is a major entrance to Rangiora and traffic volumes are expected to increase with construction of the New Arterial Road. The Community expects a high standard of urban design.
Risk Management

9.10. The project will be overseen by a Project Control Group who will review the management of the project

Health and Safety

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

CONTEXT

Policy

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

Legislation

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

Community Outcomes

9.14. The standard of our District’s roads is keeping pace with increasing traffic numbers.

9.15. Harm to the environment from sewage and stormwater discharges is minimised

Delegations

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

10. POND C REMEDIAL WORKS

REASON IT WAS NOT INCLUDED IN THE DRAFT ANNUAL PLAN

10.1. Investigations have not progressed to a stage where remedial works have been identified, designed and costed.

RISK OF NOT ADOPTING THE RECOMMENDATION

10.2. There is a risk that Council may breach the conditions of its resource consent for Pond C.

ISSUES AND OPTIONS

10.3. Pond C was designed to treat stormwater runoff from the Southbrook Industrial Area. Discolouration of the water at the pond outlet was noticed by staff and members of the public. It was first thought that the problem could be traced back to water fowl remobilising sediment from the bottom of the pond however further investigations identified high sediment loadings from the industrial catchment as another factor

10.4. Opus Consultants who were the designers of the Stormwater Management Area (SMA), were engaged to undertake a survey of the pond. The survey revealed extensive areas of plant die off and natural recolonization with Raupo.
10.5. Subsequently Opus were asked to undertake a sediment survey which identified up to 1300m³ of sediment has accumulated in the pond since it was commissioned in 2013.

10.6. The preliminary estimate to remediate Pond C is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supply and plant RX90 grade plants</td>
<td>Ea.</td>
<td>9,640</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>$96,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove accumulated silt</td>
<td>m³</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>$35</td>
<td>$45,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$141,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Fees</td>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$14,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$31,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$187,308</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.7. Investigations and design will be undertaken in 18/19 and construction will be completed in 19/20.

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

COMMUNITY VIEWS

Groups and Organisations

10.9. No community groups have been consulted on this project at this stage, however The Central Rural Drainage Advisory Group is aware of the issues around the performance of Pond C.

Wider Community

Some members of the public have commented that the discharge from Pond C is cloudy.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

Financial Implications

10.10. There is a risk that the pond could cost more to rehabilitate when the detailed investigation and design has been completed.

10.11. The cost of rehabilitating Pond C is estimated at $190,000 including engineering fees and project Contingency. This would increase the Rangiora urban Drainage Rate by 0.9% or $2.37 per property in 19/20.

10.12. The budget estimate is based on the sediment being uncontaminated and able to be taken to a local landfill site. If tests show that the sediment is contaminated the budget may need to be increased to allow for disposal at Kate Valley. This eventuality has not been costed however it will cost considerably more money and staff will need to request more budget from the Council if the sediment is found to be contaminated.

Community Implications

10.13. The Pond is in a high profile location adjacent to a Major entrance to Rangiora and is of interest to the community.
Risk Management

10.14. Consultation will be undertaken with the contracting industry to establish the most cost effective methods of sediment removal and re planting of the pond.

Health and Safety

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

CONTEXT

Policy

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

Legislation

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

Community Outcomes

10.18. Harm to the environment from sewage and stormwater discharges is minimised

Delegations

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

11. MANDEVILLE AND WAIKUKU BEACH DRAINAGE ISSUES

11.1. Flooding occurred in the Mandeville area in June 2014. In response, Council staff investigated the options of diverting overland flood flows along No 10 Road to the Old Eyre River channel and a diversion along Tram Road to Bradleys Road. In response to submissions from the Mandeville Residents Association, staff have requested that the previously approved budgets for this work, be brought forward as follows: $20,000 in year 3, $100,000 in year 4 and $600,000 in year 5 of the LTP. This is considered appropriate and achievable given the current flood works programme.

11.2. Waikuku Beach residents are experiencing a prolonged period of localised surface flooding/ponding issues. WDC Drainage staff have met with representatives of the community and Ecan to better understand the causes and extent of the drainage problems. Investigation work has been started using existing maintenance budgets. Staff will report to the Utilities and Roading Committee, with recommendations for future works.

Owen Davies
Drainage Asset Manager
3 Waters Team
1. **SUMMARY**

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

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

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

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

**Attachments:**

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

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180419042535

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

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

(d) **Notes** that groundwater is high in this area and this is likely to persist in winter and spring causing damage to the road if the upgrade is delayed.
(e) Circulates this report to the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board for their information.

3. **BACKGROUND**

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

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

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

![Kaiapoi 12 Month Rain Total](image)

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

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

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

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

4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

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

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

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

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. Groups and Organisations

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

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

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

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

6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Estimates</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction Estimate</td>
<td>$106,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Fees</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project contingency</td>
<td>$34,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$150,000.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Split</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ohoka Rural Drainage</td>
<td>$94,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roading WDC</td>
<td>$28,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roading NZTA</td>
<td>$28,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

6.4. **Community Implications**

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

6.6. **Risk Management**

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

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

6.9. **Health and Safety**

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

7. **CONTEXT**

7.1. **Policy**

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

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

7.4. Community Outcomes

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

7.5. Delegations

7.6. As this is unbudgeted capital expenditure, Council approval of the budget through the LTP, is required for this work to proceed.
1. **Introduction**

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

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

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

2. **Catchment description**

The Mandeville area was significantly affected by heavy rainfall events and high ground water levels in June and July 2014, and again in July and August 2017. The preceding wet weather raised the groundwater levels and resulted in resurgent groundwater (springs) operating on a semi-permanent basis. High runoff during 2014, and moderate runoff during 2017 storm events caused significant nuisance flooding of roads and properties. In the case of Siena and Sillano Place, ponded and stagnant water has been observed through the latter half of 2017 and into 2018.
No 10 Road has a reasonably defined road centreline and is taken to be the western extent of the Bradleys Road catchment for design purposes for calculating drain and culvert flows (ie the primary catchment). The upslope catchment extends past Earlys Road, which will contribute to overland flows in large rainfall events. The catchment is very long and narrow when extended to Earlys Road. The ground slopes generally from west to east in the catchment at an approximate grade of 1 in 180.

![Figure 2 - Bradleys Road catchment](image)

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

In 2014 it was identified the stockwater race lacked capacity to carry the design flows calculated from the design storm events and there was significant flooding along the route following the June 2014 rainfall events. The water race was breached along the back boundary of No 60 and 67 Velino Place and No 67 Siena Place and flowed overland through properties on the west side of Siena Place and then down Siena Place to Bradleys Road. The high groundwater level following the June 2014 rainfall events caused significant nuisance flooding and standing water along Siena Place during July and August 2014 which resulted in minor damage to the carriageway. Following the 2014 flood events, Council constructed a drainage channel along the western side of Siena Place, to convey drainage flows to Bradleys Road. The Bradleys Road drain was also increased in capacity following the 2014 flood event. (Refer to Figure 3).

![Figure 3 - Post-2014 drainage channels (thick green) and stockwater race (blue) in Siena Place](image)
The secondary flow paths from Flood Hazard mapping are shown in Figure 4. The northern overland flow path has been cut-off by the San Dona development (particularly evident at Siena Place), and then intercepted by Bradleys Road drain.

![Figure 4 - Overland flow paths from Flood Hazard mapping (100-year event)](image)

3. **July and August 2017**

Resurgent groundwater has been flowing in Mandeville since mid-2017 and continues. Figure 5 shows long term groundwater levels from an Environment Canterbury shallow groundwater monitoring bore (M35/0143) approximately 10km up-gradient of Mandeville. When the groundwater level in well M35/0143 is at 10m below ground level, the water table in Mandeville and Ohoka is generally at or above the ground surface and resurgence flows are likely. It can be seen in Figure 4 that the groundwater level measured in mid-2014 was the highest on record, and the groundwater level at present-day and through 2017 is near that maximum.

![Figure 5 - Long-term groundwater monitoring data](image)
The 2017 resurgence groundwater flow was observed to be flowing strongly through the latter part of 2017 and into 2018. It was observed along the Bradleys Road drain (from the Wards Road SMA), the Siena Place drainage channel and stockwater race, and the channel to the north of Siena Place properties.

![Figure 6 - Resurgence flow at Bradleys Road and Siena Place intersection (October 2017)](image)

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

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

Previous drainage investigations by Council are described below.

Flooding Mitigation Works and Funding DRA-16-02.01 / 141009110892, 2014

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

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

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

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

5. Investigations

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

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

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

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

6. Maintenance issues and localised capacity constraints

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Figure 12 - Weed growth and sediment upstream of Velino Place culvert (October 2017)

Figure 13 - Channel through 100 Siena Place (October 2017)
7. **Maintenance**

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

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

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

8. **Short term upgrade options**

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

1. **Issue c): Replace the existing solid under channel pipe with a new slotted pipe subsoil drain to ensure sufficient drainage is achieved in this area.**

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

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

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

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

10. **Recommendations**

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

10.1. **Maintenance works**

a) Clean culvert at Bradleys road confluence

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

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

10.2. **Short term works**

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

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

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

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

10.3. **Future long term works**

None identified.
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1. UNIT/ACTIVITY SUMMARY

1.1 Overview of Unit/Activity

The Council’s drainage activity provides for the management of stormwater within residential and designated rural areas in the District. Drainage rating is categorised into five urban drainage areas and seven rural drainage areas (listed below). In urban drainage areas the Council owns, maintains and replaces the assets, provides a level of service for asset capacity and maintains certain waterways, while in rural areas Council maintains certain drains and waterways in a functional condition.

Urban Drainage Areas:
- Rangiora
- Coastal (Waikuku Beach, Woodend, Pines/Kairaki)
- Kaiapoi
- Oxford
- Pegasus

Rural Drainage Areas:
- Oxford
- Ohoka
- Cust
- Clarkville
- Coastal
- Central
- Loburn Lea

The activities undertaken to manage the Council’s Drainage assets includes annual maintenance and enhancement of drains and waterways, new and renewal capital works programmes to provide required levels of service (five years in residential areas and ten years in the Rangiora and Kaiapoi Central Business Districts) and replying to drainage enquiries.
The following table summarises the rates movements for each scheme.

### Table 1: Projected Drainage Rates for 2018/19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drainage Schemes</th>
<th>Number of Properties</th>
<th>2017/18 Rates ($/Property)</th>
<th>Predicted 2018/19 LTP Rate from 2017/18 AP ($/Property)</th>
<th>Proposed 2018/19 Rate ($/Property)</th>
<th>Reason for Increase/Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>7,355</td>
<td>$194</td>
<td>$179</td>
<td>$203</td>
<td>Operating costs increased and growth was less than previously predicted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Urban</td>
<td>1,666</td>
<td>$182</td>
<td>$136</td>
<td>$187</td>
<td>Growth was less than expected therefore predicted drop in rate not realized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pegasus</td>
<td>1,496</td>
<td>$233</td>
<td>$228</td>
<td>$234</td>
<td>No significant change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
<td>5,024</td>
<td>$345</td>
<td>$338</td>
<td>$347</td>
<td>No significant change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Urban</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>$140</td>
<td>$103</td>
<td>$117</td>
<td>Increase in rated properties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohoka Rural</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>$209</td>
<td>$229</td>
<td>$198</td>
<td>Increase in rated properties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loburn Lea Rural</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>$545</td>
<td>$551</td>
<td>$548</td>
<td>No significant change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Rural</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>$95</td>
<td>$95</td>
<td>$102</td>
<td>Increase in operations costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarkville Rural</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>$245</td>
<td>$254</td>
<td>$246</td>
<td>No significant change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Rural</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>$179</td>
<td>$188</td>
<td>$223</td>
<td>Increase in drain maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Rural</td>
<td>1003</td>
<td>$111</td>
<td>$109</td>
<td>$123</td>
<td>Drop in rated properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cust Rural</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$314</td>
<td>$229</td>
<td>$412</td>
<td>Decrease in No. of rated properties</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1.2 Key Issues to Consider

- Capital works expenditure is mainly focused on Rangiora, Kaiapoi and Flood Response projects to address known flooding areas, as identified and already allowed for in the LTP.
• A new operating allowance of $150,000 has been added to the Flood Response budget. This sum increases the existing district wide flood rate to deal with areas that are not currently in a drainage rated area that contribute to downstream issues in a flood event. As covered in the 3 Waters Alternative Rating Structure Report (refer Trim No 170721076345), this will add $6 per property to the flood rate and charged through General Rates. Further background on this proposed additional budget is covered in a separate report.

• Drain maintenance budgets include for the use of herbicide sprays for controlling weeds in the drainage network. An outright ban on glyphosate based herbicides will affect the drainage maintenance costs. The increased cost of maintenance across the Council is presented in a separate report for consideration.

• Oxford experienced surface flooding during the July and August storm events. This identified a number of issues in the Main Street, Burnett Street, Matai Place and Kowhai Street areas that are currently being investigated assessed. No additional capital works budgets have been allowed for in the draft LTP, but will be added if necessary as part of a staff submission.

• Network discharge consents - Network discharge consents for all reticulated urban stormwater networks are required under provisions of the Land and Water Regional Plan (LWRP). The Rangiora network consent will be lodged with Environment Canterbury in December. High levels of zinc has been detected in the Middle Brook which need to be addressed under the new consent. Work is underway to identify the source(s) and there is some budget provisions to address this work. However, the full extent of upgrades necessary to comply with the water quality requirements of the LWRP is still unknown.
## 2. OPERATING BUDGET – BUDGET IMPLICATIONS

### 2.1 2018-19 Operating Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Approved AP 2017/18 ($000)</th>
<th>Proposed LTP 2018/19 ($000)</th>
<th>Describe Change</th>
<th>Service Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct Expenditure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>1,278</td>
<td>1,288</td>
<td>10 Insurance ($10k)</td>
<td>Nil – no change to maintenance budgets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Urban</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>32 Operations ($4k), Interest ($8k), Depreciation ($34k), Indirect ($3k)</td>
<td>Nil – no change to maintenance budgets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pegasus</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>Nil – no change to maintenance budgets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
<td>1,262</td>
<td>1,348</td>
<td>86 Operations ($26k), Insurance ($12k) Maintenance ($8k), Interest (-$31k), Depreciation ($74k)</td>
<td>Nil – reduction in maintenance relates to basin no vested yet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Nil – no change to maintenance budgets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohoka Rural</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>-17 Operations ($5k), Depreciation (-$7k)</td>
<td>Nil – no change to maintenance budgets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loburn Lea Rural</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4 Depreciation ($4k)</td>
<td>Nil – no change to maintenance budgets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Rural</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2 No notable change.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarkville Rural</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2 No notable change.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Rural</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>-1 No notable change.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Rural</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>3 No notable change.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cust Rural</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2 Depreciation ($2k)</td>
<td>Nil – no change to maintenance budgets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Response</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>238 Asset management ($50k), Maintenance ($100k), Interest ($88k)</td>
<td>Allows for investigation and maintenance works to be</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
undertaken in non-rated drainage areas.

Direct Income
Refer to budget sheets

2.2 Longer Term 2018-19 – 2027-28 Operating Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Value ($000)</th>
<th>Describe Change</th>
<th>Service Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct Expenditure</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. CAPITAL BUDGET

3.1 2018/19 Capital Budgets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Approved AP 2017-18 ($000)</th>
<th>Proposed LTP 2018-19 ($000)</th>
<th>Describe project</th>
<th>Service Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Replacements/Renewals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New levels of service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Response Rural Areas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Improvements to the Dockey Creek in Mairaki Downs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Value ($000s)</td>
<td>Describe project</td>
<td>Service Implications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Parnhams Drain Catchment Improvements</em></td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>Construction of new pump station on west side of motorway. Budget for construction pushed out to 2019/20.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New works growth</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Todd's Road SW Pond</em></td>
<td>935</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Stormwater pond to service commercial area West of Todd's Road, Rangiora. Pushed out to 2021/22 as development unlikely next financial year.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>West Kaiapoi Ponds</em></td>
<td>2,063</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Stormwater ponds to service Kaiapoi West ODP are north-east of Island Road. Pushed out to 2019/20 as development unlikely next financial year.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Mill Road SMA</em></td>
<td>300</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>Cost of Land Purchase ($350k) based on current rates moved to 2018/19 and construction costs ($300k) pushed out to 2021/22.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Capital (ALL)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.2 Longer Term 2018-19 – 2027-28 Capital Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Value ($000s)</th>
<th>Describe project</th>
<th>Service Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Replacements/ Renewals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New levels of service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Works</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. **LONG TERM PLAN ISSUES**

5. **FEES AND CHARGES INCOME**

6. **RECOMMENDATIONS**

THAT the Council:

(a) **Approves** the draft LTP drainage budget for the 2018-2028.
1. **SUMMARY**

1.1. This report is to provide a request for changes to the 2018-28 Long Term Plan regarding the water supply budgets.

1.2. Each of the submissions is stand-alone, and should be considered on its merits. The justification for each separate issue is given for each submission, in order for them to be debated separately.

1.3. Table 1 shows the items that are addressed and the effect that these changes are projected to have on rates and development contributions.

1.4. The changes generally fit into one of the following categories:

1.4.1. Modification to UV treatment installation budgets. These budgets were initially a late addition to the draft Long Term Plan in response to recommendations in the Havelock North Inquiry Stage 2 Report which was released in December 2017, and are required to be increased substantially following site specific advice from Beca who have been investigating options and costs.

1.4.2. Well head upgrade budgets for Kaiapoi and Woodend where there are below ground well heads installed. This is in response to stricter application of requirements of below ground well heads by drinking water assessors which puts Council at risk of losing its secure status.

1.4.3. Additional budgets in Kaiapoi and Mandeville to increase source capacity due to additional analysis undertaken in recent months.

1.4.4. Allowance for Poyntzs Road and Garrymere source upgrade budgets to be completed over the next two financial years, rather than committing to completion within the 2018/19 financial year due to additional consultative requirements.

1.4.5. Deferral and removal of other capital works budgets to create a higher degree of certainty that all capital works projects in the initial years will be completed on time, and to reduce the risk of carry overs.

1.4.6. Increase to Kaiapoi Headworks renewals budget due to generator and pump assets failing in recent months.
Table 1: Summary of Recommended Changes and Financial Implications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Budget Year</th>
<th>Budget Type</th>
<th>Draft Long Term Plan 2018-28 Budget</th>
<th>Revised Budget</th>
<th>Rate Change (per conn. or per unit)</th>
<th>Development Contribution Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>UV Installation</td>
<td>Currently for 2018/19 – 2019/20</td>
<td>Partially Growth</td>
<td>$ 600,000</td>
<td>$ 1,400,000</td>
<td>$ 8.2</td>
<td>$ 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
<td>UV Installation</td>
<td>Partially Growth</td>
<td>$ 800,000</td>
<td>$ 1,800,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 14.8</td>
<td>$ 164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend-Pegasus</td>
<td>UV Installation (incl. transfer pump upgrades)</td>
<td>Currently budgeted for 2018/19 only. Change to split over 2018/19, 2019/20 and 2020/21</td>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>$ 420,000</td>
<td>$ 750,000</td>
<td>$ 8.9</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Solely Growth (Ravenswood DC Funded)</td>
<td>$ 78,110</td>
<td>$ 150,000</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA (pre-agreed financial contribution)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cust</td>
<td>UV Installation</td>
<td>Currently 2018/19 – 2019/20. Extend to 2020/21</td>
<td>Partially Growth</td>
<td>$ 270,000</td>
<td>$ 600,000</td>
<td>$ 173.7</td>
<td>$ 2,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Renewal</td>
<td>$ 120,000</td>
<td>$ 400,000</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohoka</td>
<td>UV Installation</td>
<td>Currently 2020/21 – 2021/22. Extend out to 2022/23.</td>
<td>Change to Partially Growth</td>
<td>$ 270,000</td>
<td>$ 500,000</td>
<td>$ 193.5</td>
<td>$ 288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Urban</td>
<td>UV Installation</td>
<td>Currently 2018/19 – 2019/20. Extend some budget to 2020/21</td>
<td>Partially Growth</td>
<td>$ 400,000</td>
<td>$ 560,000</td>
<td>$ 12.5</td>
<td>$ 138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Rural No.2</td>
<td>UV Installation (Oxford Rural No.2 share)</td>
<td>Currently 2019/20. Extend some budget to 2020/21</td>
<td>Partially Growth</td>
<td>$ 100,000</td>
<td>$ 140,000</td>
<td>$ 3.3</td>
<td>$ 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Eyreton</td>
<td>UV Installation</td>
<td>Currently 2020/21 – 2021/22. Extend some budget out to 2022/23.</td>
<td>Change to Partially Growth</td>
<td>$ 100,000</td>
<td>$ 170,000</td>
<td>$ 11.2</td>
<td>$ 325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summerhill</td>
<td>UV Installation</td>
<td>Partially Growth</td>
<td>$ 100,000</td>
<td>$ 170,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 12.2</td>
<td>$ 364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poyntzs Road*</td>
<td>UV Installation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 100,000</td>
<td>$ 170,000</td>
<td>$ 12.2</td>
<td>$ 364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
<td>Source Capacity Upgrade</td>
<td>2025/26 to 2027/28</td>
<td>Solely Growth</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 800,000</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$ 1,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well Head Improvements</td>
<td>2018/19</td>
<td>2018/19</td>
<td>2020/21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>$1.5</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headworks Renewals</td>
<td>2018/19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandeville Storage Upgrade</td>
<td>2021/22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially Growth</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>$10.4</td>
<td>$107</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend-Pegasus Well Head Improvements</td>
<td>2018/19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>$0.70</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrymere Source Upgrade</td>
<td>2018/19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially Growth</td>
<td>$390,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget to remain the same, but spread over 2018/19 and 2019/20 financial year</td>
<td>No change (just change in timing)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poyntz Road Source Upgrade</td>
<td>2018/19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially Growth</td>
<td>$843,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend-Pegasus Gladstone and Pegasus Well Raw Water Main</td>
<td>2018/19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>$731,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Smith Street 5th Bore</td>
<td>2018/19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solely Growth Related</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend-Pegasus Ravenswood North Trunk Main North Upgrade 1</td>
<td>2018/19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solely Growth (Ravenswood DC Funded)</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget to be removed</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>(DCs are pre-agreed amount).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Rural No.1 Rockford / Depot Trunk Main – Stage 1B</td>
<td>2018/19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solely Growth</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>-$135.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend Water Renewals</td>
<td>2018/19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>- $1.60</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019/20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020/21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladstone Road Wells Electrical Kiosk Control Renewal</td>
<td>2020/21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewal</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>budget, but push out to 2021/22</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikuku Beach Water Renewals</td>
<td>2020/21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewal</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
<td>budget, but push out to 2021/22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi Damley and Peraki Reservoir Strengthening and Sealing</td>
<td>2018/19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>budget, but push out $300,000 to 2019/20</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Urban Gammans Creek Backup Source</td>
<td>2020/21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewal</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
<td>budget, but push out to 2021/22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi Water Renewals</td>
<td>2018/19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Renewals</td>
<td></td>
<td>$380,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>per year</td>
<td></td>
<td>per year</td>
<td>per year</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Oxford Urban Water Renewals 2018/19 – 2020/21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Renewals</th>
<th>$100,000 per year</th>
<th>$50,000 per year</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Rangiora Water Renewals

| Renewals | $380,000 in 2018/19 and $430,000 in 2019/20 and 2020/21 | $350,000 per year | NA | NA |

### Coldstream Road Water Main extension

| Level of Service | $100,000 in 2018/19 | $20,000 in 2018/19 and $80,000 in 2019/20 | NA | NA |

*Poyntzs Road UV budget is based on assumption that Poyntzs Road will join with West Eyreton scheme

* Rate and Development Contribution changes in this table are over and above rating implications of previous budgets recommended prior to this staff submission (i.e. they are the changes to rates as a result of the proposed changes in budget, not as a result of the total budget).

### References:

i. Beca draft report regarding UV treatment installations (180509050990).
ii. Mandeville storage assessment (180509051004).

*note the above reports have not been appended to this report due to their size, but can be referred to electronically if required.

### 2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180509050672.

**UV Treatment Budgets**

(b) Approves an increase to the Rangiora UV Installation capital works budget from $600,000 to $1,400,000, and increasing the timeframe by which the project will be completed by one year, such that the budget will be $100,000 in 2018/19, $500,000 in 2019/20 and $800,000 in 2020/21, noting that this will increase the Rangiora water rate by $8.20 per connection per year from 2022/22 onwards and the Rangiora water development contribution by $86 per new connection.

(c) Approves an increase to the Kaiapoi UV Installation capital works budget from $800,000 to $1,800,000, and increasing the timeframe by which the project will be completed by one year, such that the budget will be $100,000 in 2018/19, $700,000 in 2019/20 and $1,000,000 in 2020/21, noting that this will increase the Kaiapoi water rate by $14.8 per connection per year from 2021/22 onwards and the Kaiapoi water development contribution by $164 per new connection.

(d) Approves an increase to the Cust UV Installation capital works budget from $270,000 to $600,000, and increasing the timeframe by which the project will be completed by one year, such that the budget will be $50,000 in 2018/19, $100,000 in 2019/20 and $450,000 in 2020/21, noting that this will increase the Cust water rate by $173.70 per connection per year from 2020/21 onwards and the Cust water development contribution by $2,063 per new connection.

(e) Approves the deletion of the $120,000 Cust Water Supply headworks renewal budget in 2022/23 and approves a new headworks renewal budget of $400,000 split $100,000 in 2019/20 and $300,000 in 2020/21 noting that the renewal of the headworks is triggered by the need to upgrade the treatment plant to accommodate UV treatment which cannot be accommodated within the existing site.
(f) **Approves** an increase to the Pegasus UV and Transfer Pumps Upgrades budgets from $420,000 to $750,000 for the level of service portion and from $78,110 to $150,000 for the growth portion, and also allowing for the timing of the project to be split with $100,000 Level of Service budget and $50,000 Growth budget in 2018/19, $100,000 Level of Service budget and $100,000 Growth budget in 2019/20, and $500,000 Level of Service budget in 2020/21, noting that this will increase Woodend-Pegasus water supply rates by $8.90 per connection per year from the 2021/22 year onwards.

(g) **Approves** an increase to the Ohoka UV Installation capital works budget from $270,000 to $500,000 and increasing the timeframe over which the project will be completed by one year, such that the budget will be $10,000 in 2020/21, $90,000 in 2021/22 and $400,000 in 2022/23, noting that this will increase the Ohoka water rate by $193.50 per connection per year from 2023/24 onwards and the Ohoka water development contribution by $288 per unit.

(h) **Approves** an increase to the Oxford Urban UV Installation capital works budget from $400,000 to $560,000 and increasing the timeframe over which the project will be completed by one year, such that the budget will be $100,000 in 2018/19, $200,000 in 2019/20 and $260,000 in 2020/21, noting that this will increase the Oxford water rate by $138.30 per connection per year from 2021/22 onwards and the Oxford water development contribution by $138 per connection.

(i) **Approves** an increase to the Oxford Rural No.2 UV Installation capital works budget from $100,000 to $140,000 and deferring the completion date by one year, such that the budget will be $70,000 in 2019/20 and $70,000 in 2020/21, noting that this will increase the Oxford Rural No.2 water rate by $35.40 per unit per year from 2021/22 onwards and the Oxford Rural No.2 water development contribution by $35 per unit.

(j) **Approves** an increase to the West Eyreton UV Installation capital works budget from $100,000 to $170,000 and increasing the timeframe over which the project will be completed by one year, such that the budget will be $25,000 in 2020/21, $25,000 in 2021/22 and $120,000 in 2022/23, noting that this will increase the West Eyreton water rate by $22.70 per unit per year from 2022/23 onwards and the West Eyreton water development contribution by $601 per unit.

(k) **Approves** an increase to the Summerhill UV Installation capital works budget from $100,000 to $170,000 and increasing the timeframe over which the project will be completed by one year, such that the budget will be $25,000 in 2020/21, $25,000 in 2021/22 and $120,000 in 2022/23, noting that this will increase the Summerhill water rate by $11.20 per unit per year from 2022/23 onwards and the Summerhill water development contribution by $325 per unit.

(l) **Approves** an increase to the Poyntzs Road UV Installation capital works budget from $100,000 to $170,000 and increasing the timeframe over which the project will be completed by one year, such that the budget will be $25,000 in 2020/21, $25,000 in 2021/22 and $120,000 in 2022/23, noting that this will increase the Poyntzs Road water rate by $12.20 per unit per year from 2022/23 onwards and the Poyntzs Road water development contribution by $364 per unit.

(m) **Notes** that Poyntzs Road will only contribute to the UV treatment system if they join to the West Eyreton scheme prior to the project commencing. This strategy is proposed as a means of upgrading the Poyntzs Road scheme to achieve compliance with the Drinking-water Standards, but is subject to community consultation (as noted elsewhere in this report).

(n) **Notes** that allowance has not yet been made to operational budgets for the proposed UV treatment systems due to advice still being sought on this. These rating implications are expected to be modest relative to the implications of the capital cost, and will not come into effect until after the projects have been completed (2021/22 at the earliest). This will be addressed as part of a future Annual Plan.
(o) **Notes** that the requirement for UV treatment on supplies that are currently compliant with the Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand is in response to recommendations made in the Havelock North Drinking-water Inquiry Stage 2 Report, and is based on the best understanding that staff have of what future requirements will be. Until Central Government provides clear direction there will be a degree of uncertainty regarding the requirements for these treatment systems.

(p) **Approves** changing the Ohoka, West Eyreton, Summerhill and Poyntzs Road UV treatment budgets from level of service budgets to a partially growth funded budgets, to reflect that the projects will be sized for future growth as well as existing demand on the scheme, and for consistency with the other UV treatment budgets where this is already the case.

(q) **Notes** that the reason for the recommended increases to the UV Installation budgets is due to detailed assessments being carried out at all sites, while original budgets included in the draft 2018-28 Long Term Plan were based on high level engineering judgement until more detailed assessments could be completed.

**Well Head Upgrade Budgets**

(r) **Approves** a new capital works budget for the Kaiapoi water supply scheme of $100,000 in 2018/19 to allow the existing 4 underground well heads to be better sealed to reduce the risk of contamination, noting that this will increase the Kaiapoi water rate by $1.50 per connection per year.

(s) **Approves** a new capital works budget for the Woodend-Pegasus water supply scheme of $25,000 in 2018/19 to allow one existing underground well head to be better sealed to reduce the risk of contamination, noting that this will increase the Woodend-Pegasus water rate by $0.70 per connection per year.

(t) **Notes** that the reason for better sealing the well heads is in order to maintain the secure status of the schemes, and to address the public health risk associated with the existing underground well heads, also noting that this is in particular in response to stricter application of requirements of below ground well heads by drinking water assessors which puts Council at risk of losing its secure status.

**Kaiapoi Source Capacity Upgrade**

(u) **Approves** a new capital works budget for the Kaiapoi water supply scheme of $800,000 over the 2025/26 ($50,000), 2026/27 ($150,000) and 2027/28 ($600,000) financial years to fund a new well, noting that this is forecast to increase the Kaiapoi water development contribution by $1,345 per new connection.

(v) **Notes** that the reason for this new budget being identified is due to high demand over the 2017/18 summer causing the water modelling to be refined for the Kaiapoi scheme, which has resulted in the realisation that a new well will be required to accommodate future growth on the scheme.

**Mandeville Storage Upgrade**

(w) **Approves** an additional capital works budget for the Mandeville water supply scheme of $250,000 for the 2021/22 financial year, noting that this will increase the Mandeville water rate by $10.4 per unit per year from the 2022/23 year onwards, and the development contribution by $107 per new unit from 2018/19 onwards.

(x) **Notes** that the reason for requiring the additional storage for the scheme is in order to provide emergency storage to reduce the risk or duration of an outage on the scheme.

**Garrymere Source Upgrade**
Approves the deferral of $140,000 capital works budget that is forecast for the 2018/19 financial year for the Garrymere water supply scheme to the 2019/20 financial year.

Approves the deferral to the increases to the operational budgets for the Garrymere water supply scheme as noted within the contents of this report, to reflect the proposed treatment system being constructed 12 months later than originally planned.

Notes that deferring this budget will allow staff to establish a water supply advisory group for the scheme in order to work through issues and options with the source upgrade project prior to committing to a solution, which is in response to feedback received when the community was consulted on this project.

**Poyntzs Road Source Upgrade Project**

Approves deferring $693,000 of the $793,000 capital works budget for the Poyntzs Road source upgrade budget from the 2018/19 financial year to the 2019/20 financial year.

Notes that deferring this budget will allow staff to continue to work with the West Eyreton and Summerhill water supply advisory groups regarding the sharing of their source water prior to consulting with the Poyntzs Road community regarding the source upgrade budget.

**Kaiapoi Water Headworks Renewals**

Approves increasing the Kaiapoi water supply headworks renewals capital works budget for the 2018/19 financial year from $40,000 to $250,000 to allow for renewal of pumps and a generator that has failed subsequent to the draft Long Term Plan going out for consultation.

Notes that staff have obtained 3 quotes for the pump replacements at the Peraki Street headworks, and the new pumps (which take 12 weeks to deliver) will be ordered upon the approval of this report, to reduce the risk of a lack of pumping capacity for the scheme during the upcoming summer months.

Approves the deletion of the $180,000 Kaiapoi water supply headworks renewals capital works budget for the 2020/21 financial year as this was intended for the renewal of the Darnley Square generator, which is now proposed to be renewed in the 2018/19 financial year.

**Other Rescheduling and Minor Adjustments**

Approves deferring 50% of the $731,000 capital works budget allocated to the Gladstone and Pegasus Well Raw water main project (split $511,700 for level of service and $219,300 for growth) from the 2018/19 financial year to the 2019/20 financial year for the Woodend-Pegasus water supply scheme.

Notes that this budget was recently increased by $231,000 for the reasons noted in report 180322031093[v2].

Approves deferring 50% of the $700,000 capital works budget allocated to the Rangiora Water Supply Smith Street 5th Bore capital works project from the 2018/19 financial year to the 2019/20 financial year.

Notes that deferring the above budgets will allow staff to provide a greater level of certainty that the project will be completed in accordance with the timing of the budgets, and reduce the risk of carry overs.

Approves removing the $15,000 capital works budget allocated to the Woodend-Pegasus water supply scheme for the Ravenswood Trunk Main North Upgrade 1 project for the
2018/19 financial year as this main has already been installed as part of the Ravenswood development.

(ii) Approves reducing the capital works budget for the 2018/19 financial year for the Rockford Road Trunk Main Stage 1B project on the Oxford Rural No.1 scheme budget from $150,000 to $50,000 given that the majority of the work will be able to be completed under the budget allocated to the 2017/18 financial year, noting that this will decrease the Oxford Rural No.1 development contribution by $135.10 per unit.

(mm) Approves the following changes to the Woodend water supply renewals budget, noting that overall this will reduce the Woodend-Pegasus water rate by $1.6 per connection per year:

   i. In 2018/19 removing the $40,000 level of service budget and $70,000 renewal budget

   ii. In 2019/20 increasing the renewal portion of the budget from $70,000 to $80,000.

   iii. In 2020/21 reducing the level of service portion from $40,000 to $20,000, and the renewal portion from $70,000 to $40,000.

(nn) Approves deferring the $110,000 Gladstone Road Wells Electrical Kiosk Control Renewal budget for the Woodend-Pegasus water supply scheme from the 2020/21 financial year to the 2021/22 financial year in order to better spread expenditure over the Long Term Plan period.

(oo) Approves deferring the $75,000 level of service and $175,000 renewal portion of the Waikuku Beach water pipeline renewals budget from the 2020/21 financial year to the 2021/22 financial year, in order to better spread expenditure over the Long Term Plan period.

(pp) Approves deferring $300,000 of the $350,000 capital works budget for the Darnley Square and Peraki Street Reservoir Strengthening and Sealing budgets from the 2018/19 financial year to the 2019/20 financial year in order to reduce the risk of a carry over on this project.

(qq) Approves deferring the $20,000 renewal and $180,000 level of service budgets for the Gammans Creek backup source project for the Oxford Urban water supply scheme from the 2020/21 financial year to the 2021/22 financial year, in order to better spread expenditure over the Long Term Plan period.

(rr) Approves reducing the Kaiapoi water renewals capital works budget for the 2018/19, 2019/20 and 2020/21 financial years from $380,000 per year to $300,000 per year in order to minimise expenditure over the first 3 years of the Long Term Plan period where possible.

(ss) Approves reducing the Oxford Urban water renewals capital works budget for the 2018/19, 2019/20 and 2020/21 financial years from $100,000 per year to $50,000 per year in order to minimise expenditure over the first 3 years of the Long Term Plan period where possible.

(tt) Approves reducing the Rangiora water supply renewals capital works budget from $380,000 to $330,000 in 2018/19 and from $430,000 to $330,000 in 2019/20 and 2020/21 in order to minimise expenditure over the first 3 years of the Long Term Plan period where possible.

(uu) Approves deferring $80,000 of the $100,000 budget for the Coldstream Road water main extension project for the Rangiora water supply scheme from the 2018/19 financial year to the 2019/20 financial year in order to reduce the risk of carry overs.
Notes that for all budgets proposed, and proposed changes to budget beyond 2018/19 the community will have the opportunity to provide feedback on as part of future Annual Plans or Long Term Plans.

3. BACKGROUND & ISSUES AND OPTIONS

UV Treatment Budgets

3.1. In December 2017 the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry Stage 2 Report was released. This included a recommendation that all water be treated, and also a recommendation that the secure classification section of the current drinking water standards be abolished. The implication from this is that all water would need to be treated for both bacteria and protozoa.

3.2. At the time staff responded by including placeholder budgets in the draft Long Term Plan for UV treatment systems to be installed which are assessed to be sufficient to provide treatment of protozoa and bacteria on all schemes that currently rely on the secure status of their sources. These budgets were not set based on detailed engineering assessments but instead on high level engineering judgement.

3.3. In the meantime Beca have undertaken detailed assessments at each site to determine likely costs of the treatment systems. The draft version of this assessment report has now been completed, and has indicated that the initial budgets included in the draft Long Term Plan are insufficient. At the time that the draft budgets were presented to Council it was reported that this may be the case. It has eventuated that following the detailed assessments, the recommended budget figures are approximately double those initially allowed for.

3.4. In particular, a significant amount of additional budget is recommended for Cust. This is due to the existing headworks site lacking room to construct the UV room, meaning that it has been recommended that the water supply headworks be relocated to the rear of the Council land at this location. This would involve constructing a new pump room and reservoirs, in addition to constructing a UV treatment room. As this would involve renewing the existing headworks assets, which would be partially renewal funded.

3.5. These recommended changes are summarised on Table 2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Budget Year</th>
<th>Budget Type</th>
<th>draft Long Term Plan 2018-28 Budget</th>
<th>Revised Budget</th>
<th>Rate Change (per conn. or per unit)</th>
<th>Development Contribution Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>UV Installation</td>
<td>Currently 2018/19 – 2019/20, extend to 2020/21</td>
<td>Partially Growth</td>
<td>$ 600,000</td>
<td>$ 1,400,000</td>
<td>$ 8.2</td>
<td>$ 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
<td>UV Installation</td>
<td>Partially Growth</td>
<td>$ 800,000</td>
<td>1,800,000</td>
<td>$ 1,800,000</td>
<td>$ 14.8</td>
<td>$ 164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend-Pegasus</td>
<td>UV Installation (incl. transfer pump upgrades)</td>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>$ 420,000</td>
<td>$ 750,000</td>
<td>$ 750,000</td>
<td>$ 8.9</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Growth (Ravenswood DC Funded)</td>
<td>$ 78,110</td>
<td>$ 150,000</td>
<td>$ 150,000</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA (pre-agreed financial contribution)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cust</td>
<td>UV Installation</td>
<td>Partially Growth</td>
<td>$ 270,000</td>
<td>$ 600,000</td>
<td>$ 600,000</td>
<td>$ 173.7</td>
<td>$ 2,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headworks Renewal</td>
<td>Currently in 2022/23. Move to 2020/21</td>
<td>Renewal</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohoka UV Installation</td>
<td>Currently 2020/21 – 2021/22. Extend by 1 year.</td>
<td>Change to Partially Growth</td>
<td>$270,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$193.5</td>
<td>$133</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Urban UV Installation</td>
<td>Currently 2018/19 – 2019/20, extend to 2020/21</td>
<td>Partially Growth</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$560,000</td>
<td>$12.5</td>
<td>$138</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Rural No.2 UV Installation (Oxford Rural No.2 share)</td>
<td>Currently 2020/21 – 2021/22. Extend by 1 year.</td>
<td>Partially Growth</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td>$3.3</td>
<td>$35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Eyreton UV Installation</td>
<td>Currently 2021/22. Extend by 1 year.</td>
<td>Change to Partially Growth</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$170,000</td>
<td>$22.7</td>
<td>$247</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summerhill UV Installation (Summerhill share of West Eyreton)</td>
<td>Currently 2021/22. Extend by 1 year.</td>
<td>Change to Partially Growth</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$170,000</td>
<td>$11.2</td>
<td>$134</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poyntzs Road* UV Installation (Poyntzs share of West Eyreton)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$170,000</td>
<td>$12.2</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.6. It is noted that there is an allowance for Poyntzs Road to contribute towards a UV treatment system at West Eyreton, sharing the project costs with Summerhill and West Eyreton. This is based on the assumption that Poyntzs Road will join with the West Eyreton and Summerhill schemes. This is proposed as a means of upgrading the Poyntzs Road source, but is subject to final Council approval following community consultation in the 2018/19 financial year.

3.7. If this joining does not occur then Poyntzs Road would not contribute to the West Eyreton UV system, and the Summerhill and West Eyreton UV budgets would need to be increased to cover the shortfall. It is proposed that if this eventuates following community consultation that this be addressed through the next annual plan following this decision being made.

Well Head Upgrades – Woodend and Kaiapoi

3.8. In January 2018 it was announced that Christchurch City Council was required to chlorinate its water following the loss of secure status for its sources, due to deficiencies with its bore heads. Largely this was due to underground bore heads which were deemed to be at risk of contamination during flooding.

3.9. Kaiapoi, Woodend and Cust all have primary sources with underground well heads. Kaiapoi and Woodend are both required to re-apply for secure status in August 2018.

3.10. Initial inspections have been undertaken on these underground bore heads and some of the obvious issues that were reported for the Christchurch wells are not apparent in these wells (such as glands and penetrations into bore heads being open to the environment, or chambers being submerged in water). However, it is still considered that additional works are required to ensure that the wells are sufficiently protected from risk of contamination at the well head, and in order to minimise the risk of these schemes losing their secure status. Long term (beyond the 10 year Long Term Plan period) it is recommended that these wells be raised above ground level, however in the short term it is considered more
practicable and financial preferential for Council to seal the existing underground chambers.

3.11. Cust has a relatively new underground well head that was last year granted secure status. This was however before the Drinking Water Assessors started taking a stricter application of the drinking water standards regarding underground well heads. The Cust well is located in privately owned land with an easement in favour of Council. The easement however restricts Council from constructing an above ground bore head. For this reason it is not recommended or possible to raise the Cust well head above ground, unless in the future Council can purchase the land at the well site or amend the conditions of the easement. This is not thought to be possible with the current land owners, but staff will investigate this future should circumstances change.

3.12. The recommended budgets to better seal the four Kaiapoi underground well heads and the one Woodend underground well head above ground are shown in Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Budget Year</th>
<th>Budget Type</th>
<th>draft Long Term Plan 2018-28 Budget</th>
<th>Revised Budget</th>
<th>Rate Change (per conn. or per unit)</th>
<th>Development Contribution Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Woodend-Pegasus</td>
<td>Well Head Improvements</td>
<td>2018/19</td>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$1.5</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
<td>Well Head Improvements</td>
<td>2018/19</td>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$0.7</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kaiapoi Source Capacity

3.13. In the previous Annual Plan there was a budget allowance of $1,000,000 in the 2018/19 financial year for a new reservoir at the Darnley Square water supply headworks in Kaiapoi. The reason for this was to provide additional emergency storage for the scheme in case of a loss of source capacity.

3.14. This was assessed in more detail, and this budget was removed prior to the draft 2018-28 Long Term Plan for two reasons:

3.14.1. It was deemed that the Kaiapoi scheme had sufficient level of resilience such that emergency storage was not required, and this budget was removed from the draft 2018-28 Long Term Plan.

3.14.2. Emergency storage is typically required to provide water in the event that the source is lost. In the case of Kaiapoi there are six primary supply wells, each with their own individual main feeding one of two reservoirs for the scheme. In addition to this, both headworks for the scheme has a standby generator available in the event that there is a power outage at the scheme. Further the wells are all artesian, meaning that the water is free flowing at ground level. The combined effect is that the scheme has a significantly higher level of resilience than other schemes, and it is not necessary to construct additional emergency storage given that a number of separate and individual elements would be required to simultaneously fail to cause a loss of supply for the scheme.

3.14.3. There is no space available at the site to construct an additional reservoir, unless a non-typical reservoir shape was designed (i.e. an oblique shape to follow the property boundary), or an underground reservoir which would also be unconventional and would introduce some contamination risks.
3.15. In the 2017/18 summer however, the demand was significantly higher than previous summers. At the time one well supplying the scheme was out of service (the Davies Street well), and this caused the reservoirs to reach low levels on a number of occasions. This period of high demand was during a period of high temperatures following an extended dry period in November and December 2017.

3.16. These low reservoir levels triggered staff to assess whether additional source capacity was required after all, not to provide emergency storage but to provide the required capacity during periods of peak demand. This additional source capacity could be provided either through an additional well, or additional storage.

3.17. The Network Planning Team compared the demand observed over the 2017/18 summer versus the demand profile used in the water modelling work that informed the budgets for the draft 2018-28 Long Term Plan. It was identified that, as a result of this period of higher than expected demand, the future demand profiles need to be increased over and above those used previously to inform the budget.

3.18. The result of the above assessment is that the scheme is essentially at or very close to capacity, and that a new well or reservoir is required to accommodate further growth on the scheme while allowing the necessary level of redundancy in terms of one well being out of service at any given time.

3.19. It is recommended that this additional capacity be in the form of a new well, due to this having a lower cost than a new reservoir (previously estimated at $1,000,000 for the reservoir versus $800,000 for the well, well head and pump and associated pipework) as well as there not being land available to construct a reservoir on. This budget is recommended over the 2025/26 to 2027/28 financial years. This timing is intended to achieve a balance between managing Council expenditure versus balancing the risk of a loss of supply on the Kaiapoi water supply scheme.

3.20. It is noted that staff will continue to assess demand and explore opportunities to manage this better prior to committing to construction. An alternative option that could be considered would be to not include the budget at this stage until more data is collected regarding demand over the coming summers. This would however mean that development contributions would not be recovered during this interim period where there is no budget in place, and given that it is considered more likely than not that this will be required it is recommended to allow for this in the budgets while still allowing some time to collect more data before construction commences.

**Mandeville Storage Upgrade**

3.21. There was a $50,000 budget allocated in the 2017/18 financial year for additional storage at the Two Chain Road water headworks, as well as modifications to pipework to better utilise the existing tanks.

3.22. In conjunction with investigations commencing on storage upgrades at Mandeville, the Project Delivery Unit undertook an exercise to review the storage requirements for all schemes in terms of hours of emergency storage. This had particular implications for the project at Mandeville.

3.23. Previously restricted schemes did not have any requirement for emergency storage. This was based on the theory that residents should provide their own emergency storage through their private storage tanks. Essentially, if staff assume that all residents have their own storage, this would allow outages of a greater length of time on restricted schemes negating the need for emergency storage.
When the storage requirements for each scheme were reviewed, it was deemed that it was not appropriate to have no emergency storage on restricted schemes. This is due to the following factors:

3.24.1. It is not a realistic expectation that all residents maintain 24 hours of emergency storage on their properties. There is a requirement when individual storage tanks are installed that they provide at least 48 hours of storage, but not that the residents maintain half of this for emergency use only. In reality during periods of high demand residents consume all their storage, and would be very vulnerable during an extended outage. There are also schools and early childhood centres on restricted schemes, with consumers who are vulnerable to any loss of supply.

3.24.2. Private storage systems are not sophisticated enough to prevent residents from using the full volume in their tanks (i.e. there are not typically alarms, or separate outlets within tanks to essentially set aside some water for emergency use only).

3.24.3. For this reason it would not be considered to be an acceptable defence by Council in the event of an extended outage on a restricted scheme to simply say to residents that they should maintain their own storage.

3.24.4. It is preferable to utilise Council managed reservoir storage in the event of an outage rather than private storage tanks.

3.24.5. In addition to the risk of residents running out of water, if private storage tanks are utilised and Council tanks are run until empty there can be a risk of contaminants entering the system. As the pressure drops during a system outage there is a risk of contaminants entering pipes through cracks as the pipe is no longer at pressure to push potentially contaminants away. Further on some schemes there can be additional issues that arise during complete system outages such as air locks in the system.

Based on the above, each scheme’s resilience and redundancy was investigated on a case-by-case basis to determine an appropriate level of emergency storage rather than assuming that all restricted schemes do not require any emergency storage.

The key outcome of this is that it was recommended that the Mandeville scheme have 6 hours of emergency storage available at the headworks site, rather than at present where only operational storage is provided with only 1 hour of excess storage available for emergencies.

This triggered the appropriateness of the storage upgrade budget at Mandeville of $50,000 to be reviewed. It was deemed that this would not allow for the required level of storage. An options analysis was carried out by the Project Delivery Unit with the recommended solution being a 500m³ steel tank at an estimated total cost of $300,000. For this reason an additional $250,000 of budget is requested to supplement the $50,000 allocated this financial year.

Alternative options of either a plastic tank farm (a series of 30m³ plastic tanks) or a large concrete reservoir were considered but discounted.

Consideration was initially given to recommending this new $250,000 budget in the 2018/19 financial year, to allow this project to be completed as soon as possible to address the deficiency that has been identified. Given the wider aim of reducing expenditure over the first three years of the Long Term Plan, it is now recommended that this budget be included in the fourth year of the Long Term Plan (2021/22). This will mean that there is a risk of a loss of supply, or the backup sources for the scheme which are not compliant with the Drinking-water Standards being required to be utilised in the interim period. This risk
however needs to be balanced against the overall aims of Council over the Long Term Plan period.

**Poyntzs Road and Garrymere Source Upgrade Projects**

3.30. There are currently projects underway to upgrade both the Poyntzs Road and Garrymere water supply schemes to comply with the Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand. Both projects were programmed to be completed in the 2018/19 financial year in the draft 2018-28 Long Term Plan.

3.31. Both projects are forecast to have significant and unprecedented increases to their water rates (increases are over $1,000 per connection in both cases) and will become the two highest water rates in the Waimakariri District.

3.32. Consultation has been undertaken on the Garrymere project, with a strong steer given by the community that they would like a more collaborative approach before the solution is implemented. The suggestion is that a water supply advisory group be set up to workshop issues and solutions with Council staff. In order to achieve this it is anticipated that the project could be delayed by at least 6 months, meaning that the completion date would be pushed out to the 2019/20 financial year (refer to report 180504048871 for further detail).

3.33. It is recommended that Council staff work with the residents, rather than proceed with the upgrade against the wishes of the community despite the delay that would be incurred.

3.34. The alternative option would be to proceed with physical works against the community’s wishes which would achieve compliance at an earlier date, but would be unpopular with the affected residents who have shown a large degree of resistance to the project.

3.35. The Poyntzs Road project faces similar issues in terms of rate increases, but is complicated further given that the proposed solution involves joining to the West Eyreton and Summerhill schemes. There are advisory groups in West Eyreton and Summerhill who have not met for several years who were contacted recently. The have expressed some reservations about their source water being shared with Poyntzs Road. Collaboration with the advisory groups will add further time to this project, and will cause a risk that it will not be completed within the 2018/19 financial year. For this reason it is recommended that the budget in the 2018/19 financial year be split over both the 2018/19 and 2019/20 financial years.

3.36. The recommended changes to the Garrymere and Poyntzs Road capital budgets are summarised below:
Table 4: Proposed changes to Garrymere and Poynts Road Budgets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budget Changes</th>
<th>2017/18 (current year)</th>
<th>2018/19</th>
<th>2019/20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Garrymere draft 2018-28 Long Term Plan for consultation</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$140,000 (+$250,000 carried over from 17/18)</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Change to Funding as per Staff Submission</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$250,000 carried over from 17/18</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poynts Road draft 2018-28 Long Term Plan for consultation</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$793,000 (+ $50,000 carried over from 17/18)</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Change to Funding as per Staff Submission</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$100,000 (+ $50,000 carried over from 17/18)</td>
<td>$693,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.37. For Garrymere, the draft Long Term Plan includes operational budget increases relative to current 2017/18 budgets in anticipation of the treatment system being fully operational from the part way through the 2018/19 financial year. If this project is deferred by 12 months, the full operational costs will not come into effect until 2020/21, which will trigger the following changes to the operational budgets for Garrymere:

3.38. In addition to deferral of some the capital budget, there would need to be deferral of some operational budgets as well that have been allowed for to start operating the new treatment system once it is constructed. It was initially anticipated that it would be constructed part way through the 2018/19 financial year, while it is now proposed that construction be completed by the end of the 2019/20 financial year:

- Pump Power budget for 2018/19 reduce from $8,810 to $6,110
- Pump Power budget for 2019/20 to reduce from $11,760 to $6,240
- Pump Maintenance budget for 2018/19 reduce from $5,040 to $2,040
- Pump Maintenance budget for 2019/20 to reduce from $15,060 to $2,080
- Water Unit Costs budget to reduce from $13,000 to $9,500 in 2018/19
- Water Unit Costs budget to reduce from $16,860 to $9,710 in 2019/20

Kaiapoi Headworks Renewals

3.39. In recent months issues have been identified with the following Kaiapoi water supply headworks assets:

3.39.1. A surface pump at the Peraki Street headworks has failed due to reaching the end of its useful life (age of pump is approximately 40 years). A quote has been obtained for approximately $50,000 to replace this pump, and an equivalent identical pump that is also thought to be at the end of its life.

3.39.2. The generator at the Darnley Square water supply headworks has had its control panel fail. This means that in the event of a power outage it will not turn on without manual intervention. Given the age and condition of the generator it is recommended to renew this asset as well as associated fuel storage system rather than repair just the control panel. The cost of this work is estimated at $200,000.

3.40. An allowance was made in the 2018-28 draft Long Term Plan for Kaiapoi water supply headworks renewals for the value of $40,000. It is recommended that this budget be increased to $250,000 to allow for the above two projects to be completed.
Other Rescheduling and Minor Adjustments

3.41. Staff have been placing scrutiny over other items within the first year of the Long Term Plan to confirm the following:

3.41.1. That all projects will be completed within the financial year they are budgeted for to reduce the risk of carryovers.

3.41.2. To minimise expenditure in the initial year if possible.

3.42. With the above points in mind, the following changes are recommended:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Financial Year (as per draft LTP)</th>
<th>Budget Type</th>
<th>Draft Long Term Plan Year of Budget</th>
<th>Proposed Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Woodend-Pegasus</td>
<td>Gladstone and Pegasus Well Raw Water Main</td>
<td>2018/19</td>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>$731,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>Smith Street 5th Bore</td>
<td>2018/19</td>
<td>Solely Growth Related</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend-Pegasus</td>
<td>Ravenswood North Trunk Main North Upgrade 1</td>
<td>2018/19</td>
<td>Solely Growth Related</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>Budget to be removed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Rural No.1</td>
<td>Rockford / Depot Trunk Main – Stage 1B</td>
<td>2018/19</td>
<td>Solely Growth</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend</td>
<td>Water Renewals</td>
<td>2018/19</td>
<td>Level of Service Growth</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2019/20</td>
<td>Level of Service Growth</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2020/21</td>
<td>Level of Service Growth</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Growth $70,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gladstone Road Wells Electrical Kiosk Control Renewal</td>
<td>2020/21</td>
<td>Renewal</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
<td>Same budget, but push out to 2021/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikuku Beach</td>
<td>Water Renewals</td>
<td>2020/21</td>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>Same budget, but push out to 2021/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Renewal</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
<td>Darnley and Peraki Reservoir Strengthening and Sealing</td>
<td>2018/19</td>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>Same budget, but push out $300,000 to 2019/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Urban</td>
<td>Gammans Creek Backup Source</td>
<td>2020/21</td>
<td>Renewal</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>Same budget, but push out to 2021/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
<td>Water Renewals</td>
<td>2018/19 – 2020/21</td>
<td>Renewals</td>
<td>$380,000 per year</td>
<td>$300,000 per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Urban</td>
<td>Water Renewals</td>
<td>2018/19 – 2020/21</td>
<td>Renewals</td>
<td>$100,000 per year</td>
<td>$50,000 per year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rangiora Water Renewals 2018/19 – 2020/21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coldstream Road Water Main extension</th>
<th>Currently 2018/19. Change to split over 2018/19 and 2019/20.</th>
<th>Level of Service</th>
<th>$100,000 in 2018/19</th>
<th>$20,000 in 2018/19 and $80,000 in 2019/20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Renewals $380,000 in 2018/19 and $430,000 in 2019/20 and 2020/21</td>
<td>$330,000 per year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.45. It is noted that there are some inherent risks in delaying projects where a need has previously been identified (such as water supply renewals). This risk however is balanced against the need of Council to manage its expenditure responsibly. Therefore, while reductions in some budget have been made, there is a residual risk that staff may be required to report back to Council throughout the Long Term Plan period to request more budget for future years if reductions to budget are resulting in unacceptable levels of water supply outages or breaks on schemes where pipes are being utilised beyond their useful life.

3.46. Further these reductions are also required in order to accommodate other projects for water supply such as treatment of all water supplies in anticipation of changes to legislative requirements. The proposed budgets are intended to strike the appropriate balance between meeting legislative requirements and levels of service, managing expenditure, and managing the risk of other issues arising in the future as assets continue to age and deteriorate.

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

4. COMMUNITY VIEWS

4.1. Groups and Organisations

4.2. Direct consultation has not been undertaken regarding the UV treatment projects, the source or storage upgrade projects in Kaiapoi and Mandeville, or the well head upgrade projects.

4.3. The Garrymere community has been consulted regarding the source upgrade project, which is covered in report 180504048871 to the Rangiora Ashley Community Board. The recommendation from this is that a Garrymere Water Supply Advisory Group be established.

4.4. The Poyntzes Road community has not yet been consulted regarding their source upgrade project. The proposal at present is to continue to work with the West Eyreton and Summerhill Water Supply Advisory Groups until an acceptable solution in terms of sharing their source can be found. This will then be followed by consultation with the three affected communities of Poyntzes Road, West Eyreton and Summerhill.

4.5. Wider Community

4.6. As noted above staff are working through or towards consultation with the communities affected by the Poyntzes Road and Garrymere source upgrade projects. The Garrymere community has already expressed their concerns with the proposal to upgrade their scheme which has led to the recommendation to form an advisory group to work through their concerns.
5. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

5.1. Financial Implications

The financial implications are covered in the Issues and Options section of this report.

5.2. In terms of capital expenditure the UV treatment projects are of greatest significance, with a significant capital increase recommended. This is however in anticipation of changes to regulatory requirements in order to comply with minimum standards.

5.3. In terms of rating implications the Poyntzs Road and Garrymere source upgrade projects have the most significant impact to individual ratepayers with rating increases over $1,000 per ratepayer per year making these the highest rated schemes in the district.

5.5. Community Implications

5.6. The implications to the Garrymere and Poyntzs Road communities will be addressed through the work with the water supply advisory groups that is proposed.

5.7. Risk Management

5.8. The UV upgrade budgets are proposed to address expected changes to minimum standards for drinking water. These changes to the drinking water standards are as a result of the Havelock North Inquiry Stage 2 Report which has identified in particular a risk with providing communities with untreated drinking water, or drinking water that is only treated for bacteria but not protozoa. It is due to this lower level of tolerance for risk with drinking water that additional treatment is expected to be required.

5.9. In terms of the new well project proposed in Kaiapoi, this is required to address the risk of a loss of water supply as a result of continued growth on the scheme.

5.10. The Mandeville storage upgrade project is required to address the current risk of a loss of supply on the scheme due to there being minimal emergency storage available currently.

5.11. The well head upgrade budgets in Kaiapoi and Woodend are proposed to address the risk of contamination of public water supplies associated with underground well heads.

5.12. The Poyntzs Road and Garrymere source upgrade projects are required to address the risks that currently exist with those supplies, that do not currently comply with the Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand. It is noted that by deferring these projects, Council is taking on additional risk but that this is in order to address the concerns of the communities associated with the very high cost to ratepayers to fund these upgrades.

5.13. Health and Safety

5.14. As noted previously, for all projects where additional or upgraded treatment systems are proposed, or changes to a scheme’s water source, this is in order to address the public health risk that currently exists with a given scheme.

6. CONTEXT

6.1. Policy

This matter is a matter of significance in terms of the Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.

6.2. Legislation
6.3. Section 69 of the Health (Drinking Water) Amendment Act 2007 is relevant in this matter.

6.4. Community Outcomes

6.5. The following community outcomes are relevant in this matter:

- There are wide ranging opportunities for people to contribute to the decision making that affects our District
- There is a safe environment for all
- Core utility services are provided in a timely and sustainable manner
- People have wide-ranging opportunities for learning and being informed

6.6. Delegations

6.7. The Council has the delegated authority to add or amend budgets.
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1. SUMMARY

1.1 The purpose of this report is to request changes to wastewater budgets in year 1 of the draft Long Term Plan.

1.2 Detail on each item is provided in section 3 of this report. Each item is exclusive of the others so that each item can be considered separately on its own merits.

1.3 Specifically the following additional items are addressed in this request:

- An increase in the cost of the Ohoka Road sewer upgrades by $14,000 to allow for asbestos mitigation,
- Provide for the following items on the Tuahiwi sewer scheme:
  - Adjustment of the budget for the Tuahiwi Road reticulation main extension
  - Design and construction of a wastewater reticulation main in Topito Road
  - Inspection of septic tanks to determine the source of inflow and infiltration
- Analysis of the wetlands at the Kaiapoi wastewater treatment plant
- Mitigation of hazards at wastewater sites
- Contingency planning for wastewater overflows
- Consultation for connection of Fernside scheme to Eastern District Sewer Scheme

1.4 Additionally the following projects are requested to be partially or fully deferred, following review of the 2018/19 capital works programme:

- Rangiora Sewer - Central Rangiora Capacity Upgrade Stage 3
- Rangiora Sewer - WWTP Inlet Works – Septage Disposal Facility
- Rangiora Sewer - Additional Aeration WWTP Ponds
- Kaiapoi Sewer - Charles Street Rising Main
- Kaiapoi Sewer - Moorcroft Sewer Main
- Kaiapoi Sewer - Cridland Street Sewer Repairs
- Woodend Sewer - Wetland Plant Investigations
- Fernside Sewer - Connect to EDSS

Attachments:

i. Report no. 170928105216
ii. Report no. 171020113861[v1]
iii. Report no. 180219017018
iv. Report no. 180301021693
2. **RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council

(a) **Receives** report No. 180327032669.

(b) **Approves** the request for additional funding in year 1 of the draft Long Term Plan for $14,000 from the wastewater renewals account for upgrades to the Ohoka Road wastewater catchment in Kaiapoi. The cost will be recovered through Eastern District Sewer Scheme rates.

(c) **Approves** the request to increase the budget for a main extension in Tuahiwi Road by $33,000 in year 1 of the draft Long Term Plan to account for a contribution from the Ngai Tuahuriri runanga.

(d) **Approves** the request for funding of $86,109 in year 1 of the draft Long Term Plan for a reticulation main extension in Topito Road in Tuahiwi. This cost will be recovered through development contributions.

(e) **Approves** the request to investigate inflow and infiltration on the Tuahiwi scheme in year 1 of the draft Long Term Plan. This cost will be managed through existing operations and maintenance budgets.

(f) **Approves** the request to develop a contingency plan for minimizing wastewater overflows as required by the Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan. This work will be completed in year 1 of the draft Long Term Plan. The cost will be managed through existing resource consent budgets.

(g) **Approves** the request to analyse the configuration of the Kaiapoi wastewater treatment plant to determine if a more efficient configuration is possible. This work will be completed in year 1 of the draft Long Term Plan. This cost will be managed through existing resource consent budgets.

(h) **Approves** the request to mitigate hazards at wastewater facilities on the Eastern District Sewer Scheme. This work will be completed in years 1 through 9 of the draft Long Term Plan, with the bulk of the work occurring in years 1 through 5. This cost will be managed through existing maintenance and renewal budgets.

(i) **Approves** the request to mitigate hazards at wastewater facilities on the Oxford scheme. This work will be completed in years 1 through 5 of the draft Long Term Plan. This cost will be managed through existing maintenance and renewal budgets.

(j) **Approves** the request to mitigate hazards at wastewater facilities on the Loburn Lea scheme. This work will be completed in years 1 through 4 of the draft Long Term Plan. This cost will be managed through existing maintenance and renewal budgets.

(k) **Approves** the deferral of the projects as set out in the following table to provide an achievable capital works programme for 2018/19.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme - Project</th>
<th>Budget Type</th>
<th>Draft LTP 2018-28</th>
<th>Revised Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Sewer - Central Rangiora Capacity Upgrade Stage 3</td>
<td>Solely Growth</td>
<td>$1,011,000 (2018/19)</td>
<td>$505,500 (2018/19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>$92,000 (2018/19)</td>
<td>$46,000 (2018/19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Renewals</td>
<td>$807,000 (2021/22)</td>
<td>$403,500 (2018/19)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. **BACKGROUND**

**Ohoka Road Sewer Upgrades**

3.1. As reported to the Utilities and Roading Committee at its 20th March, 2018, meeting, and documented in report number 170928105216 in Trim, a portion of the Kaiapoi wastewater reticulation system in Ohoka Road between Peraki Street and Williams Street is undersized to convey wastewater in the catchment. A budget of $205,000 is placed in year 1 of the draft Long Term Plan to make upgrades to the reticulation system in this area.

3.2. These improvements involve rerouting the flow from the Kaikanui pump station away from the Ohoka Road catchment and into the Courtenay Drive catchment. This will require the installation of new reticulation in Courtenay Drive.

3.3. Recent discovery of asbestos in Courtenay Drive on other Council projects makes it likely that asbestos will be present in the area of this project and will need to be mitigated during construction of the reticulation improvements.

3.4. A budget of $14,000 from the wastewater capital renewals account is requested in year 1 of the draft Long Term Plan. This was not included in the original budget for the project because it was not known that asbestos is present in Courtenay Drive. Recent roading projects have revealed that asbestos is present in the vicinity of this project; therefore, staff feels that it is appropriate to provision for this expenditure at this stage of the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Level of Service</th>
<th>Budget 2018/19</th>
<th>Budget 2019/20</th>
<th>Budget 2020/21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Sewer - WWTP Inlet Works – Septage Disposal Facility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$500,000 (2018/19)</td>
<td>$500,000 (2020/21)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Sewer - Additional Aeration WWTP Ponds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$500,000 (2018/19)</td>
<td>$500,000 (2024/25)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi Sewer - Charles Street Rising Main</td>
<td>Solely Growth</td>
<td></td>
<td>$93,000 (2018/19)</td>
<td>$46,500 (2018/19)</td>
<td>$46,500 (2019/20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi Sewer - Charles Street Rising Main</td>
<td>Renewals</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,109,029 (2018/19)</td>
<td>$554,515 (2018/19)</td>
<td>$554,515 (2019/20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi Sewer - Moorcroft Sewer Main</td>
<td>Solely Growth</td>
<td></td>
<td>$70,000 (2019/20)</td>
<td>$70,000 (2024/25)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi Sewer - Cridland Street Sewer Repairs</td>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td></td>
<td>$100,000 (2018/19)</td>
<td>$100,000 (2018/19)</td>
<td>$500,000 (2019/20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi Sewer - Cridland Street Sewer Repairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,000,000 (2019/20)</td>
<td>$500,000 (2019/20)</td>
<td>$500,000 (2020/21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend Sewer - Wetland Plant Investigations</td>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td></td>
<td>$70,000 (2018/19)</td>
<td>$70,000 (2019/20)</td>
<td>$70,000 (2020/21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernside Sewer - Connect to EDSS</td>
<td>Solely Growth</td>
<td></td>
<td>$219,225 (2019/20)</td>
<td>$50,000 (2018/19)</td>
<td>$169,225 (2019/20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernside Sewer - Connect to EDSS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$812,025 (2020/21)</td>
<td>$406,012 (2020/21)</td>
<td>$406,013 (2021/22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernside Sewer - Connect to EDSS</td>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td></td>
<td>$73,075 (2019/20)</td>
<td>$73,075 (2019/20)</td>
<td>$135,337 (2021/22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernside Sewer - Connect to EDSS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$270,675 (2020/21)</td>
<td>$135,338 (2020/21)</td>
<td>$135,337 (2021/22)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Wastewater Servicing of Tuahiwi Community

3.5. This section of the staff submission addresses three items related to the servicing of the Tuahiwi community with wastewater.

Correction of Budget for Tuahiwi Road Main Extension

3.6. At its 7th November, 2017, meeting, Council approved the entrance into an agreement with Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga (The Runanga) to accept $33,000 toward the extension of a wastewater reticulation main in Tuahiwi Road. This main extension is detailed in a report to Council located in Trim at record number 171020113861[v2].

3.7. Council staff placed a budget for the main extension in year 1 of the draft Long Term Plan; however, this budget did not include the contribution from the Runanga. Council staff requests that the budget for this work is increased by $33,000 to include the funding so that all necessary funding can be put into the capital project. This will not result in an increase in rates to customers on the Eastern District Sewer Scheme, as this funding will come from an external source.

Creation of Budget for Topito Road Main Extension

3.8. Similar to the request in item 3.12 above, the Runanga offered $33,000 to Council for the extension of a wastewater main in Topito Road from the existing Turiwhaia pump station to the vicinity of 61 Topito Road. This contribution and main extension are detailed in report number 180219017018 in Trim. Each was approved by Council at its 3rd April, 2018, meeting.

3.9. Council staff request that budget for this main extension in the amount of $86,109 is placed in year 1 of the draft Long Term Plan. This includes the contribution of $33,000 from the Runanga and $53,109 of funding from Council. This was not in the draft Long Term Plan because the project was not requested by the Runanga at that time.

Investigation of Inflow and Infiltration on the Scheme

3.10. Like several schemes across the Waimakariri District and New Zealand, the Tuahiwi scheme experiences high levels of inflow and infiltration (I&I) during periods of wet weather. This I&I is problematic because it uses capacity in existing reticulation and pump stations that could otherwise be allocated to new connections on the scheme.

3.11. Council staff need to undertake an investigation of the scheme to find the source of this I&I, identify ways to stop the I&I from entering the system, and then program these repairs.

3.12. If this I&I is found and removed from the system, then it could delay necessary upgrades to the Turiwhaia pump station. These pump station upgrades are currently planned for year 5 of the Long Term Plan.

3.13. Council staff contracted with Advanced Environmental Services in 2014 to perform the same kind of investigation on the Mandeville scheme. The results of this investigation proved successful in finding faults on the scheme that were allowing I&I to enter the system.

3.14. Council staff estimates this work will have a cost of $10,000 in year 1. Staff will attempt to manage this cost within existing operations and maintenance budgets. This was not included in the draft Long Term Plan because Council was not aware of the need for this main extension.

Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan Contingency Planning

3.15. The Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan (LWRP) requires councils in Canterbury to implement contingency measures to minimize the risk of discharge from a wastewater reticulation
system to surface water in the event of a system failure or in the event that the system is overloaded beyond design capacity during large rain events.

3.16. Specifically, policy 4.15 of the LWRP states that:

   In urban areas, the adverse effects on water quality, aquatic ecosystems, existing uses and values of water and public health from the cumulative effects of sewage, wastewater, industrial or trade waste or stormwater discharges are avoided by:

   (c) the implementation of contingency measures to minimise the risk of a discharge from a wastewater reticulation system to surface water in the event of a system failure or overloading of the system beyond its design capacity; and

   (d) any reticulated stormwater or wastewater system installed after 11 August 2012 is designed and managed to avoid sewage discharge into surface water.

3.17. Council staff will engage a consultancy to perform an assessment of selected sites, identify options and costs for managing overflows at these sites, and then program the costs of these options for implementation in future years.

3.18. Council staff estimates that this work will have a cost of $19,000. Staff will attempt to manage this within existing resource consent compliance budgets. This was not included in the original draft Long Term Plan because it is an issue that has come about since Long Term Plan budgets were drafted in late 2017.

   **Analysis of Kaiapoi Wastewater Treatment Plant**

3.19. As part of its resource consent for the Ocean Outfall, Council is required to sample for a few items present in wastewater before wastewater effluent is discharged into the marine environment. Among these items are enterococci and E. Coli.

3.20. The Ocean Outfall has had difficulty achieving compliance with its resource consent at times because of high levels of enterococci, particularly in the months of February and March when the level of enterococci spikes to levels that are much higher than at other times of the year. This spike in enterococci occurred again in February and March 2018.

3.21. Council staff believe that this spike in enterococci is possibly related to the formation of blue-green algae in the wetlands at the Kaiapoi wastewater treatment plant. If enough of this blue-green algae is passed through the ultraviolet (UV) unit that provides final disinfection before wastewater leaves the plant, then it can prevent the UV from performing as designed and can allow excessive amounts of enterococci and E. Coli to leave the plant untreated.

3.22. Council staff would like to undertake an analysis of the wetlands to determine if a more efficient and effective arrangement of flow through the plant would aid in the Ocean Outfall meeting its resource consent in all months of the year.

3.23. Council staff estimates that this work will have a cost of $15,000. Staff will attempt to manage this within existing resource consent compliance budgets. This was not included in the draft Long Term Plan because it is an issue that has come about since Long Term Plan budgets were drafted in late 2017.

   **Mitigate Hazards Discovered During Health & Safety Audit of Wastewater Sites**

3.24. A risk assessment of hazards at all wastewater sites was competed in March 2018 by Civil Link Limited. The intent of this work was to identify health and safety hazards at wastewater sites and develop plans and costs to mitigate those hazards.
3.25. The likelihood and consequence of occurrence criteria in Table 1 were used to classify hazards into five different categories from the most severe, extreme, to the least extreme, very low. No extreme or very low risk hazards were identified during the assessment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likelihood</th>
<th>Consequences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Insignificant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Injury not requiring First Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost Certain</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>VL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlikely</td>
<td>VL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Rare</td>
<td>VL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E = Extreme       H = High      M = Medium    L = Low    VL = Very Low

Table 1 – Hazard Categories

3.26. A number of hazards were identified across wastewater sites. Once hazards were classified using the criteria in Table 1, Council staff used the timeframes in Table 2 to schedule mitigation of these hazards. The schedule for mitigation of all hazards is shown in Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extreme</td>
<td>Complete Immediately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Complete within 12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Complete within 2-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Complete when funds available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>Complete when funds available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 – Timeframes to Address Hazards

3.27. Table 4 lists the type of hazards that will be mitigated by this program of work.
3.28. Council staff will attempt to manage these health and safety projects within existing maintenance or replacement budgets, depending on the type of work being performed. These were not included in the draft Long Term Plan because the inspections and report documenting the findings were not complete at that time.

### Design & Consultation for Connection of Fernside Scheme to Eastern District Sewer Scheme

3.29. In financial year 2020/21, the Fernside scheme will be connected to the Eastern District Sewer Scheme. This project is currently funded over 2 years in the draft Long Term Plan, years 2 & 3. Those budgets and the purpose of each are:

- Design & Consultation 2019/20 – $219,225 (Growth) + $73,075 (LOS)
- Construction 2020/21 – $812,025 (Growth) + $270,675 (LOS)

3.30. To allow for an adequate consultation period, Council staff would like to divide the design and consultation period into a 2-year period beginning in year 1 of the draft Long Term Plan. The revised funding schedule below is proposed:

- Design & Consultation 2018/19 – $50,000 (Growth)
- Design & Consultation 2019/20 – $169,225 (Growth) + $73,075 (LOS)

3.31. Council staff request a budget of $50,000 to be placed in year 1 of the draft Long Term Plan and that the budget for year 2 is decreased by $50,000 for a total of $169,225.

3.32. This change will result in no difference in the cost of the project. The only change will be when the project budget will be spent.

### ISSUES AND OPTIONS

4.1. Staff has reviewed the existing wastewater capital program to determine if the work can be completed as planned. Table 5 on the following shows changes to the capital program that staff is proposing for the 2018/19 financial year and the rational for the proposed change.

4.2. These changes will result in an achievable capital program and will also allow the additional items requested in this report to be completed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme - Project</th>
<th>Budget Type</th>
<th>Draft LTP 2018-28 Budget</th>
<th>Revised Budget</th>
<th>Rational</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Sewer - Central Rangiora Capacity Upgrade Stage 3</td>
<td>Solely Growth</td>
<td>$1,011,000 (2018/19)</td>
<td>$505,500 (2018/19)</td>
<td>$505,500 (2019/20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>$92,000 (2018/19)</td>
<td>$46,000 (2018/19)</td>
<td>$46,000 (2019/20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Renewals</td>
<td>$807,000 (2021/22)</td>
<td>$403,500 (2018/19)</td>
<td>$403,500 (2019/20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Sewer - WWTP Inlet Works – Septage Disposal Facility</td>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>$500,000 (2018/19)</td>
<td>$500,000 (2018/19)</td>
<td>Deferred as further assessment of proposed location and charging mechanism required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Sewer - Additional Aeration WWTP Ponds</td>
<td>Solely Growth</td>
<td>$500,000 (2018/19)</td>
<td>$500,000 (2018/19)</td>
<td>Deferred by 5 years to align with growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi Sewer - Charles Street Rising Main</td>
<td>Solely Growth</td>
<td>$93,000 (2018/19)</td>
<td>$46,500 (2018/19)</td>
<td>$46,500 (2019/20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Renewals</td>
<td>$1,109,029 (2018/19)</td>
<td>$554,515 (2018/19)</td>
<td>$554,515 (2019/20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi Sewer - Moorcroft Sewer Main</td>
<td>Solely Growth</td>
<td>$70,000 (2019/20)</td>
<td>$70,000 (2019/20)</td>
<td>Deferred to align with growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi Sewer - Cridland Street Sewer Repairs</td>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>$100,000 (2018/19)</td>
<td>$100,000 (2018/19)</td>
<td>$500,000 (2019/20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend Sewer - Wetland Plant Investigations</td>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>$70,000 (2018/19)</td>
<td>$70,000 (2018/19)</td>
<td>$70,000 (2019/20)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 – Adjustments to Capital Programme

4.3. There are three options for moving forward with these requests. Those are:
- Accept the request as written.
- Ask Council staff to modify the requests appropriately.
- Reject the requests outright.
5. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

5.1. **Groups and Organisations**

A concerned citizen in Kaiapoi has voiced concern to Council about the performance of its wastewater treatment plants. Council staff have worked frequently with him to better understand his concerns and address them where possible.

5.2. **Wider Community**

The wider community has not been consulted on any of the items in this report; however, since each of these will result in an increased level of service, it is anticipated that public opposition to any of these items would be very minor or non-existent.

6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**

Council staff will attempt to manage each of these additional items within existing maintenance or capital budgets; however, there is a risk that some or all of these budgets will be exceeded by the end of the financial year.

6.2. **Community Implications**

Each of these items is intended to improve the level of service that customers receive from Council wastewater schemes. Since level of service will be improved, it is not expected that there will be significant opposition to any of these items.

6.3. **Risk Management**

The items that will be mitigated as part of the 3 Waters Site Hazard Assessment will remove a number of hazards from wastewater sites. A detailed risk assessment for the program will be performed prior to beginning the physical works.

6.4. **Health and Safety**

The delivery of wastewater services in the Waimakariri District directly impacts the health and safety of both customers of the Council and residents of the larger Waimakariri District. Each of the items presented in this staff submission will either directly or indirectly improve the wastewater service that Council provides to its customers and the larger Waimakariri District, thereby improving the health and safety of the larger community.

7. **CONTEXT**

7.1. **Policy**

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

7.2. **Legislation**

The Local Government Act of 2002 is relevant in this matter.

7.3. **Community Outcomes**

The following Council purpose and community outcomes apply to the items presented in this staff submission.

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

  - Harm to the environment from sewage and stormwater discharges is minimised.
- Council sewerage and water supply schemes, and drainage and waste collection services are provided to a high standard.”

7.4. **Delegations**

Any decisions made as a result of this report are within the delegated authority of the Council.
Attachment 1

Trim Report 1709281025216 – Ohoka Road Sewer Improvements
8. SUMMARY

8.1. The purpose of this report is to update the Utilities and Roading Committee on investigations toward improving the wastewater reticulation system in Kaiapoi. A portion of the wastewater reticulation system in Ohoka Road between Peraki Street and Williams Street is undersized to convey wastewater in the catchment. A plan of the area is included on Figure 1.

8.2. The reticulation system has experienced blockages and overflows from rainfall events in July and August 2017. In the rainfall event that occurred on 21st July, 2017, the residents of the Ranui Mews housing complex were evacuated from their homes and placed in hotel-type accommodations because of flooding in the area and the wastewater system’s inability to convey these higher than normal flows. This inability to convey wastewater flows caused raw sewage to backup into the residences. During a second large rainfall event on 14th August, 2017, sucker trucks were used to remove sewage from the reticulation system to ensure that this evacuation did not happen again. This arrangement has been used three times again in larger rain events since August 2017, with the most recent time being on 20th and 21st February, 2018, during ex-Cyclone Gita.

8.3. Council Project Delivery Unit (PDU) and 3 Waters staff identified and evaluated seven options to alleviate the over-utilization of this part of the reticulation system. Six options included replacing a part of the reticulation system with larger pipes, while a seventh option identified removing part of the Ohoka Road catchment and diverting it to a different catchment. A multi-criteria decision analysis (MCDA) was used to assess each of these options.

8.4. Option 7 which diverts the flow from the Kaikanui pump station out of the Ohoka Road catchment and into the Courtenay South pump station catchment is the recommended option. This work involves the replacement of electrical components and pumps in three pump stations and installing approximately 65 meters of new pumping main between the Kaikanui pump station and the reticulation in the catchment for the newly-constructed Courtenay South pump.
station. Of the seven options considered, it is the lowest cost option and received the best MCDA score of all options evaluated. The total cost of this option is estimated at $219,000. The budget for this option was placed in year 1 of the draft Long Term Plan.

Attachments:

i. Map of the area of work
ii. Options analysis

9. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Committee:

(l) Receives report No. 170928105216.

(m) Approves the adoption of Option 7 of diverting flow from the Kaikanui pump station into the Courtenay South and Courtenay North pump stations as the recommended solution.

(n) Notes that budget provision of $219,000 is included in the 2018/19 year of the draft Long Term Plan and that the works will be carried out in that year.

(o) Circulates the report to the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board.
Figure 1 – Ohoka Road Vicinity Map
10. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

10.1. A portion of the reticulation system in Kaiapoi is undersized. The section of the system that is undersized is between Williams Street and Peraki Street, between manhole WW007758 and manhole WW007739 in Ohoka Road. This section of the system receives heavier than normal flows during rainfall events, suggesting that there are high levels of inflow and infiltration entering the system in the area.

10.2. Of particular concern is the recently constructed Ranui Mews elderly housing complex between Williams Street and Hills Street. This housing complex is served by the 150mm sewer main described above. In the rainfall event that occurred on 21st July, 2017, the residents of the complex were evacuated and placed in hotel-type accommodations because of flooding in the area and the wastewater system’s inability to convey wastewater flows, causing sewer backups into residences.

10.3. The PDU Network Planning Team has assessed the amount of flow in this section of the system, particularly during larger rainfall events, and has determined that the existing 150mm diameter main does not have enough capacity.

10.4. Seven options were identified to alleviate the over-utilization of this part of the reticulation system. Options 1 through 6 involve installing new pipelines in either new or existing alignments in Ohoka Road. Option 7 involves installing a short section of rising main and making electrical modifications to three existing pump stations to move the flow from the Kaikanui pump station on Courtenay Drive out of the Ohoka Road catchment and into the Courtenay South pump station catchment. It should be noted that option 6 is considerably more expensive than options 1 through 5 because it involves replacing the water main in Ohoka Road because of its close proximity to the sewer main.

10.5. An eighth option to remedy the overutilization of this section of the reticulation system involves investigations into the source of the excessive inflow and infiltration in this part of the system and then removing as much of the excess water as possible. This option will be addressed in the hydraulic model update for the Kaiapoi collection system and future capital works.

Table 1 – Options Assessed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Install new 225mm sewer main along existing alignment with open trench.</td>
<td>$574,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Install new 225mm sewer main along existing alignment with pipe bursting.</td>
<td>$495,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Install new 225mm sewer main on south side of Ohoka Road.</td>
<td>$495,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Install new 150mm sewer main on south side of Ohoka Road to serve as parallel sewer.</td>
<td>$439,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Install new 150mm sewer main on south side of Ohoka Road as overflow sewer.</td>
<td>$273,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Install new 225mm sewer main and new water main in same alignments as existing.</td>
<td>$718,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Divert flow from Kaikanui pump station to Courtenay South and Courtenay North pump station</td>
<td>$219,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Investigate and reduce inflow and infiltration in the existing reticulation system.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.6. Each of these options was assessed using a high-level MCDA. The output of the MCDA is included at the end of this document. As shown in table 2, option 7 yielded the best score of all options and is therefore the preferred option. This option is the lowest cost of all considered, reduces the over-utilization of the existing sewer main in Ohoka Road, and is the least disruptive and safest option of all assessed.

10.7. A plan of this area is included in Figure 2.
10.8. In addition to the result of the MCDA recommending selection of option 7, re-routing the pump station to the Courtenay Drive catchment is a more efficient configuration of the wastewater system in this area. When the Kaikanui pump station was constructed, the reticulation system in Courtenay Drive did not exist; therefore, the only option for discharge from the pump station was in Ohoka Road. The existing arrangement is against gravity in the area, as water is being pumped west and uphill away from the treatment plant to a different catchment and then on to other pump stations before being pumped to the wastewater treatment plant. Re-routing the pump station into the Courtenay Drive catchment is a much more efficient movement of wastewater through the Kaiapoi reticulation system.
10.9. It is recommended Option 7 be implemented.

10.10. Further to the modifications to the pump station and reticulation, PDU staff are updating the hydraulic model for the Kaiapoi reticulation system. Of particular interest are those parts of the collection system that see higher than normal levels of inflow and infiltration (I&I) from stormwater runoff and groundwater. I&I in a wastewater reticulation system takes capacity that is otherwise planned and constructed for wastewater service. If I&I is removed from a reticulation system, then further upgrades to increase capacity can be delayed.

10.11. PDU and 3 Waters staff inspect parts of the different reticulation systems to identify these areas of high I&I. When they are identified, they are programmed for either relining or replacement. Identifying these areas and programming them for renewal or replacement will be a large part of the Kaiapoi reticulation system model update to be completed by the end of 2018.

10.12. Investigation of I&I in the Ohoka Road catchment will continue, and capital works to remove I&I in the catchment will be necessary in future years. Additional upgrades to the existing 150mm line in Ohoka Road may still be needed in the future to achieve level of service.

11. COMMUNITY VIEWS

11.1. The Community has not been consulted regarding this matter; however, Council staff believe that the works will improve their level of wastewater service and therefore don’t expect any significant opposition to this work.

12. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

12.1. The estimate for the cost of this work is $219,000. This estimate includes all labour, materials, and professional services necessary to complete the system upgrades. This work is budgeted in the 2018-19 draft annual plan budget and will be carried out in that year.

12.2. Council staff notes that this is urgent work that shall be carried out as soon as possible; however, sufficient time does to design, consent, and construct the project does not remain in the current financial year. Therefore, the works will be carried out as early as possible in the next financial year.

13. CONTEXT

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

13.2. Legislation
The Council has committed to meeting certain levels of service as specified in the Activity Management Plan for the Wastewater System. There are two levels of service that pertain to this work. Those are:

- SeW 09 – Overflows on Private Property - Number of recorded overflows on private property found to be the result of insufficient capacity in the reticulation system for any rainfall up to a 1 in 2 year event, for areas designed prior to 1999.
• SeW 11 – Percentage of respondents to a three-yearly community survey that have an opinion that rates the service as "Satisfactory" or "Very Satisfactory."

Continued overflows and backups because of inaction in this area will contribute to a declining level of service for each of these metrics. Inaction will also cause the Council to incur unnecessary reactive maintenance costs when reinstating service. This reactive maintenance expense is a sunk cost that would otherwise not be incurred and could be passed on to customers as a savings in their rates.

13.3. **Community Outcomes**

13.3.1. The expected outcome from this work will be an improved level of service for wastewater. This portion of Kaiapoi should not experience loss of wastewater service because of excessive flows in the mains.
Table 2 – Multi-Criteria Decision Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option Number</th>
<th>Option 1 – Open trench sewer replacement on existing alignment</th>
<th>Option 2 – Pipe burst existing sewer main in new alignment</th>
<th>Option 3 – Open trench new 225mm I.D. replaced main in new alignment</th>
<th>Option 4 – Open trench new 225mm I.D. duplicated main in new alignment</th>
<th>Option 5 – Shallow open trench 225mm I.D. Pipe in new alignment as overflow</th>
<th>Option 6 – Open trench sewer replacement as existing alignment including water main replacement</th>
<th>Option 7 – Direct flow from Kakaho Pump Station to Courtenay Pump Station</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Replace sewer main and manholes WW007746 to WW007779/Choka Road including replacing a section of 200mm AC water main.</td>
<td>Replace sewer main and manholes WW007746 to WW007779 along Choka Road by bursting existing 150mm reinforced concrete pipe with 200mm I.D. HDPE pipe including CDA allowance for water main repair.</td>
<td>Replace sewer main and manholes WW007746 to WW007779 in new alignment in southern shoulder of Ohoka Road and replacing sewer main parallel to WW007758 to WW007779, includes relay of pipe at WW007758 and new pipe from WW007779 to a new manhole in the shoulder. All laterals transferred to new main.</td>
<td>Replace sewer main and manholes WW007746 to WW007779 in new alignment in southern shoulder of Ohoka Road and replacing sewer main parallel to WW007758 to WW007779, including relay of pipe at WW007758 and new pipe from WW007779 to a new manhole in the shoulder. Single lateral on south side of road assumed transferred.</td>
<td>Replace sewer main and manholes WW007746 to WW007779 along Choka Road including replacing 200mm A.1 Critical AC water main (1978, 39 yrs readiness for renewal).</td>
<td>Install VFD control on Courtenay Pump Station, relaying of 300mm I.D. pipe, replace Courtenay South Pumps and increase capacity of new Courtenay North Pumps. Include for electrical and controls upgrades.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Cost</td>
<td>$174,000.00</td>
<td>$145,000.00</td>
<td>$66,000.00</td>
<td>$70,000.00</td>
<td>$87,000.00</td>
<td>$273,000.00</td>
<td>$219,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer Cost</td>
<td>$200,000.00</td>
<td>$200,000.00</td>
<td>$60,000.00</td>
<td>$200,000.00</td>
<td>$718,000.00</td>
<td>$680,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Total Cost</td>
<td>$574,000.00</td>
<td>$545,000.00</td>
<td>$146,000.00</td>
<td>$370,000.00</td>
<td>$951,000.00</td>
<td>$963,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Level Multi Criteria Analysis</td>
<td>Ranking for 0 to 4 best relative to others and 4 worst relative to others</td>
<td>Ranking for 0 to 4 best relative to others and 4 worst relative to others</td>
<td>Ranking for 0 to 4 best relative to others and 4 worst relative to others</td>
<td>Ranking for 0 to 4 best relative to others and 4 worst relative to others</td>
<td>Ranking for 0 to 4 best relative to others and 4 worst relative to others</td>
<td>Ranking for 0 to 4 best relative to others and 4 worst relative to others</td>
<td>Ranking for 0 to 4 best relative to others and 4 worst relative to others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advantages (additional to those stated above)</td>
<td>Hydraulic capacity increase</td>
<td>Hydraulic capacity increase</td>
<td>Hydraulic capacity increase</td>
<td>Hydraulic capacity increase</td>
<td>Hydraulic capacity increase</td>
<td>Hydraulic capacity increase</td>
<td>No flow from Kakaho catchment to Ohoka Road gravity main</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disadvantages (additional to those stated above)</td>
<td>High risk of damage to 200mm AC water main replacement</td>
<td>Deep installation</td>
<td>Long construction duration</td>
<td>Penfold Street road closure</td>
<td>Water main is fragile and aged and needs full replacement</td>
<td>Deep installation</td>
<td>Long construction duration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 – Multi-Criteria Decision Analysis
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Trim Report No. 171020113861
14. SUMMARY

14.1. The purpose of this report is to seek Council approval to enter into private agreements with Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga and private property owners to extend the STEP sewerage scheme in Tuahiwi to facilitate development in accordance with revised planning provisions applying to MR873.

Attachments:
  i. Map of the Tuahiwi village area

15. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(p) Receives report No. 171020113861.

(q) Agrees to enter into a private agreement with Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga to receive $33,000 towards the cost of implementing a STEP sewer main in Tuahiwi Road from Topito Road to Waikoruru Road at a total cost of $109,470 (incl. GST).

(r) Approves a connection charge of $2,250 per dwelling unit for the first ten units to connect to the sewer along this length of Tuahiwi Road.

(s) Notes that those connecting to the service would be required to also pay development contributions required for the Eastern Districts Sewerage Scheme Ocean Outfall and the Woodend reticulation system and treatment plant at the sum of $9,471.

(t) Notes that further extensions of the STEP scheme in the vicinity will likely give rise to the need to upgrade the capacity of the Turiwhaia pumping station and further recoveries of these costs will need to be made via an additional development contribution.

(u) Notes that the costs of that upgrade is included in draft LTP budgets for the Council’s consideration in January 2018.
16. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

16.1. Land Use Recovery Plan Action 21 directed the Council to change its District Plan in 2015 to facilitate residential development on Maori land in Maori Reserve 873. This include provision for phased cluster housing on conforming rural zoned properties.

16.2. Since these provisions became operative, a number of Whanau groups have progressed development proposals but none have gone onto completion at this stage. While issues of financing and finalising arrangements among descendent owners have been causes for delay, so too has arrangements to provide for and fund necessary servicing.

16.3. Unlike development of contiguous lots within a subdivision under the control of a single party, this situation involves discontinuous properties, multiple owners and parties who wish to progress incremental development for residential purposes over extended periods. Financing networked water and wastewater services in this situation is problematic and a barrier to expeditious development.

16.4. Recent discussions with the Upoko of Ngai Tuahuriri, Te Maire Tau, have sought to progress servicing along a segment of Tuahiwi Road between Topito Road and Okaihau Road and along Topito Road for approximately 970 metres south of Tuahiwi Road. Water service is available along most of the length of these sections, but the current STEP sewerage scheme does not provide service for any of the area along Tuahiwi Road and most of the area along Topito Road.

16.5. To accelerate this servicing of wastewater, a funding contribution of $66,000 has been put forth by the Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga. This contribution would be divided equally between the two segments, or $33,000 per road, to be serviced and would be seen as a means of accelerating development in the area and leveraging the recently-adopted planning provisions for MR 873.

In the interim to facilitate development along Tuahiwi Road, a wastewater main would be extended from the existing Turiwhaia Pump Station to Waikoruru Road. The total cost for this extension would be approximately $109,469. After the Rununga contribution of $33,000 is subtracted from this amount, a total of $76,469 would be funded by the Council. To recover these costs, a connection charge of $2,250 per property wanting to connect would be required.

The connection cost of $2,250 was arrived at by assuming that, in the next 10 years, the 20 existing properties along Tuahiwi Road would connect to the new reticulation system and that an additional two parcels would be developed to their maximum 7 residences per parcel. This yields a total of 34 connections that would share in the Council-funded portion of $76,469 for the new reticulation system.

In addition to these connection costs, persons wanting to connect to the reticulation system in Tuahiwi Road would need to pay the following costs:

- Development contributions – costs that contribute to recouping the cost of the existing reticulation system and treatment plant infrastructure in Woodend and in the Eastern Districts Sewer Scheme.

- Onsite costs – the costs to install infrastructure within the property boundary to convey wastewater to the public mains, i.e. septic tanks, pumps, and service laterals. These costs would apply to new development requiring an entirely new septic system or homeowners choosing to replace their existing septic tank and pump. If a homeowner has an adequate septic tank and chooses to retain that tank and pump, then these costs would not apply.
The table below details each of these costs for the first ten connections along Tuahiwi Road.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Connection Cost</td>
<td>$2,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Development Contributions (DC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Woodend DC</td>
<td>$231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Eastern Districts DC</td>
<td>$9,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Onsite Costs</td>
<td>$16,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Total incl. GST</td>
<td>$28,281</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 – Costs Associated with Wastewater Connection

16.6. Wastewater flows for up to ten new connections in the Turiwhaia pump station catchment can be accommodated within the existing pump station. The above costs apply to those first ten houses to connect along Tuahiwi Road. Additional development beyond these ten homes, whether they occur along Tuahiwi Road, Topito Road, or elsewhere in the Turiwhaia pump station catchment, will trigger an upgrade to the pump station and reticulation downstream of the pump station. This upgrade would be funded by new development, replacements, and level of service charges. Provision for the pump station and reticulation upgrades is proposed in year two of the LTP budget at a cost of $1.934Million. These costs would be recouped through development contributions and rates. Appropriate development contribution costs will be determined in the next financial year as part of the design of the pump station and downstream reticulation.

To achieve a sustainable solution, considerable engagement and consultation with the community will be required to determine an appropriate scale of reticulation upgrade and its feasible uptake duration.

16.7. Council staff are aware of a proposed development at 80 Topito Road. If this development moves forward as planned, then Council staff may bring forward a similar proposal for wastewater infrastructure along Topito Road.

16.8. The Management Team/CE has reviewed this report and supports the recommendations.

17. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

17.1. Community views were canvased in relation to the planning provisions facilitating additional residential development in rural zoned MR873 and factored into the decision-making on the Plan Change at that time.

18. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

18.1. Council faces the following financial implications to service Tuahiwi village with wastewater service.

18.1.1. To extend wastewater service along Tuahiwi Road, Council faces a financial contribution of $76,469. To service development in Tuahiwi Village beyond the ten homes mentioned earlier in this report, Council faces a $1,934M cost to make upgrades to the Turiwhaia pump station and downstream reticulation. These costs would be recovered over a period of time as properties connect to the sewer system.
18.2. Council is at risk of development in the area not proceeding as planned or existing properties choosing to not connect to the sewer system. If Council chooses to install the infrastructure to service planned growth in the area but this development does not occur, then Council has no means to recover the infrastructure costs incurred.

19. **CONTEXT**

19.1. **Policy**

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

19.2. **Legislation**

The Local Government Act of 2002 is relevant in this matter.

19.3. **Community Outcomes**

This report relates to the following community outcomes:

1. Effect is given to the Treaty of Waitangi.
2. There is a safe environment for all.

Simon Markham  
Strategy & Engagement Manager

Chris Parton  
Wastewater Asset Manager
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WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT

FILE NO and TRIM NO: SEW-03-04-05 / 180219017018

REPORT TO: Council

DATE OF MEETING: 3 April 2018

FROM: Chris Parton, Wastewater Asset Manager
Simon Markham, Manager Strategy & Engagement

SUBJECT: Request Authorization to Bring Forward Funding for Reticulation Extension

SIGNED BY: Department Manager
pp Chief Executive

20. SUMMARY

20.1. There are four distinct purposes of this report. Each of these is detailed below.

20.2. The first is to seek approval from Council to bring forward funding of $35,720 into the 2017/18 financial year for a wastewater reticulation main extension in Tuahiwi Road. This budget was approved by Council on 7 November 2017, and funding for this extension was placed in the draft Long Term Plan for the 2018/19 financial year. This timeframe does not meet the required timeframe of Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga (the Runanga) and therefore needs to be accelerated. The amount of $35,720 provides for design fees and 25% of the cost of installing the main. The remaining 75% of the construction cost will remain in the 2018/19 financial year budget.

20.3. The second is to seek approval from Council to accept $33,000 from the Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga (the Runanga) toward the extension of wastewater reticulation in Topito Road from the existing Turiwhaia pump station to the vicinity of 61 Topito Road to serve a proposed development at 233 Tuahiwi Road. The total cost of this main extension is estimated at $86,109, with the Council portion estimated to be $53,109. This will be a new budget item placed in the draft Long Term Plan by staff submission for the 2018/19 financial year.

20.4. The third is to request funding of $8,908 for the current financial year to begin design of the main extension in Topito Road.

20.5. The fourth is to update Council on efforts toward developing a master plan for improving wastewater service in the Tuahiwi area.

Attachments

ii. Map showing Tuahiwi Road Main Extension
iii. Map showing Topito Road Main Extension
21. **RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(v) **Receives** report No. 180219017018.

(w) **Approves** the request to bring funding of $35,720 forward from the 2018/19 financial year in the draft Long Term Plan to the current financial year of 2017/18 for design and partial construction of the main extension in Tuahiwi Road.

(x) **Approves** a budget of $8,908 for the current financial year of 2017/18 to design a wastewater main extension in Topito Road.

(y) **Agrees** to enter into a private agreement with Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga to receive $33,000 (incl. GST) towards the cost of implementing a STEP sewer main in Topito Road from Tuahiwi Road to 61 Topito Road at a total cost of $86,109.

(z) **Notes** that additional works to develop a master plan for wastewater service in the Tuahiwi area will be conducted in parallel to these main extensions, with extensive public engagement with residents of the Tuahiwi community beginning later in 2018.

22. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

**Tuahiwi Road Reticulation Extension**

22.1. At a meeting on 7 November 2017, Council approved a request to enter into an agreement with Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga to receive $33,000 toward the construction of a wastewater reticulation main in Tuahiwi Road and to fund the remaining cost of this construction. Council’s portion of this construction is estimated to be $76,470. This is detailed in Trim report number 171020113861. The location of this main is shown in Figure 1.

22.2. Council’s portion of the design and construction of this wastewater main was included in the draft Long Term Plan for the 2018/19 financial year, with design currently planned to commence in July 2018.

22.3. Recent discussions with representatives of Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga indicate that this timeframe is not adequate and will potentially hinder progress toward development of single-family cluster housing in the Tuahiwi area.

22.4. In order for development to progress in the timeframe desired, design and construction of the main extension needs to begin before the start of the 2018/19 financial year.

22.5. Resources internal to Council’s Project Delivery Unit (PDU) can design and call for tenders for the main extension in the timeframe required to service the development. Therefore, Council staff requests that funding for design and 25% of construction of this main extension be made available in the 2017/18 financial year. The amount of funding to be brought forward into the current financial year is $35,720. The remaining amount of $45,750 will be placed in year 1 of the draft Long Term Plan.

**Topito Road Extension**
22.6. During a recent meeting with representatives from Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga, plans to construct cluster housing at 233 Tuahiwi Road were also discussed. The builder of these homes wishes to connect to Council’s wastewater scheme.

22.7. A wastewater reticulation extension along Topito Road from the existing Turiwhaia pump station to the vicinity of 61 Topito Road would be required for these new homes to connect to Council’s scheme. The cost of this main extension is estimated to be $86,109 for construction, professional fees, and contingency. The location of this main is shown in Figure 2.

22.8. The Runanga has offered to contribute $33,000 (incl. GST) toward the extension of this main. The balance of the works is $58,059 after the Runanga contribution is deducted. This amount would be paid by Council. Budget provision for this main extension will be placed in year 1 of the draft Long Term Plan by staff submission.

22.9. These costs would be recovered by a connection cost of $3,056 per property. This was arrived at by assuming that the 9 existing properties along Topito Road that aren’t connected to public reticulation would connect to the system and that two additional properties along Topito Road will develop to their full potential in the next 10 years. This yields a total of 19 new connections to share in the Council-funded portion of $58,059 for the new reticulation system.

22.10. To ensure that the timeframe of the developers is met, design and tendering for the works needs to commence in the current financial year. Resources internal to PDU can design and call for tenders for the main extension in the timeframe required to service the development. Therefore, Council staff request that funding for the design of this main extension in the amount of $8,908 be made available in the 2017/18 financial year.

Master Plan for Wastewater Service in Tuahiwi

22.11. In addition to these main extensions in the Tuahiwi area, Council staff will begin working on a master plan for servicing the Tuahiwi community with reticulated wastewater. This master plan will include anticipated reticulation extensions needed, estimated upgrades to the Turiwhaia pump station, and funding strategies for the work necessary to upgrade wastewater service in the Tuahiwi community.

22.12. A significant portion of this planning process will involve consulting with the Tuahiwi community to identify those properties that plan to develop in the next 10 to 15 years, as well as existing properties that don’t plan to develop but that would still like to connect to a public wastewater system.

22.13. This information, along with estimated costs for reticulation and pump station upgrades, will be used to develop an appropriate development contribution for the Tuahiwi scheme.

22.14. The main output of this master plan will shape the extent of the public wastewater scheme in the Tuahiwi area.

23. COMMUNITY VIEWS

23.1. The public has not been consulted on this matter to date; however, funding for the main extension in Tuahiwi Road is included in the Long Term Plan which is currently out for public consultation. Therefore, the public will have ample opportunity to review that project.
23.2. Extensive public consultation will be conducted as part of the master planning efforts. This consultation will be geared toward identifying those properties which might develop in the future and those properties that have a desire to connect to a public wastewater scheme in the future.

24. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

24.1. Council faces the following financial implications to service Tuahiwi village with wastewater service.

24.1.1. To extend wastewater service along Tuahiwi Road, Council’s share is $76,469.

24.1.2. To extend wastewater service along Topito Road, Council’s share is $53,109.

24.1.3. Once upgrades to the existing TURIWHAIA pump station are required, Council’s share will be approximately $1.934M.

24.2. These costs will be recovered through development contributions over a period of time as properties connect to the sewer system.

24.3. Council is at risk of development in the area not proceeding as planned or existing properties choosing to not connect to the sewer system. If Council chooses to install the infrastructure to service planned growth in the area but this development does not occur, then Council has no means to recover the infrastructure costs incurred.

25. **CONTEXT**

25.1. **Policy**

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

25.2. **Legislation**

The Local Government Act of 2002 is relevant in this matter.

25.3. **Community Outcomes**

This report relates to the following community outcomes:

- Core utility services are provided in a timely, sustainable and affordable manner.
Figure 1 – Tuahiwi Road Main Extension
Figure 2 – Topito Road Main Extension
Attachment 4

Trim Report No. 180301021693
SUMMARY

1.1 The purpose of this report is to update the Utilities & Roading Committee on the management of wastewater treatment plants in the Waimakariri District Council.

1.2 Specifically, staff would like to update the committee on efforts around:

- Midges and other insects around treatment plant sites,
- Generation of odours at treatment plant sites,
- Monitoring of sea foam that could be a result of Council’s ocean outfall,
- Efforts toward minimizing chances of future incidences of avian botulism, and
- Further testing to determine the cause of excessive levels of enterococci in the ocean outfall.

Attachments:

i. Report from ESR on sea foam analysis

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Utilities & Roading Committee

a) Receives report No. 180301021693.

b) Supports that Council staff will make a staff submission in the range of $50,000 to the draft Long Term Plan for midge and insect management at the Kaiapoi wastewater treatment plant.

c) Notes that Council staff will continue to monitor for the presence of sea foam along the beach between the Waimakariri River mouth and 1 km north of Council’s ocean outfall.

d) Notes that Council staff will compile information relative to avian botulism and develop a comprehensive management strategy to minimize the chances of future incidences of avian botulism occurring.
e) **Notes** that Council staff will continue work to determine the cause of elevated levels of enterococci in Council’s ocean outfall pipeline.

f) **Circulates** the report to the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board, the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board, and the Woodend-Sefton Community Board for information.

**BACKGROUND**

3.1 Council staff would like to update the Utilities and Roading Committee on a number of items related to the management of wastewater treatment plants in Waimakariri District Council.

3.2 There has been concern from the public regarding these issues. Council has received feedback and complaints from members of the community in person, through its service request system, and via email.

3.3 The following section contains information relating to each of these issues.

**ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

**Midges and Other Nuisance Insects Around Wastewater Treatment Plants.**

4.2 Council has set a level of service target of no complaints from midges or other nuisance insects related to its wastewater treatment plants. This level of service has generally been met in the past; however, there have been occasional complaints received regarding midges around the Kaiapoi wastewater treatment plant.

4.3 Council has received one complaint regarding midges at the Kaiapoi treatment plant this financial year; therefore, the level of service for midges will not be met this quarter. A photo below shows the number of midges at this residence.

4.4 To aid in meeting this level of service in the future, Council commissioned a consultancy, Beca, to develop a plan for managing midges at the Kaiapoi plant.

4.5 The report from Beca recommended adoption of four different strategies to better manage midges:

- Install insect traps around the plant site to monitor the number of midges present
- Apply insecticide in spring and summer to kill midge larvae,
- Apply insecticide in spring and summer to kill midge adults, and
- Establish vegetated kill zones around the plant site to attract adults for further contact with insecticides.

4.6 Council staff will review all options to manage nuisance insects around its treatment plant sites with all environmental effects being considered before a final plan is implemented.
4.7 Council staff will incorporate these recommendations from Beca, as well as information from other sources, into a pilot project for inclusion in the Long Term Plan commencing in the 2018/2019 financial year.

Generation of Odours from Council Treatment Plant Sites

4.9 Council has set a level of service target of no odour complaints from its treatment plant sites.

4.10 Council received one complaint regarding odour from its Kaiapoi treatment plant site in February 2018 and therefore will not meet its level of service target for this quarter of the financial year.

4.11 This odour complaint came in the middle of an extended warm and dry period that caused excessive evaporation in the wetlands at the plant site. The water level in the wetlands dropped because of this evaporation, causing accumulated sludge around the edge of the wetlands to become exposed to air and become septic, generating offensive odours to the public in the area around the treatment plant.

4.12 Council has since raised the water level in the wetland to prevent the sludge from becoming septic. A project to remove accumulated sludge from the wetland is planned for later this financial year and will likely start in April 2018.

4.13 Council has received no other odour complaints regarding any of its wastewater infrastructure.

Monitoring of Sea Foam Along the Beach Between Waimakariri River Mouth and Ocean Outfall

4.15 Council has received some questions regarding whether there is a link between the ocean outfall system and the generation of sea foam along the beach between the Waimakariri River mouth and approximately 1km north of the ocean outfall.

4.16 Past efforts to test sea foam to determine if it was generated by the ocean outfall suggested that the sea foam was not related to Council’s ocean outfall.

4.17 Council has continued to monitor the beach in the vicinity of the outfall since the last time sea foam was present.

4.18 Beginning on 8th January, 2018, Council staff elevated the number of times per week that the beach is visited to monitor for the presence of foam. Council staff visit the beach 5 times weekly to monitor for foam and will continue to do so until mid-April.

4.19 To date, one instance of sea foam was witnessed on 15th January. Samples of this foam were collected and sent to ESR, a contractor to Council, for analysis.

4.20 Results of this analysis showed that there were slightly elevated levels of enterococci and E. Coli in the seawater tested and very elevated levels of enterococci and E. Coli in the Waimakariri River water tested. The test results are presented in the Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Number</th>
<th>Sample Location</th>
<th>E. Coli</th>
<th>Action Level*</th>
<th>Enterococci</th>
<th>Action Level*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>500m south of Ocean Outfall</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 km north of ocean outfall</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 km south fo ocean outfall</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Waimakariri River, upstream of Kaiapoi WWTP</td>
<td>194.3</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* As established by Ministry for the Environment.
Table 1 – Test Results from Sea Foam Analysis

4.21 It is important to note that the levels of both enterococci and E. Coli in both the sea and river water were still well below action or alert levels as defined by the Ministry for the Environment.

4.22 Council staff will continue to engage members of the public that frequent the beach to alert us to the presence of sea foam.

Efforts to Minimize Risk of Avian Botulism Outbreak Occurring in the Future

4.24 For approximately 5 years, Council has experienced incidences of avian botulism at the Kaiapoi, Rangiora, and Woodend wastewater treatment plants.

4.25 Avian botulism is a disease that affects waterfowl, causing paralysis and eventual death. The disease affects birds in councils throughout New Zealand and other countries.

4.26 Cases of avian botulism have been predominantly concentrated at the Kaiapoi treatment plant but have also occurred at the Woodend and Rangiora wastewater treatment plant sites. Smaller numbers of affected birds have been discovered at other outlying Council sites, as well as at the Tutaepatu Lagoons in Pegasus.

4.27 In the current season, approximately 1,400 birds have been removed from Council plant sites as of 1st March 2018, with most of the bird deaths occurring at or near the Kaiapoi treatment plant site. For reference to past outbreaks of avian botulism, Council removed approximately 5,500 birds from treatment plant sites in 2015.

4.28 Council’s efforts at managing the effects of avian botulism have been to remove the carcasses of dead birds from treatment plant sites, thereby reducing the chance of spread of the disease to other birds. In the past, birds were removed two to three times a week. This is a best practice measure to minimize the impact of the disease.

4.29 Council has chosen to remove birds daily from the Kaiapoi site this year to better manage the disease and has continued every other day removals at the Rangiora and Woodend sites.

4.30 Council has sought advice from subject matter experts such as Keystone Ecology and the Department of Conservation and will continue to do so in an attempt to improve the management of the situation in future years.

Efforts to Determine the Source of Elevated Enterococci Levels in the Ocean Outfall

4.32 As part of its resource consent for the Ocean Outfall, Council is required to sample for the level of enterococci discharged into the marine environment.

4.33 Two consent conditions pertain to enterococci:

4.34 The requirement for weekly sampling of the ocean outfall effluent, and

4.35 The seasonal numerical limit for the level of enterococci present in the effluent.

4.36 The numerical limit for enterococci was not exceeded until February 2013 when the level of enterococci in the effluent spiked.
4.37 Since then, Council has commissioned a number of tests to determine the cause of elevated levels of enterococci.

4.38 Beginning in the week of 19th February, 2018, enterococci levels again spiked. Council staff have re-engaged ESR to begin the next phase of testing to determine the source of these elevated levels and to better understand options to prevent these spikes from occurring in future years.

4.39 To date in the 2018 financial year, Council has not breached its resource consent limit for enterococci; however, should levels remain elevated, a consent breach is possible. If a consent breach occurs, this will likely result in a minor non-compliance notification from Environment Canterbury.

ISSUES AND OPTIONS

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

COMMUNITY VIEWS

Groups and Organisations

A concerned citizen in Kaiapoi has voiced concern to Council about wastewater treatment plant performance. Council staff have worked frequently with him to better understand his concerns and address them where possible.

Wider Community

The wider community has not been consulted on any of the items presented in this report.

IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

Financial Implications

There may be additional financial implications due to some of the information presented in this report. The extent of those is unknown at this time.

There will be a staff submission in the range of $50,000 for the management of midges into the Long Term Plan process for the 2018/19 financial year.

Community Implications

The implications of the update presented in this report will be improved level of service, specifically around the generation of odours and midges from wastewater treatment plants.

Risk Management

If the management of wastewater treatment plants is not appropriately managed, the risk of complaints from the community and non-compliance with resource consents will increase.

Health and Safety

Detailed health and safety plans will be developed for each of these items when implementation of any recommendations begins.

CONTEXT

Policy

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

Community Outcomes

8.2 Council sewerage and water supply schemes, and drainage and waste collection services are provided to a high standard.

Delegations

8.3 Any decisions made as a result of this report are within the delegated authority of the Council.
24 January 2018

To: Chris Parton
   Wastewater Asset Manager
   Waimakariri District Council
   Private Bag 1005
   RANGIORA 7440

   Email: chris.parton@wmk.govt.nz

From: ESR Christchurch Science Centre
   PO Box 29181
   CHRISTCHURCH 8540

   Email: paula.scholes@esr.cri.nz

REPORT ON BROWNISH-GREEN “SLIME” ANALYSIS

The following samples were received on 16th January 2018. They were labeled as being sampled from Pines Beach.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESR Number</th>
<th>Client Reference</th>
<th>Date / Time sampled</th>
<th>Site Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CMB180025</td>
<td>001CP</td>
<td>15/01/2018, 1:15</td>
<td>sea water 500m S of outfall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMB180026</td>
<td>003CP</td>
<td>15/01/2018, 1:45</td>
<td>sea water 1 km S of outfall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMB180027</td>
<td>002CP</td>
<td>15/01/2018, 1:30</td>
<td>sea water 1 km N of outfall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMB180028</td>
<td>004CP</td>
<td>15/01/2018, 2:00</td>
<td>Waimak Rv, west of Kaiapoi WWTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMB180029</td>
<td>001CP - sand</td>
<td>15/01/2018, 1:15</td>
<td>sand 500m S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMB180030</td>
<td>003CP - sand</td>
<td>15/01/2018, 1:45</td>
<td>sand 1km S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMB180031</td>
<td>002CP - sand</td>
<td>15/01/2018, 1:30</td>
<td>sand 1km N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notice of Confidential Information:
### Results of *E. coli* and *Enterococci* Analysis:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESR Number</th>
<th>Client Reference</th>
<th>Description / Site ID</th>
<th><em>E. coli</em> cfu / 100m or cfu / g dry weight</th>
<th><em>Enteroc</em> cfu / 100m or cfu / g dry weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CMB180025</td>
<td>001CP</td>
<td>sea water 500m S of outfall</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMB180029</td>
<td>001CP - sand</td>
<td>sand 500m S</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>160.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMB180026</td>
<td>003CP</td>
<td>sea water 1 km S of outfall</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMB180030</td>
<td>003CP - sand</td>
<td>sand 1km S</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMB180027</td>
<td>002CP</td>
<td>sea water 1 km N of outfall</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMB180031</td>
<td>002CP - sand</td>
<td>sand 1km N</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMB180028</td>
<td>004CP</td>
<td>Waimak Rv, west of Kaiapoi WWTP</td>
<td>194.3</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion:

These samples were taken in response to the presence of brownish-green “slime” on the beach near the WWTP outfall (refer photo).

All the beach water results are less that the alert level for marine water. The results from the Waimakariri River sample are higher, but still less than the “unsuitable for swimming” guidelines.

Notes:
Brief details of the methods of analysis are available on request. These results relate to samples as received. This report may not be reproduced except in full.

Paula Scholes
Laboratory Operations Coordinator
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT FOR DECISION

FILE NO and TRIM NO: FIN-01 / GOV-01-11 / 180517054036

REPORT TO: Council

DATE OF MEETING: 29 - 31 May 2018

FROM: Paul Christensen, Finance Manager

SUBJECT: Carryovers from 2017-18 to 2018-19

SIGNED BY:
Department Manager
Chief Executive

1. SUMMARY
This report contains a list of projects and capital works which have either not commenced or will not be completed this financial year. Approval is required to include these projects into the 2018-28 Long Term Plan. The cost of completing the projects listed will be met either by credit balances carried forward, reserve fund transfers or by loan funding.

It is intended that the budget carryovers be approved as part of the 2018-28 Long Term Plan process, but the actual carryover will be made after the 30 June 2018 accounts have been completed and the actual expenditure situation for each project is known.

Attachments:
i. Schedule of Proposed Carryovers from 2017-18 to 2018-19 (180517054043)

2. RECOMMENDATION
THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180517054036.
(b) Adopts the carryovers as listed for inclusion in the 2018-28 Long Term Plan.

3. BACKGROUND
3.1 Not applicable

4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS
4.1. This report identifies the projects included in the 2017-18 budget which will not be completed by 30 June 2018.

Remarks have been provided for each project explaining the reason why the carryover has been requested.

4.2. Rates may be affected in outer years to a minor extent, due to the expenditure relating to loan repayments. The cost of completing the projects listed will be met either by credit balances carried forward, reserve fund transfers or by loan funding.

4.3. A project is normally capitalised when it is fully completed. Therefore in most cases the full budget needs to be carried over. Projects that will be partially capitalised as at 30 June 2018 will only have unspent portion carried over. If a project is overspent but still continues
into the next financial year, only the Council approved budget will be carried over. Capital projects that have already been included/re-budgeted in the 2018-28 Long Term Plan will not be included on the carry over list.

4.4. Operational expenditure will only be carried over if there is sufficient operational expenditure surplus in the account. If there is not, a separate report is required to be approved by Council. The carry over requirements for operational budgets this year are $504,080 in total. $463,620 is from Woodend and Kaiapoi Sewers for desludging ponds, $31,560 is from Recreation for the Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw Advisory Group and $8,900 is from Governance for Community Board Discretionary Grant Funds.

4.5. Council’s projected spend on capital (excluding projects carried over from last year) as at 30 June 2018 is expected to be over $80.0m.

4.6. Additional carryovers requested (capital projects) for the current year are summarised below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Budget for Projects to carryover</th>
<th>Anticipated expenditure to 30 June 2018</th>
<th>Unspent portion</th>
<th>Amount to be carried over</th>
<th>Number of Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>$1.9m</td>
<td>$0.7m</td>
<td>$1.2m</td>
<td>$1.6m</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer</td>
<td>$9.2m</td>
<td>$4.9m</td>
<td>$4.3m</td>
<td>$5.5m</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage</td>
<td>$1.6m</td>
<td>$0.2m</td>
<td>$1.4m</td>
<td>$1.6m</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road</td>
<td>$3.4m</td>
<td>$0.9m</td>
<td>$2.5m</td>
<td>$2.6m</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>$2.7m</td>
<td>$1.5m</td>
<td>$1.3m</td>
<td>$1.8m</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earthquake</td>
<td>$6.9m</td>
<td>$3.7m</td>
<td>$3.2m</td>
<td>$3.9m</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>$1.6m</td>
<td>$0.3m</td>
<td>$1.3m</td>
<td>$1.3m</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>$27.3m</strong></td>
<td><strong>$12.1m</strong></td>
<td><strong>$15.2m</strong></td>
<td><strong>$18.2m</strong></td>
<td><strong>65</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.7. All of the Roading carryovers are either sub-divisional or growth related projects which do not effect rates.

4.8. The Draft Long Term Plan already contained $20.4m worth of carryovers. Of which the following have now been reduced or are being double counted in the table above:

- Roading - $4.6m
- Sewer - $1.7m
- Recreation - $1.0m
- Solid Waste - $1.5m
- Total - $8.8m

4.9. Therefore, the $20.4m worth of carryovers plus the additional $18.2m of carryovers less the $8.8m of carryovers reduced/double counted provides a combined total of carryovers from 2017-18 into 2018-19 worth $29.7m.

4.10. The unspent portion of the combined total of carryovers from 2017-18 into 2018-19 is $23.8m.
4.11. Significant carryovers of each category are summarised below:

**Capital budget**

4.11.1. Water

Summerhill – Source Upgrade 2\textsuperscript{nd} Well - *Budget $0.4m Anticipated Expenditure $0.1m*

New well has been drilled, developed and tested but consent has not yet been gained. Once this is gained well head will be constructed to complete the project.

North East Kaiapoi Boost Main - *Budget $0.7m Anticipated Expenditure $0.3m*

Delays in design have resulted in construction not being able to be completed before the end of June 2018.

4.11.2. Sewer

Central Rangiora Railway to Waste Water Treatment Plant Construction - *Budget $7.9m Anticipated Expenditure $4.2m*

This is a multi-year project. Construction on stage 2B is underway and will be completed by the end of the 2019 financial year. $1,516,250 is already included in the Draft Long Term Plan as carryovers. Requesting an additional $3,080,750 to be carried over.

Central Rangiora Capacity Upgrade - *Budget $0.7m Anticipated Expenditure $0.4m*

This is a multi-year project. Construction on stage 2B is underway and will be completed by the end of the 2019 financial year. $142,500 is already included in the Draft Long Term Plan as a carryover. Requesting an additional $430,500 to be carried over.

4.11.3. Drainage

Flood Response Rural Areas - *Budget $0.5m Anticipated Expenditure $*

Second culvert on Cones Road. Project ties in with intersection widening at Faucets Road (Roading led project) which has been postponed until 2018-19.

North Brook and Railway Drain - *Budget $0.4m Anticipated Expenditure $0.1*

Flood mitigation options still being investigated.

4.11.4. Road

Waikuku to Pegasus Cycleway Upgrade - *Budget $0.6m Anticipated Expenditure $0.1m*

Sealing access from Waikuku to Horse Float car park on hold until logging is complete. $60k is budget to be carried over. $250k is to be carried over and reallocated to Asphalt Resurfacing Northern half of the New Arterial Road.

Gladstone Rd: Walking / Cycling Connection - *Budget $0.3m Anticipated Expenditure $*

Property purchase and boundary adjustment process is underway.

Rangiora Car Park Building - *Budget $2.0m Anticipated Expenditure $0.5*

Awaiting on decision from Gibson’s.

4.11.5. Recreation
Non-specified Reserve Enhancement - Budget $0.6m Anticipated Expenditure $0.3m
Staff have undertaken a review of all parks and a programme for improvements has been identified. $365,000 is already included in the Draft Long Term Plan as a carryover. Requesting an additional $180,000 to be carried over.

Gladstone Park - Budget $0.9m Anticipated Expenditure $0.8m
Staff are now talking with sports turf institute about the development of the additional sports fields. $325,000 is already included in the Draft Long Term Plan as a carryover. Requesting an additional $120,000 to be carried over.

4.11.6. Earthquake
Restoration of red zone areas capital works - Budget $1.5m Anticipated Expenditure $0.4
Project consists of multiple smaller projects. Will be split out into multiple projects in the 2018/19 year.

Kaiapoi Town Centre Renewal - Budget $1.8m Anticipated Expenditure $0
Project consists of multiple smaller projects.

4.11.7. Vehicle Renewal
Motor Vehicle Purchase - Budget $0.9m Anticipated Expenditure $0.2
Vehicles will be purchased per replacement programme in 2018/19.

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

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. Groups and Organisations
Not applicable

5.2. Wider Community
Not applicable

6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1. Financial Implications
The Long Term Plan for 2018-28 will be adjusted to include the approved carryovers.

The loan adjustments to previous carryovers in the draft Long Term Plan plus the additional carryovers requested will have the effect of increasing the rates by 0.06% in 2018/19.

Risks arise with the delay or non-completion of projects with the two main consequences being:

- Necessary work not being completed could result in not achieving the level of service.
- Escalation of prices due to the current economic environment.

6.1.1. For each project the Council may approve that the project is carried over to the 2018-28 Long Term Plan.

OR

6.1.2. The Council may amend the work.
6.1.3. The Council may decide not to proceed with the particular project. Rates may be affected in outer years to a minor extent, due to the expenditure relating to loan repayments. The cost of completing the projects listed will be met either by credit balances carried forward, reserve fund transfers or by loan funding.

6.2. Community Implications

Not applicable

6.3. Risk Management

Risk is associated with the delay of projects with the main consequences being:

- Necessary work not being completed could result in not achieving levels of service.
- Price fluctuations due to the current economic environment.
- Earthquake recovery – availability and amount of government funding and insurance recoveries for some assets.
- Further costs which may be incurred in future earthquakes e.g. Council self-insures bridges in conjunction with NZTA funding.

6.4. Health and Safety

Not applicable

7. CONTEXT

7.1. Policy

This matter is a matter of significance in terms of the Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy as the cost of some projects, or in total, exceed $1m, however the original approval was done in conjunction to a special consultative procedure and is requested for approval due to the timing of the projects. The expected completion dates (if known) are provided on the schedule attached.

7.2. Legislation


7.3. Community Outcomes

The Long Term Plan process contributes to the following community outcomes:

“There are wide ranging opportunities for people to contribute to the decision-making by public organisations that affects our District

- The Council makes information about its plans and activities readily available.
- The Council takes account of the views across the community including mana whenua.”

7.4. Delegations

Not applicable
## Carry-over schedule 2018/19

Capital work requested to be carried over from 2017/2018 to 2018/2019 (capital projects that had been re-budgeted in 2018/2019 will not be listed on this carry over report)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Category (Current Year or Multi-Year or Developer Driven)</th>
<th>Full year revised budget</th>
<th>Actual Expenditure to date as at 31 March 18</th>
<th>Anticipated Expenditure to 30 June 2018</th>
<th>Anticipated Capitalization</th>
<th>Projected Completion Date (mth/yr)</th>
<th>Unspent</th>
<th>Amount to be carried over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROADING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Road Subtotal</td>
<td>5,112,250</td>
<td>360,574</td>
<td>889,687</td>
<td>169,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,292,699</td>
<td>3,226,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRAINAGE</td>
<td>Drainage Subtotal</td>
<td>3,420,729</td>
<td>52,000</td>
<td>288,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,142,729</td>
<td>3,068,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WATER</td>
<td>Water Subtotal</td>
<td>1,665,026</td>
<td>817,717</td>
<td>341,607</td>
<td></td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>86,612</td>
<td>86,612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEWER</td>
<td>Sewer Subtotal</td>
<td>9,217,160</td>
<td>3,695,667</td>
<td>4,918,364</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,719,364</td>
<td>4,298,800</td>
<td>4,097,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESERVES - RECREATION</td>
<td>Reserves - Recreation Subtotal</td>
<td>2,416,887</td>
<td>1,171,011</td>
<td>1,017,004</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,141,100</td>
<td>1,057,799</td>
<td>1,057,799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMPING GROUNDS - RECREATION</td>
<td>Camping Grounds - Recreation Subtotal</td>
<td>214,010</td>
<td>131,170</td>
<td>130,006</td>
<td></td>
<td>88,000</td>
<td>88,000</td>
<td>88,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RANGIORA CENTRAL BUSINESS AREA - RECREATION</td>
<td>Rangiora Central Business Area - Recreation Subtotal</td>
<td>76,000</td>
<td>43,975</td>
<td>43,975</td>
<td></td>
<td>43,975</td>
<td>32,000</td>
<td>32,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOLID WASTE</td>
<td>Solid Waste Subtotal</td>
<td>229,200</td>
<td>14,980</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>164,220</td>
<td>164,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUILDING CONTROL</td>
<td></td>
<td>35,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10,930</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24,570</td>
<td>24,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARMS DEFENCE</td>
<td></td>
<td>76,235</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10,930</td>
<td></td>
<td>15,290</td>
<td>15,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT DELIVERY UNIT</td>
<td></td>
<td>114,230</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>114,230</td>
<td></td>
<td>114,230</td>
<td>114,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEHICLE RENEWAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>108,200</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>111,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>111,000</td>
<td>111,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPUTER SERVICES</td>
<td></td>
<td>276,000</td>
<td>31,785</td>
<td>217,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>217,000</td>
<td>217,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Capital Budgets (None Earthquake)</td>
<td>20,451,571</td>
<td>6,281,292</td>
<td>8,444,697</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,905,444</td>
<td>5,905,444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earthquake Recovery Budgets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RED ZONE REGENERATION - RECREATION</td>
<td>Red Zone Regeneration - Recreation Subtotal</td>
<td>1,452,750</td>
<td>43,478</td>
<td>409,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>395,000</td>
<td>1,043,800</td>
<td>1,057,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WATER EQ</td>
<td>Water EQ Subtotal</td>
<td>331,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>311,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEWER EQ</td>
<td>Sewer EQ Subtotal</td>
<td>2,342,000</td>
<td>2,005,842</td>
<td>2,142,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>342,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENERAL EQ</td>
<td>General EQ Subtotal</td>
<td>2,420,000</td>
<td>2,001,062</td>
<td>2,142,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>342,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRAINAGE EQ</td>
<td>Drainage EQ Subtotal</td>
<td>276,000</td>
<td>13,508</td>
<td>226,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>276,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECREATION EQ</td>
<td>Recreation EQ Subtotal</td>
<td>276,000</td>
<td>13,508</td>
<td>226,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>276,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Earthquake Recovery Budgets</td>
<td>6,862,700</td>
<td>2,416,385</td>
<td>3,093,587</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,000,567</td>
<td>3,000,567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Capital to Carry Over</td>
<td>27,314,121</td>
<td>8,759,687</td>
<td>12,138,264</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8,906,011</td>
<td>8,906,011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Comments

- The total capital to carry over is 27,314,121, with an amount of 8,759,687 left unspent and 18,554,434 to be carried over.
1. **SUMMARY**

1.1. The purpose of this report twofold:

1. To present the consultation feedback from the community on the proposed upgrade of the Garrymere water supply.

2. To seek direction from the Community Board on the preferred way forward for the water supply.

1.2. The Garrymere water supply does not comply with the Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand (DWSNZ) and represents an unacceptable risk to the public health of the Garrymere community in the long term.

1.3. The Health Act requires Council to “take all practicable steps” to comply with the DWSNZ. Following the contamination event in the Havelock North water supply, the CDHB have signalled that cost is not a practicable barrier to upgrading the Garrymere supply because it considers it to be affordable for the Council.

1.4. The Council has previously met its obligations under the Health Act by complying with an approved Water Safety Plan. The Water Safety Plan however commits Council to completing the upgrade by 2017. Therefore, an upgrade to the Garrymere supply is overdue and should not be unduly delayed.

1.5. Circumstances have conspired to make the cost to ratepayers of upgrading the Garrymere scheme very high. These circumstances being:

   a) A lack of good quality sources in the area, specifically deep groundwater.

   b) Relative isolation, leading to a lack of nearby schemes to amalgamate with and benefit from improved economies of scale.

   c) No imminent growth planned to help improve the economies of scale.

   d) The significant cost of upgrading the treatment of the existing shallow well to comply with the DWSNZ relative to the small rating base.

   e) The Council’s long established practice of individual schemes funding their own improvement works.
1.6. At the heart of the issue is a tension between the water supply provisions in the Health Act, Council's Revenue and Financing Policy, and the Council's Community outcome that Core utility services are provided in a timely, sustainable and affordable manner.

1.7. The Garrymere scheme members have not responded positively to the proposed upgrade, or specifically the cost of the upgrade. The scheme members have almost unanimously signalled they consider the upgrade to be excessive and/or unaffordable.

1.8. One of the submissions which is claimed to be supported by more than half of the scheme members has suggested a delay to the project for 12 months while a water supply advisory group is established to work through the issues and options, and find an efficient and affordable solution.

1.9. Staff are supportive of the principle of this approach, and recommend that the project be delayed by up to 12 months, while a working group considers the issues and options and reports back to Council by June 2019.

Attachments:
1. Consultation material (180504048869)
2. Set of frequently asked questions and answers (180314027477)
3. Summary of feedback from the community (180504048682).
4. Garrymere Landcare group submission (180406036544)
5. Copy of letter from Mayor to Hon David Clark requesting advice on potential government funding options (180316028182).

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Rangiora Ashley Community Board:

(b) Receives report No. 180504048871.

(c) Notes that the Garrymere community have been consulted on the upgrading options and, the community has expressed strong concern over the affordability of the upgrade. Of those that selected a preferred upgrade option, 5 out of 6 favoured Option A, the lowest cost option.

(d) Notes that, at this time, there are no known external alternative funding sources for the upgrade.

(e) Notes that a submission from the Garrymere Landcare Group, claiming to represent over half the scheme members, has recommended deferring the project by 12 months to allow the establishment of a Garrymere Water Supply Advisor Group to work through the issues and options, and that staff support this approach,

(f) Recommends to the Council that it delays the upgrade by up to 12 months while a Garrymere Water Supply Advisory Group is established to consider and recommend a preferred approach to the upgrade that provides a safe and affordable water supply, and meets the Council's legislative requirements.

(g) Recommends to the Council that the Water Supply Advisory Group comprises:
- 4-6 Volunteer representatives from the Garrymere water supply
- 2 members of the Rangiora Ashley Community Board
- Councillor Williams as portfolio holder for water and wastewater
- Council's Water Asset Manager and 3 Waters Manager (or Manager Utilities & Roading)
- 1 representative from the CDHB (Drinking Water Assessor), if agreeable,
And that the Advisory Group be directed to report its recommendations to Council in
by June 2019.

(h) **Recommends** to the Council that they leave provision in the Long Term Plan budget for
the Garrymere water supply upgrade, based on upgrade Option A, but that it be deferred
to reflect the additional 12 month delay while the Advisory Group considers issues and
options and reports back to Council, meaning that the budget would be required to be split
over the 2018/19 and 2019/20 financial years.

(i) **Notes** that the current programme is based on the project being funded entirely from the
Garrymere water supply scheme members.

3. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

**Background**

3.1. The Garrymere water supply scheme has been identified for a proposed upgrade to be
completed by June 2019 to provide a supply that meets the water quality requirements of
the Drinking Water Standards for New Zealand (DWSNZ), and to provide a safe and
reliable water supply.

3.1. The Board and Utilities and Roading Committee have received the following reports on
the proposal to upgrade the Garrymere water supply which can be referred to for
background information:

- 8 November 2017 Report to RACB Request to consult with community
  (171025115123[v2]).
- 12 December 2017 Report to Utilities and Roading Committee, Request to consult
  with community (171128128873[v2]).

3.2. The most recent report to the U&R Committee on 12 December 2017, which was
forwarded to the Board for information, (Ref 171128128873) authorised staff to consult
with the community over four upgrade options. These options were:

- Option A – Treat existing shallow well with filtration and UV system
- Option B – Drill new deep well with the aim of finding high quality groundwater
  source
- Option C – Connect with Summerhill water supply scheme
- Option D – Connect to Summerhill and convert semi-restricted connections to fully
  restricted connections

3.3. Central to the consultation material was the rating impact of each option, which is
summarised in the table below.
### Table 1: Proposed rating impact of all options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Capital Cost</th>
<th>Projected Rate for 2-unit Property for 2019/20</th>
<th>Projected Rate for 19-unit property for 2019/20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Rates (17/18)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$1,272</td>
<td>$1,803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A: Treat Existing Shallow Well</td>
<td>$387,490</td>
<td>$2,602</td>
<td>$3,689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Drill New Deep Well</td>
<td>$878,724</td>
<td>$2,813</td>
<td>$3,988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: Connect to Summerhill</td>
<td>$1,812,304</td>
<td>$4,819</td>
<td>$6,831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D: Connect to Summerhill and Convert Semi-Restricted Connections</td>
<td>$1,048,901</td>
<td>$3,384</td>
<td>$3,579 *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*this rate is for connections that are currently 19 unit connections that would be converted to 3 unit connections under this option.

3.4. Significantly, the option of individual onsite treatment systems being installed was assessed and discounted due to it being more expensive than a centralised treatment upgrade and because it was unlikely to comply with the future requirements of the Health Act following expected changes following the Havelock North Drinking-water Inquiry Stage 2 Report.

**Consultation**

3.5. The consultation process comprised the following steps:

1) An information brochure was distributed to all scheme members. This was distributed on 5 February 2018, with submission originally required to be returned by 2 March 2018.

2) A drop in session was held to discuss the issues and options. At this session strong feedback was received requesting that a public meeting be held, more information provided, and that the consultation period be extended. Following this, the following steps were taken:

   a) Consultation period extended to line up with the Long Term Plan consultation period, with all feedback required to be received by 9 April 2018.

   b) A set of frequently asked questions and answers were distributed to residents on 13 March 2018 to provide more information as requested.

   c) A public meeting was held on 20 March 2018. Key points covered at this meeting were:

      - The background to the project
      - The options available
      - Why point-of-entry treatment is not considered viable.
      - Why the costs are so high, and whether it could be funded differently
      - Next steps.

3) Written submissions were received by 9 April 2018, rather than the original date of 2 March 2018.

3.6. An official head count was not taken at the drop in session, but it is estimated 15 people attended.

3.7. The public meeting was well attended by the scheme members, elected members, and Council staff. It is estimated approximately 25 scheme members attended the meeting. A detailed presentation was given by staff, and this was followed by a good number of
questions that covered a wide range of concerns and issues, with some strong views being expressed by the community.

3.8. The principal concerns raised by the community primarily related to the high cost of the current water supply, and the projected cost increase after the proposed upgrade.

3.9. Formal written feedback was sought from the community, and a total of 12 submissions have since been received as part of the targeted consultation for the project. The majority of these submissions were in the format provided by Council staff, however some were simply by way of email or letter correspondence.

3.10. In addition to those residents who submitted feedback as part of the targeted consultation for this project, a number of residents submitted as part of the consultation process for the Council’s draft 2018-28 Long Term Plan either in addition to or instead of submitting directly to the targeted consultation for the project.

3.11. For completeness the submissions made to the Long Term Plan as well as the submissions made as part of the targeted consultation for the project have been considered in this report.

3.12. In total, 23 submissions have been received across both consultation processes. However, there were a number properties that provided dual submissions. If the double-ups were ignored, then 16 submissions were received out of the 41 properties on the scheme (40% response rate).

3.13. Of the 16 submissions, one was received from the Garrymere Landcare Group which claims to represent over half the properties on the scheme, although the specific properties represented were not stated.

3.14. The submissions (excluding names) are attached to this report.

3.15. The submissions essentially fall into two categories:

1) Those that selected a preferred upgrade option.

There were six submissions from individual properties where an option was selected, of which five out of six selected Option A (Upgrade treatment of the existing shallow well). The sixth submission which selected an option selected Option D (Join with Summerhill and reduce allocation of semi-restricted properties).

2) Written comments, either on the feedback forms or as a separate stand-alone submission.

There were eleven written submissions. They almost all expressed strong concerns over the proposed cost of the upgrade, or the consultation process, or both. Table 2 summarises the number and types of comments:
Table 2: Summary of consultation comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summarised Comment</th>
<th>Number of Submissions making comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All upgrading options are too expensive and / or unaffordable</td>
<td>10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More work needed to consider options.</td>
<td>6*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defer the upgrade works and form an Advisory Group to consider and determine most efficient and cost effective upgrade solution.</td>
<td>4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question reliability of costings provided</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciate upgrade is needed</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question balance between cost and risk</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate consultation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes submission from Garrymere Landcare Group, which claims to represent over half of the properties on the scheme.

3.16. The written submissions have generally been well considered and presented. The submission from the Garrymere Landcare Group is of particular interest and is discussed further in the Options section of this report.

3.17. Combining the formal feedback with verbal feedback from the drop in session and public meeting, staff believe the following summarises the feeling within the community regarding the proposed upgrade:

1) Overwhelmingly, the community considers the upgrade costs are excessive and unaffordable.

2) The unpalatable costs has led the community to question the options considered, the reliability of the costs, the need for an upgrade, and the consultation process.

3) Of the few that selected a preferred upgrade option, they almost all favoured Option A (5 out of 6), presumably because it has the lowest financial impact.

Issues

3.18. The issues associated with the Garrymere water supply are relatively easy to define, an acceptable solution is not. The issues being:

1) The Garrymere water supply does not comply with the DWSNZ and represents an unacceptable risk to the public health of the Garrymere community in the long term.

2) The Health Act requires Council to “take all practicable steps” to comply with the DWSNZ. Following the contamination event in the Havelock North water supply, the CDHB have signalled that cost is not a practicable barrier to upgrading the Garrymere supply because it considers it to be affordable for the Council.

3.19. The Council has previously met its obligations under the Health Act by complying with an approved Water Safety Plan. The Water Safety Plan however commits Council to completing the upgrade by 2017. Therefore, an upgrade to the Garrymere supply is overdue and should not be unduly delayed.

3) Circumstances have conspired to make the cost of upgrading the Garrymere scheme very expensive. These circumstances being:

a) A lack of good quality sources in the area, specifically deep groundwater.
b) Relative isolation, leading to a lack of nearby schemes to amalgamate with and benefit from improved economies of scale.

c) No imminent growth planned to help improve the economies of scale.

d) The relatively high cost of upgrading the treatment of the existing shallow well to comply with the DWSNZ relative to the small rating base.

e) The Council’s long established practice of individual schemes funding their own improvement works.

4) Unsurprisingly, the Garrymere scheme members have not responded positively to the proposed upgrade, or specifically the cost of the upgrade. The scheme members have almost unanimously signalled they consider the upgrade to be excessive and/or unaffordable.

3.20. The following provides some context around the proposed rate increase following the upgrade of the Garrymere water supply:

1) The current Garrymere water supply rate is approximately $1,300 for a 2 unit restricted supply and $1,800 for an original 19 unit connection.

2) The upgrade would double the cost to $2,600 (2 unit) and $3,600 (19 unit).

3) The scheme rates, following the upgrade, would be between six and eight times the cost of the district’s highest urban water rate (Oxford) and double the cost of the district’s highest restricted water scheme (Summerhill).

4) After the upgrade, the average total district rate for a Garrymere property would be approximately $5,800, which is almost double the district average of approximately $3,000.

Options

3.21. Despite some feedback to contrary, Council staff are firmly of the view that an upgrade is essential, and that upgrading the treatment of the existing shallow well is the best option. Point-of-entry treatment has been investigated in some detail at the request of residents, and this has been discounted due to it being expected to be higher cost than central treatment, as well as having a high risk that it would not comply with future revisions to the Health Act and the DWSNZ.

3.22. The Council has previously considered and discounted the option of offsetting some of the upgrade cost for Garrymere across the district’s larger schemes. The Council has not signalled any shift in its thinking in this regard and therefore this option will not be discussed further in this report.

3.23. The Mayor has written to the Hon. David Clark to request clarification regarding potential funding options for upgrading the water supply. Verbal advice is that there is no funding available, but a formal written response has not been received to date.

3.24. In the absence of a shift in policy relating to funding, either from the Government or the Council, there are very limited practical funding options for the Garrymere water supply.

3.25. The Garrymere Landcare Group have made a particularly well considered, researched and presented submission. While perhaps not doing the submission justice, staff would summarise it into three key points:
1) The upgrade options offered are too expensive and unaffordable to the Garrymere Community and, by extension, the Council is not delivering its Community Outcome of providing core utility services in an affordable manner.

2) An appropriate balance between cost and risk would not be delivered by the proposed upgrade, which seeks to fully comply with the DWSNZ and therefore meet the Council’s commitment under the Health Act.

3) The relief sought is to defer the upgrade 12 months and establish a Garrymere Water Supply Advisory Group to determine the most efficient and affordable way to upgrade the supply.

3.26. The Group makes some very good points in their submission. In particular, Council staff have a lot of sympathy for the argument relating to the balance between risk and affordability. Indeed staff have submitted many of the same arguments during national consultation on the water supply legislation. This is not to say staff are of the view that a lesser standard of upgrade would be appropriate for Garrymere. Rather, a balance between affordability and risk is essential, albeit difficult to achieve in this instance.

3.27. Staff are of the view that the proposal by the Garrymere Landcare Group to establish an advisory group has merit. However, a balance needs to be found between delaying the project long enough to determine the optimum solution and proceeding in a timely manner to complete an upgrade of the supply.

3.28. Therefore, staff propose the design and physical works be delayed by up to 12 months while a Garrymere Water Supply Advisory Group is established to consider and recommend a preferred approach to the upgrade that provides a safe and affordable water supply, and meets the Council’s legislative requirements.

**Proposed Way Forward**

3.29. It is proposed that the project be progressed according to the timetable below:
Table 3: Proposed project plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Complete by</th>
<th>Agenda by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rangiora Ashley Community Board provide recommendation to Utilities and Roading Committee to proceed with community consultation, and provide feedback on draft consultation material.</td>
<td>8th November 17</td>
<td>27th October 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Draft consultation material updated (based on RACB feedback)</td>
<td>24th November 17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Approval from U&amp;R Committee to consult community on recommended upgrade options</td>
<td>12th December 17</td>
<td>1st December 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Consultation commences</td>
<td>February 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Public drop in session</td>
<td>February 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Public meeting</td>
<td>20 March 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Consultation closes</td>
<td>9 April 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Staff report to RACB with results of community consultation and to seek endorsement of recommended way forward</td>
<td>16 May 2018</td>
<td>3 May 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Council adopt budget based on delayed works and Option A (as a holding budget) as part of adoption of 2018-28 Long Term Plan but split over two financial years</td>
<td>19 June 2018</td>
<td>8 June 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Staff report to Council with the recommendation to delay the design and physical works by up to 12 months and establish an advisory group.</td>
<td>3 July 2018</td>
<td>29 June 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Working Group established</td>
<td>31 July 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Council adopts pathway forward based on outcome of Working Group findings.</td>
<td>prior to June 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>July – Oct 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Feb - June 2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

4. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

4.1. The views of the Garrymere community have been outlined in the consultation section above.

4.2. In brief, there are strong reservations within the Garrymere over the affordability of the upgrade. Of those that selected a preferred upgrade option, five out of six selected Option A. The community has proposed, and staff agree with, the establishment of a Garrymere Water Supply Advisory Group.

5. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

5.1. A total budget of $450,000 was allocated as part of the Council 2017/18 Annual Plan to fund the proposed source upgrade which was based on Option A.

5.2. This budget was then further refined as part of the draft 2018-28 Long Term Plan that went out for consultation. The refinements to the budget are summarised below, and are based on updated information regarding the expected costs of Option A:

- $250,000 available in 2017/18 (current financial year) which includes $50,000 that was carried over from the 2016/17 financial year. The original $50,000 was intended for preliminary design and options assessment works to inform the consultation. The $200,000 of new funding available in the 2017/18 financial year was intended to fund consultation, design, tender and some of the construction works.
A further $140,000 was proposed for the 2018/19 financial year to make up a total budget of $390,000 for the project. This final $140,000 of funding was intended to fund the completion of the construction works of the proposed solution.

5.3. The total expenditure to date is approximately $28,000 spent on investigation works and consultation.

5.4. Based on the feedback from the community and the recommendation to defer the construction works to allow the establishment of an advisory group, a staff submission to the 2018-28 Long Term Plan is proposed to split the budget over the following two financial years, rather than aim for completion of all works within the 2018/19 financial year. This would involve the following changes:

Table 2: Proposed changes to budget timing as per staff submission to Long Term Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017/18 (current year)</th>
<th>2018/19</th>
<th>2019/20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>draft 2018-28 Long Term Plan for consultation</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$140,000 (+$250,000 carried over from 17/18)</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Change to Funding as per Staff Submission</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$250,000 carried over from 17/18</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.5. In addition to deferral of some the capital budget, there would need to be deferral of some operational budgets that have been allowed for to start operating the new treatment system once it is constructed. It was initially anticipated that it would be constructed part way through the 2018/19 financial year, while it is now proposed that construction be completed by the end of the 2019/20 financial year. The following changes to operations budgets would be required as a result of deferring the project:

- Pump Power budget for 2018/19 reduce from $8,810 to $6,110
- Pump Power budget for 2019/20 to reduce from $11,760 to $6,240
- Pump Maintenance budget for 2018/19 reduce from $5,040 to $2,040
- Pump Maintenance budget for 2019/20 to reduce from $15,060 to $2,080
- Water Unit Costs budget to reduce from $13,000 to $9,500 in 2018/19
- Water Unit Costs budget to reduce from $16,860 to $9,710 in 2019/20

5.6. The draft Long Term Plan includes rating increases for the Garrymere scheme of 35% in the 2018/19 financial year, followed by 62% the following year. If the project is deferred as suggested the rating increase for the 2018/19 financial year of 35% will be able to be minimised to approximately 5%, with the increases currently consulted on to occur 12 months later than previously reported.

5.7. The capital cost and projected rating impact of the most viable option (Option A – Treatment) is summarised on the table below.
Table 3: Assessment of Rating Impact to Garrymere Water Supply Scheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>A - TREATMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capital Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$387,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change in Operational Cost (first year after upgrade completed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$29,440</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rate Impact based on different allocations of units currently on the scheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing Rates ($/year)</th>
<th>Increase in Rates ($/year)</th>
<th>New Rate ($/year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19 units (24 properties)</td>
<td>$1,803</td>
<td>$1,796</td>
<td>$3,599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 units (1 property)</td>
<td>$2,397</td>
<td>$2,387</td>
<td>$4,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 units (1 property)</td>
<td>$1,335</td>
<td>$1,329</td>
<td>$2,664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 units (1 property)</td>
<td>$1,303</td>
<td>$1,298</td>
<td>$2,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 units (14 properties)</td>
<td>$1,272</td>
<td>$1,267</td>
<td>$2,539</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.8. It is noted that on schemes such as Garrymere with ‘fixed-variable’ rating charges (i.e. a fixed ‘per connection’ rate as well as a variable ‘per unit’ cost), the fixed charges cover 75% of total costs against the scheme, while the variable charges cover the remaining 25% of costs against the scheme. This has the result that as the number of units that a property has increases, the rates do not increase directly proportionally to the additional volume of water being supplied, which is evident in the table above.

5.9. As noted earlier in this report, Council has an obligation under the Health Act to take all practicable steps for the water supply to comply with the Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand. It could be argued that by deferring the project to allow the formation of the advisory group that Council is not taking all practicable steps to complete the upgrade. The Council's approved water safety plan states that the upgrade would have been completed in 2017. This delay will mean that the extent of time by which this upgrade is overdue will be increased.

5.10. There is therefore some risk taken on by Council in opting to defer this upgrade. This is due to balancing the risk associated with the water supply with the need to consult with the affected parties, and provide affordable services.

6. **CONTEXT**

6.1. **Policy**

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

6.2. **Legislation**

The Health (Drinking Water) Amendment Act is relevant in this matter.

6.3. **Community Outcomes**

This project is related to the following community outcomes:

- There is sufficient clean water to meet the needs of communities and ecosystems.
• Core utility services are provided in a timely, sustainable and affordable manner.

6.4. This matter significantly challenges the Council’s ability to deliver the above Community Outcomes. More specifically, the community has strongly signalled that it considers the proposed upgrade of the Garrymere water supply to be unaffordable. Yet, the Council needs to provide a water supply that meets the needs of the community, including being safe to drink.

6.5. Essentially, there is a tension between the water supply provisions in the Health Act, Council’s Revenue and Financing Policy, and the Council’s Community Outcomes.

6.6. The best way to find an appropriate balance between these tensions is to establish a focused water supply advisory group to work through the issues and options.
The Garrymere Water Supply Scheme requires an upgrade to comply with the Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand. We have identified four possible solutions and would like to get your feedback around which option your household prefers.

PUBLIC DROP IN – 15 February 4-7pm at Loburn Domain
What’s the issue?

The existing Garrymere supply draws water from a shallow bore. The water supply is chlorinated but this is not a sufficient treatment system to remove all potential contaminants such as protozoa. Protozoa are organisms such as giardia that can be harmful to humans. Because of this, the water supply does not comply with Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand (DWSNZ) and must be upgraded to meet its requirements under the Health Act. Not upgrading the scheme is not an option that Council can consider.

What are the options and how much will it cost?

There are four options for providing good quality water to the existing Garrymere community that will meet the requirements of the DWSNZ and are outlined below. Costs will vary depending upon how many units your property is allocated. A fifth option, private treatment systems is also outlined, but assessed as not being viable. Costs for each of the options are based on our best estimates for the infrastructure and operating costs required for each option. The final rates will be based on actual costs of the project, and may differ from those presented below.

This information can be viewed on our website and you can give us your feedback online – waimakariri.govt.nz/letstalk

Option A – Treatment of existing source

This option involves the additional treatment of the existing shallow well through the installation of a pre-filtration system, followed by ultra violet (UV) disinfection. This will further treat any potential contaminants that survive the current chlorine treatment. Rates provided are on a per year basis.

Capital cost for this option $387,490  
Operational cost for this option $29,440

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate Impact by Number of Units</th>
<th>Existing Rates</th>
<th>New Rate</th>
<th>Increase in Rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19 units (24 properties)</td>
<td>$1,803</td>
<td>$3,599</td>
<td>$1,796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 units (1 property)</td>
<td>$2,397</td>
<td>$4,784</td>
<td>$2,387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 units (1 property)</td>
<td>$1,335</td>
<td>$2,664</td>
<td>$1,329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 units (1 property)</td>
<td>$1,303</td>
<td>$2,601</td>
<td>$1,298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 units (14 properties)</td>
<td>$1,272</td>
<td>$2,539</td>
<td>$1,267</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Option B – Drill new well at Garrymere**

In this option, we would drill and develop a new deep well up to 300m deep within the Council easement at the existing Garrymere headworks site. The aim would be to find a secure water source with adequate capacity for the scheme. This option has a high risk that the new well may be unsuccessful. The deepest wells currently in the area are no more than 80m deep and yield less than the required capacity for the scheme.

**Capital cost for this option $878,724**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate Impact by Number of Units</th>
<th>Existing Rates</th>
<th>New Rate</th>
<th>Increase in Rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19 units (24 properties)</td>
<td>$1,803</td>
<td>$3,898</td>
<td>$2,094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 units (1 property)</td>
<td>$2,397</td>
<td>$5,181</td>
<td>$2,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 units (1 property)</td>
<td>$1,335</td>
<td>$2,885</td>
<td>$1,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 units (1 property)</td>
<td>$1,303</td>
<td>$2,817</td>
<td>$1,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 units (14 properties)</td>
<td>$1,272</td>
<td>$2,749</td>
<td>$1,477</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Operational cost for this option $1,817**

**Option C – Connect to Summerhill Water Supply**

This option would involve connecting the Garrymere scheme into the Summerhill water supply scheme from the existing pipe at the old Summerhill intake at the Ashley River. Construction would involve two river crossings; one across the Ashley River and one across the Garrymere River and require approximately 2.9km of pipe. This would also include additional upgrade works at the West Eyreton water supply headworks and within the Summerhill scheme to cater for the additional demand.

**Capital cost for this option $1,812,304**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate Impact by Number of Units</th>
<th>Existing Rates</th>
<th>New Rate</th>
<th>Increase in Rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19 units (24 properties)</td>
<td>$1,803</td>
<td>$6,741</td>
<td>$4,937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 units (1 property)</td>
<td>$2,397</td>
<td>$8,960</td>
<td>$6,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 units (1 property)</td>
<td>$1,335</td>
<td>$4,989</td>
<td>$3,654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 units (1 property)</td>
<td>$1,303</td>
<td>$4,872</td>
<td>$3,568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 units (14 properties)</td>
<td>$1,272</td>
<td>$4,755</td>
<td>$3,483</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Operational cost for this option $31,970**
**Option D – Connect to Summerhill and reduce demand**

This option is similar to Option C in that it involves a connection into the Summerhill scheme from the existing pipe at the old intake at the Ashley River. However, in order to minimise capacity upgrades within the West Eyreton and Summerhill schemes, demand would need to be decreased within the Garrymere scheme. This would be achieved by changing the semi-restricted 19 unit (13 litres per minute) connections to 3 unit (2 litres per minute) restricted connections. This would decrease the costs within the West Eyreton and Summerhill schemes for capacity upgrades, and will include the install of tanks and pumps on these properties in order to convert the existing semi-restricted connections to fully-restricted connections.

**Capital cost for this option $1,048,901**  
**Operational cost for this option -$3,450**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate Impact by Number of Units</th>
<th>Existing Rates</th>
<th>New Rate</th>
<th>Increase in Rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19 units (24 properties)</td>
<td>$1,803</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 units (1 property)</td>
<td>$2,397</td>
<td>$7,895</td>
<td>$10,292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 units (1 property)</td>
<td>$1,335</td>
<td>$2,373</td>
<td>$3,707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 units (1 property)</td>
<td>$1,303</td>
<td>$2,210</td>
<td>$3,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 units (14 properties)</td>
<td>$1,272</td>
<td>$2,048</td>
<td>$3,320</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assumed all 19 unit connections converted to 3 unit connections.
Private Treatment Systems

The Drinking Water Standards for New Zealand allow for private on-site treatment systems to be implemented, where a scheme can be classified as a Rural Agricultural Drinking Water Supply (RADWS). In order for a scheme to be classified as a RADWS it must be able to be demonstrated that a minimum of 75% of water used on the scheme is for agricultural purposes, with the remaining 25% for domestic use. Staff have assessed Garrymere and have concluded that the scheme does not meet this criteria. For this reason the use of private treatment systems is not considered to be a viable option to comply with the Drinking Water Standards. It is noted that staff could not find any examples of schemes in New Zealand that have been classified as a RADWS.

The table below provides a full overview of the associated costs for each of the four options.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>A - TREATMENT</th>
<th>B - DRILL WELL</th>
<th>C - CONNECT TO SUMMERHILL</th>
<th>D - CONNECT TO SUMMERHILL AND REDUCE DEMAND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital Cost</td>
<td>$387,490</td>
<td>$878,724</td>
<td>$1,812,304</td>
<td>$1,048,901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in Operational Cost</td>
<td>$29,440</td>
<td>$1,817</td>
<td>$31,970</td>
<td>-$3,450</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate Impact by Number of Units</th>
<th>Existing Rates</th>
<th>Increase in Rates</th>
<th>New Rate</th>
<th>Increase in Rates</th>
<th>New Rate</th>
<th>Increase in Rates</th>
<th>New Rate</th>
<th>Increase in Rates</th>
<th>New Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19 units (24 properties)</td>
<td>$1,803</td>
<td>$1,796</td>
<td>$3,599</td>
<td>$2,094</td>
<td>$3,898</td>
<td>$4,937</td>
<td>$6,741</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 units (1 property)</td>
<td>$2,397</td>
<td>$2,387</td>
<td>$4,784</td>
<td>$2,784</td>
<td>$5,181</td>
<td>$6,563</td>
<td>$8,960</td>
<td>$7,895</td>
<td>$10,292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 units (1 property)</td>
<td>$1,335</td>
<td>$1,329</td>
<td>$2,664</td>
<td>$1,550</td>
<td>$2,885</td>
<td>$3,654</td>
<td>$4,989</td>
<td>$2,373</td>
<td>$3,707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 units (1 property)</td>
<td>$1,303</td>
<td>$1,298</td>
<td>$2,601</td>
<td>$1,514</td>
<td>$2,817</td>
<td>$3,568</td>
<td>$4,872</td>
<td>$2,210</td>
<td>$3,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 units (14 properties)</td>
<td>$1,272</td>
<td>$1,267</td>
<td>$2,539</td>
<td>$1,477</td>
<td>$2,749</td>
<td>$3,483</td>
<td>$4,755</td>
<td>$2,048</td>
<td>$3,320</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*rates provided are $ per year.

The additional cost for the proposed upgrade will be recovered through your water rate. The rates in the table above show how much you would pay for each of the options.

For example – Bob Jones has a property with a 19 unit connection (19,000 litres per day allocation), he currently pays $1,803 for his water rate.

Under Option A – Treatment, the new water rate for Bob’s property would be $3,599, an increase of $1,796.

In comparison, if Option B – Drill Well was the preferred option, Bob’s new water rate would be $3,898, an increase of $2,094.

What are the risks?

There are two main risks associated with the options being considered.

- If Option B – Drill Well is adopted, the well may not be successful in striking a water source of the required quality and capacity. If this were the case, the scheme would have to not only cover the costs of the unsuccessful well, but also the costs of one of the alternative options.

- All options: Construction costs may be higher than the Council has estimated, which would increase the impact on rates. This risk is arguably higher for Option C and D (connecting to the Summerhill water supply scheme) as these two options involve a substantially greater amount of capital expenditure.
How will the Council decide?
Feedback from the community will be collected and presented to Council along with a report from council staff on the various options. After carefully considering the feedback from the community, Council will choose an option to proceed with. We will notify you once the decision has been made, which is expected to be in April 2018.

Public Information Drop In Session
You can find out more and ask questions at a sausage sizzle at the Loburn Domain Pavilion on Thursday 15 February between 4 and 7pm.

What now?
Tick which option you prefer and return this form to the Council no later than Friday 2 March 2018.

**OPTION A** – Treatment of existing source

**OPTION B** – Drill new well at Garrymere

**OPTION C** – Connect to Summerhill water supply

**OPTION D** – Connect to Summerhill water supply and decrease allocated demand

You can also give us your feedback online - waimakariri.govt.nz/letstalk

If you have any questions, or if you would like further information, phone 0800 965 468 or email your feedback to records@wmk.govt.nz

Make sure your feedback reaches us by Friday 2 March 2018.
Please indicate your preferred option for the Garrymere water supply upgrade:

- **Option A** – Treatment of existing source
- **Option B** – Drill new well at Garrymere
- **Option C** – Connect to Summerhill water supply
- **Option D** – Connect to Summerhill water supply and decrease allocated demand
Garrymere Water Supply Upgrade – Frequently Asked Questions

What have previous water test results on the scheme shown?

The water is tested for E. coli at the headworks (after chlorination) and within the reticulation (pipework). Samples are taken at the headworks weekly and within the reticulation monthly as required by the Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand (DWSNZ).

There have been no positive E. coli tests from samples taken on the scheme since 2002 from either of the official sampling points for the scheme at the headworks or within the reticulation.

The source water is not required to be routinely tested (only the treated water is required to be tested under the DWSNZ), however when a raw source water sample was taken in 2017 this showed a presence of E. coli. The E. coli did not show up in the official sampling for the scheme as this is treated with chlorine as part of the current treatment process. This positive E. coli test is not unexpected given the shallow nature of the existing source well.

The E. coli samples that are taken only show if bacteria is present in the water, but not protozoa. Protozoa is not tested for on the scheme, and this is not able to be treated using chlorine.

Rather than upgrade the treatment system, why can’t we stop the contamination from occurring in the first place?

Under the current Drinking Water Standards the only way to prove a well is free from sources of contamination is to demonstrate that it is a secure well.

One of the key criteria for a well to be secure is that the water must be more than one year old (i.e. the time taken for the water to travel from the surface to the well screen must be greater than a year). This can generally only be achieved with deep wells, which is one of the options presented. This criteria is not able to be met for the current shallow well however.

Given that the existing well cannot be deemed to be a secure well, treatment must be provided for both bacteria and protozoa if it is to be retained.

Why are we only hearing about the need for the upgrade to the scheme now when the Drinking Water Standards were published in 2005 (revised 2008)?

When the new Drinking Water Standards were published in 2005 there was not a requirement that all schemes should comply with the standards immediately. The first requirement in the Health Act was the each scheme develop a Public Health Risk Management Plan (now referred to as a Water Safety Plan) to demonstrate how compliance will be achieved and when, and also how the safety of the scheme will be managed in the meantime. The first Public Health Risk Management Plan for the Garrymere scheme was submitted in 2009.

The need to either upgrade the existing source or develop a new source has been identified as part of the Annual Plans and Long Term Plans from as far back as the 2007/08 Annual Plan for the scheme, which are consulted on with the wider community each year.

Each year a new version of the Annual Plan is produced, except for every three years where a Long Term Plan is produced. As part of this annual process Council adjusts and reprioritises projects, which means that the timing of projects proposed can change from year to year.
In addition to the Annual Plans and Long Term Plans, in September 2006 a public meeting was held to discuss issues on the scheme, including raising the issue of the need to upgrade the source or improve treatment in the future.

The targeted consultation is taking place now as an assessment of potential options has been carried out. The approach taken was to investigate all potentially feasible options prior to consulting with the community on what options are available. Without this detailed analysis taking place prior to engaging with the public, it would have been difficult to provide sufficient detail to make the consultation process meaningful.

**Why were additional properties allowed to connect to the scheme when it had a water supply that does not comply with the Drinking Water Standards for New Zealand?**

While the scheme does not comply with the Drinking Water Standards it does comply with the Health Act in that it has an approved Water Safety Plan (previously referred to as a Public Health Risk Management Plan) documenting how the risks associated with the scheme is managed, and that there is a plan in place to achieve compliance in the future. It is not unusual for schemes that do not fully comply with the current standards to accept new connections, with the key requirement under the Health Act being that the scheme has a documented and approved process in place to work towards compliance.

**Why has the scheme not received any government funding that was previously available to assist with upgrades of water supplies to meet the Drinking Water Standards?**

There are two key ways in which drinking water suppliers could in the past apply for and receive funding for upgrades of water supplies to meet the drinking water standards. This is either through the Tourism Demand Subsidy Scheme, or the Drinking Water Assistance Programme funding. The Garrymere scheme was assessed as not qualifying for either of these funding sources.

The Tourism Demand Subsidy Scheme is targeted at communities with high tourism numbers and small resident populations, which is not applicable to Garrymere.

There are a number of criterion for a drinking water supply to be eligible for Drinking Water Assistance Programme funding, but the key barrier is requiring a confirmed ‘Deprivation Index’ score of 7 – 10. All schemes within the district were assessed in 2006/07 and Oxford Urban was the only scheme the met the deprivation index requirements therefore making it the only scheme eligible for funding.

Further to the above Council made a submission on the 11th of August 2006 to the Ministry of Health highlighting the issue of the high rates that would result on schemes such as Garrymere as a result of carrying out works to comply with the Drinking Water Standards and noted that the ‘Deprivation Index’ alone should not be a barrier to a supply receiving funding. This submission however was not successful in changing the criteria for a scheme to qualify for funding, and as such the scheme was not able to receive any government funding. It is also noted that the drinking water assistance subsidy is now closed, so no new funding is currently available for future upgrades.

Council staff are aware of a paper that will likely be presented to cabinet in March of this year regarding a national regulator for water suppliers. If this offers any opportunity for funding to upgrade existing schemes, Council will be advocating for Garrymere to receive any such funding.
Why have the water rates in Garrymere increased in recent years, before the upgrade has been completed, and why have rates not decreased despite new connections being allowed to join the scheme?

The rates on the scheme in the 2007/08 financial year were $1,052 per property per year. They then generally increased annually for a variety of reasons such as the following:

- Allowance of leak reduction budget in accordance with Council’s Water Conservation Strategy.
- Allowance for restrictor checks and chemical costs not initially allowed for.
- Increased allowance for building maintenance and water sampling budgets.
- Increase in depreciation funding not previously allowed for.

There was a decrease from the 2013/14 to the 2014/15 financial year (approximately 20%) due to new connections joining the scheme as a result of a subdivision.

More recently there have been some rating increases as a result of investigations and budget allocated towards the source upgrade project.
### How are the current rates collected spent?

The expenditure of the current rates is summarised below from the 2017/18 budget.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Type</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reticulation</td>
<td>Pipeline repairs, valve repairs, water conservation &amp; leak reduction and restrictor checks</td>
<td>1,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headworks</td>
<td>Pump power, pump maintenance, electrical repairs and building maintenance</td>
<td>9,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>Chemical costs, Water Unit costs, water sampling and SCADA costs.</td>
<td>18,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>Internal interest</td>
<td>5,733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation</td>
<td>Depreciation of existing assets to fund future renewals</td>
<td>10,698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Expenditure</td>
<td>Rating collection costs, Asset Information Team recoveries, Indirect recoveries</td>
<td>6,466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (GST Exclusive)</td>
<td></td>
<td>57,937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (GST Inclusive)</td>
<td></td>
<td>66,628</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Why has the Council / scheme not been saving up for this project, rather than only increasing rates after the upgrade is completed?

Council can only collect rates based on actual genuine costs. Therefore funds cannot be collected for a loan that has not yet been raised, but only after the loan has been raised (once the budget is in place for the capital expenditure). This means that rates cannot be increased to pre-empt a future expenditure, but only as a result of the expenditure once it is budgeted to occur.

The above approach is consistent with the Local Government Act, which sets out that Council can only rate for what is currently benefited from, not in anticipation of a future benefit.

### Why can’t the rates be capped at an affordable level and the additional costs be spread across the district?

Using the Council’s current rating system, rates for water supplies must be targeted at schemes where the expenditure occurs.

The option of spreading some of the costs amongst other ratepayers was considered by Council however was not adopted at this point in time. Council decided to revisit consideration of this funding approach in 2022.

### Why are some services rated across the district and others using a targeted rate?

The Council undertakes a review of its Revenue and Financing policy which identifies the costs for services and what is the fairest funding mix and who should fund these services. This is generally
reviewed between Long Term Plans. It is also updated regularly due to necessity e.g. legislative changes or when a new supply is added for example.

In relation to why some rates are District wide and others are targeted is directly related to the Revenue and Financing Policy.

District wide rates are those rates that are charged on all properties for District-wide services, including libraries, swimming pools and community facilities. Some differential or targeted services may apply.

Rates are targeted where there is a close correlation between the levels of service received and those that benefit or receive that service. Targeted rates are used when the properties receiving the benefit of service are charged for that service. In the example for water, there 16 different water supplies, that have different levels of service provisions and costs for each are different. Accordingly, the amount they are paying for the services reflects the profile and costs relating to each.

**Why is the increase in rates so sharp, and can this be smoothed?**

The rates projections presented in the original consultation material were based on the increases in costs being passed on directly to ratepayers as the expenditure occurs, which is the standard way that rates are charged. Council could consider an option to smooth this increase to spread it over a number of years. This is an option that Council could consider for whichever option is preferred. This would essentially mean phasing in the increase by paying less in the initial years, but more in the later years.

An example of how this may occur is depicted on the graph and table below:
What happens if I want to disconnect from the scheme?

If an individual property owner wishes to disconnect from the scheme and find their own drinking water supply, there would be a number of considerations. These are:

- A land use consent would be required as the property’s building consent and resource consent would have been issued on the basis of a connection to the reticulated water supply. A change in this would trigger the need for a new resource consent to retain the dwelling without the connection to the public water supply.

- The Council would still have the ability to collect water rates from a property even if they do not wish to use their connection to the scheme. The reason is that rates are not charged per volume of water used, but by providing a connection available for use. Council could use its discretion not to enforce this, however for fairness of other ratepayers on the scheme and consistency with other schemes it is likely that rates would still be charged to properties even if they do not wish to utilise their connection.

Can the entire scheme be disbanded and run by the residents, or closed down completely?

There are provisions in the Local Government Act by which Council can hand over the responsibility for providing a service to another group, or the scheme be disbanded. A summary of these requirements is below:

- Council would have to consult with the Medical Officer of Health, from the Canterbury District Health Board.
- Council would have to undertake investigations and make a plan as to how the scheme will be managed in the future.
- Taking into account the views of the Medical Officer of Health and the investigation the Council would then decide whether a referendum should be held to pursue one of these options further.
- If a referendum was held on either handing the scheme over to residents or closing down the scheme, there would be the following requirements:
  - More than 75% of votes cast would have to be supporting of a potential proposal to close down the scheme, or;
  - More than 50% of votes cast would have to be supporting of a potential proposal to hand the scheme over to the residents.

In the event that the scheme be closed down entirely, all residents would have to drill their own wells and undertake the resource consent application process (by way of land use consent application) as described earlier.

In the event that the scheme be handed over to the residents to run, the obligations of the residents running the scheme would be no different to the obligations of Council in terms of complying with the Health (Drinking Water) Amendment Act and Drinking Water Standards for New Zealand.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017/18</th>
<th>2018/19</th>
<th>2019/20</th>
<th>2020/21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Draft Long Term Plan Profile</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 unit</td>
<td>1,803</td>
<td>2,483</td>
<td>3,638</td>
<td>3,769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 unit</td>
<td>1,272</td>
<td>1,754</td>
<td>2,571</td>
<td>2,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Smoothed Rates Profile</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 unit</td>
<td>1,803</td>
<td>2,039</td>
<td>2,276</td>
<td>2,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 unit</td>
<td>1,272</td>
<td>1,441</td>
<td>1,608</td>
<td>1,818</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Why can't individual point-of-entry / point-of-use treatment systems be used?

The Rural Agricultural Drinking-water Guideline allow for Point-of-Entry style treatment systems, under certain criteria. The key criteria is that more than 75% of the flow must be able to be demonstrated to be for agricultural use. Initial estimates are that the scheme does not meet this criteria, however this conclusion could change if individual flowmeters were installed at each house to get more accurate data.

In order to assess whether it would be worthwhile to invest money installing flowmeters at each property, an assessment has been carried out to determine what the costs of a point-of-entry system would be.

Two estimates were carried out. The first was based on a set of design assumptions as consistent as possible with the assumptions made in the other cost estimates. This included allowances for contingency in case actual costs are higher than those estimated. This cost estimate gave an expected additional annual cost of $2,960 per property per year, which is approximately 84% greater than the average estimate of $1,606 for the central treatment option. On this basis it was deemed that point of entry treatment systems would not be viable.

It is acknowledged however that some of the assumptions made in deriving the above estimate could be considered conservative. Given the potential range in costs depending on the assumptions made, an alternative cost estimate was made based on a set of optimistic assumptions. This included such things as no contingency allowance, and assuming a compliant individual treatment system could be found for a cost of $1,500 per unit, which may not be possible. This produced a best case ‘optimistic’ cost estimate of $1,287 per property per year. This is approximately 20% less than the average cost estimate for the central treatment system of $1,606 per property per year.

In order to provide a fair comparison between options, an optimistic version of the central treatment option was derived as well. This included removing the contingency allowance, as well making other modifications to make it more consistent with the assumptions made in the optimistic point-of entry cost estimate. This resulted in the average rate increase projected for the central treatment option reducing from $1,606 per connection per year to $1,154 per property per year.

This potential ‘best case’ rating impact of the central treatment option is less than the ‘best case’ potential cost for the point-of-entry treatment option.

What are the risks associated with the point-of-entry treatment option?

The point-of-entry treatment option has the following key risks:

- The proportion of flow use between domestic and agricultural may change over time, which could result in this type of treatment system becoming non-compliant. This risk may also restrict the ability of properties to sub-divide as this would shift the proportion of flow towards more domestic use (and less agricultural).
- Indication from Water New Zealand is that the Rural Agricultural Drinking-water Guideline may be withdrawn as part of the next revision of the Drinking Water Standards. Therefore, the risk is that investment in this type of scheme may not be allowed in the future which would mean it could become a sunk investment. Part of the reason for this is that there are currently no schemes in the country that utilise this section of the Drinking-water Standards.
- Point-of-entry systems rely on either staff entering private households to carry out maintenance works on individual systems, or individual residents being required to operate and maintain their own systems.
- The systems could provide a lower level of service as they can reduce flow depending on the capacity of the system specified, or as a result of filters becoming blocked and not changed.
- The systems require a location for their installation to be provided by residents which may be challenging at some properties.
- Some properties may require multiple units if they have multiple dwellings or buildings on them, which would increase their costs substantially.
- The cost analysis has shown that in a best case scenario the point-of-entry may cost marginally less than the conservative estimate for the central treatment plant option, but the most likely scenario is that they would have the same costs or higher costs than the central treatment option. Therefore, the risk with this option if it were preferred would be that the actual costs would be higher than the alternative central treatment option while introducing a number of other risks.
# ATTACHMENT I - BACKGROND INFORMATION (NOT TO BE PUBLISHED BUT TO BE REFERRED TO IF REQUIRED)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Conn.s</th>
<th>Rates per prop'</th>
<th>Rate per conn.</th>
<th>Rate per Unit</th>
<th>Rate per 2 unit conn.</th>
<th>Rate per 19 unit conn.</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1,052</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1,042</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1,037</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>834</td>
<td>1,095</td>
<td>Allowance of leak reduction budget and groundwater certification budgets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>1,218</td>
<td>Allowance added in budget for restrictor checks and chemical costs (not previously allowed for).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1,006</td>
<td>1,332</td>
<td>Increase to building maintenance, chemical costs and water sampling budgets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1,087</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1,130</td>
<td>1,496</td>
<td>Allowance added in budget for restrictor checks and chemical costs (not previously allowed for).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>781</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>1,189</td>
<td>Increase to building maintenance, chemical costs and water sampling budgets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/16</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>896</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>1,365</td>
<td>Increase to building maintenance, chemical costs and water sampling budgets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/17</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1,065</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1,122</td>
<td>1,601</td>
<td>Increase to building maintenance, chemical costs and water sampling budgets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/18 (current year)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1,210</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1,272</td>
<td>1,803</td>
<td>Increase to building maintenance, chemical costs and water sampling budgets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018/19 (future projection)*</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1,668</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1,754</td>
<td>2,483</td>
<td>Increase to building maintenance, chemical costs and water sampling budgets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019/20 (future projection)*</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2,445</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>2,571</td>
<td>3,638</td>
<td>Increase to building maintenance, chemical costs and water sampling budgets.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* rates are projections for future (not actual).
## EXPENDITURE

### Operations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asset Management Plans</td>
<td>1,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rates</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services Recovery</td>
<td>3,912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Rights</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Operations** 5,782

### Reticulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pipeline Repairs</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valve Repairs</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Conservation &amp; Leak Reduction</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrictor Checks</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reticulation** 1,328

### Headworks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pump Power</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pump Maintenance</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical repairs</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building maintenance</td>
<td>990</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Headworks** 9,090

### Treatment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chemical Costs</td>
<td>3,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Unit Costs</td>
<td>9,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Sampling - WINZ</td>
<td>5,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCADA</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Treatment** 18,840

### Interest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internal Interest</td>
<td>4,753</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Interest** 5,733

### Depreciation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation</td>
<td>10,698</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Depreciation** 10,698

### Subtotal: Direct Expenditure 51,471

### Indirect Expenditure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rating collection costs</td>
<td>1,017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIM recoveries</td>
<td>1,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Recoveries</td>
<td>4,147</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indirect Expenditure** 6,466

**TOTAL OPERATING EXPENDITURE** 57,937
Why can't individual point-of-entry / point-of-use treatment systems be used?

The Rural Agricultural Drinking-water Guideline allow for Point-of-Entry style treatment systems, under certain criteria. The key criteria are:

- More than 75% of water used on the scheme must be able to classified as being for agricultural use, with the remaining 25% or less for domestic use.
- The systems installed must be certified against the requirements of the Drinking Water Standards.
- There must be an approved Water Safety Plan to demonstrate how the water supplier (Council) will ensure that the individual treatment systems are operated and maintained as required to comply with the standards.

Assessment of Criteria

The staff have assessed the flow on the scheme to determine whether it would meet the first key criteria above regarding the proportion of agricultural flow. Initial calculations indicate that it does not meet these criteria (based on average domestic use profiles). However, it is possible that if individual flowmeters were installed at each dwelling on the scheme it may be possible to demonstrate that the proportion of domestic and agricultural use would satisfy the criteria. This would come at a cost however to install and monitor the flowmeters and there would still be a reasonable likelihood that this would not provide the flow balance required, so to consider this there would need to be a good case made that this style of system would offer benefits over a central treatment system.

For this reason, the viability of this style of treatment system has been assessed in terms of cost and risk.

Assessment of Cost of System.

The cost of point of entry treatment systems was analysed in terms of capital cost and repayments, depreciation, operating costs and maintenance. In order to assess this a number of assumptions were required to be made in terms of the type of system required to meet the standards, the level of operation and maintenance works, and who would be responsible for the ongoing maintenance.

Given the range of assumptions required, the costs were assessed in two ways.

The first assessment was done to replicate all the assumptions made in estimating the cost of the centralised treatment system. In particular this included:

- A 30% funding contingency was applied to the capital cost to allow for any unforeseen costs.
- Professional fees associated with facilitating the installations estimated at 15% of total capital cost.
- It was assumed that the Council’s Water Unit would undertake all operational activities (filter and bulb changes).
- Units specified such that they can measure dose rate and log this to download to demonstrate compliance.
- The amount of filter changes assumed to be monthly (this is at the upper end with what may be required, but is a conservative estimate which was made to the central treatment option).
• Replacement timeframes of other components such as bulb and UV sensor as per manufacturer recommendations.
• An allowance for pump upgrades at each property to overcome potential headloss induced by filtration systems.

Based on the above assumptions, a total annual cost has been estimated at $2,960 per property per year, which is approximately 84% greater than the average estimate of $1,606 for the central treatment option. On this basis it was deemed that point of entry treatment systems would not be viable.

It is acknowledged that there may be a lower cost way to implement point-of-entry treatment if the assumptions made were modified. It is thought that some of these assumptions could be considered optimistic, however for a point of comparison an alternative ‘optimistic’ cost estimate was also derived for point-of-entry treatment.

The reason for calculating this ‘optimistic’ cost estimate was to answer the question of even if every possible cost of the project is minimised and if low cost treatment systems can be found that still meet the required standards, would the option stack up against the central treatment plant option.

They key differences in assumptions for this option are below:
• Assumed that a compliant system could be found for a cost of $1,500. There are some units marketed at this price, however none that staff are aware of have been able to demonstrate compliance with the required standards. As a comparison the lowest cost unit that has been found that would be compliant has a cost of approximately $2,800 per unit.
• No funding contingency allowed for in capital cost estimate.
• Installation costs estimated at only $200 per property, which assumes each property is suited to a very simple installation, and has an area within the dwelling where the treatment unit could be easily installed.
• Assumed that private property owners would undertake all maintenance works, with quarterly inspections carried out by Council staff to verify compliance.
• Dose rate not able to be recorded and downloaded (lower cost but may introduce challenges in terms of compliance).
• Amount of filter changes reduced significantly relative to central treatment option (may be possible depending on how quickly filters block, but not a fair comparison with the central treatment option).
• Assumed that performance of UV bulbs and UV dose sensors exceeds manufacturer’s recommendations (so lower cost for replacement by replacing less frequently than recommended).
• No pump upgrades to overcome headloss induced by filters. This may mean that filters may begin to restrict flow over time, or that residents may try to bypass filters (losing compliance of systems). This is a risk that would have to be managed, but would reduce overall cost.
• Power cost assumed based on lowest flow capacity unit being installed at each property. Depending on actual use, this may mean that some properties have to restrict their demand.

Based on all the above assumptions, an equivalent annual cost of $1,287 per property per year was calculated. This is approximately 20% less than the cost estimate for the central treatment system of
$1,606 per property per year. It would however rely on all the above assumptions being accurate. These assumptions are either considered optimistic, would result in a lower level of service, a lower level of safety, or may compromise the compliance of the potential system.

Therefore it is concluded that even if all costs are minimized as far as could be considered possible, the cost savings at best would be marginal over the central treatment system or in a worst case may be significantly more than the central treatment option.

Modded Cost Estimate for Central Treatment Option

It was noted above that the ‘optimistic’ point-of-entry cost estimate could in a best case scenario provide a moderate cost saving over the central treatment option. This however is not considered a fair comparison, as some of the assumptions applied to one option were not equivalent with the other. For a fair comparison, there should be the same assumptions applied to both.

Therefore, for a more fair comparison, the central treatment option cost estimate has been updated with some assumptions modified for better consistency with the optimistic point-of-entry cost estimate:

- Removed 30% funding contingency of $80,000. This would reduce the cost of this option as follows:
  - Capital repayments portion of rates reduce by $159 per property per year
  - Depreciation portion of rates reduce by $45 per property per year
- Assumed filter changes only required 4 times per year rather than 12 times per year. This would reduce operational costs by $248 per property per year.

Using the above assumptions, the projected rating increase for the central treatment option could reduce by an average rate of $452 per property per year. This would reduce the average forecast rate increase by 28% from $1606 per property per year to $1,154 per property per year.

This potential ‘best case’ rating impact of the central treatment option is less than the ‘best case’ potential cost for the point-of-entry treatment option.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRIM No.</th>
<th>Submission type</th>
<th>Preferred Option</th>
<th>Key Submission Points</th>
<th>Submission comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>180302022320</td>
<td>Form</td>
<td>A - Treatment of existing source</td>
<td>Concerned with cost, requests a breakdown of operational costs for Option A</td>
<td>My preference is for Option A as I am concerned with the possible costs to the scheme should the Council proceed with Option B and not find satisfactory water. I presume both schemes would be treated so therefore the greater risk of not finding adequate satisfactory water via a new well is too great for the community. I would like to see a breakdown of the operational costs as they seem high for Option A. I reiterate that I have previously put in my own UV system at my North Island property and found it most satisfactory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180305022661</td>
<td>Form</td>
<td>A - Treatment of existing source</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180301021574</td>
<td>Form</td>
<td>None suitable</td>
<td>I don’t accept any of these options.</td>
<td>I don’t accept any of these options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180212013470</td>
<td>Form</td>
<td>A - Treatment of existing source</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180219016762</td>
<td>Form</td>
<td>A - Treatment of existing source</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180321030206</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>None suitable</td>
<td>Questioning the purpose of proposal, concerned with cost, requests that Council brainstorm a solution with Garrymere community.</td>
<td>*Where did these figures come from? *Does the council have actual quotes that Garrymere residents are able to view? *What is the actual issue the council is trying to address? Quantity of water available is not an issue there is by all accounts plenty - it does overflow! There has only been one single occurrence of a water quality problem. That problem was singular, did not accelerate and was not found after retesting, which makes one consider contamination from the testing equipment or testing process. So if quantity and quality are not an issue, than what is? We would like it noted that we do not agree with any of the suggestions put forward, and most strongly disagree with the costs associated and the astronomical increase in rates (with no end in sight for that increase) associated with any of the suggestions. Time is also an issue. Why the rush. Good water/good water flow does not equate to an emergency that requires jumping on hastily. What we would like, is for the Council to come together with the Garrymere water scheme community to brainstorm ideas and come to a mutually acceptable conclusion that is financially acceptable to the users. After all, we are the people who will be paying for this, and we are also the people who vote for council members who are meant to represent us, the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Message</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180423043948</td>
<td>Email Not specified Concerned with costs</td>
<td>Hi my name is Gene Carter, I'm writing to you in regards to Garrymere Water Supply Scheme-Source Upgrade. As far as the upgrade to the Garrymere Scheme, I find the cost for this water to well exceed living cost for our family. If we were to pay the exorbitant rates that the council are expecting us to pay, this would put our family in financial jeopardy. Financially, in this case the goods for our family we would have to opt-out of the Garrymere Water Supply.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180426045024</td>
<td>Email Not specified Requests more information on quote obtained, concerned with costs</td>
<td>Thank you for working on the Garrymere water scheme. We are grateful that you are our voice for water in Okuku. Affordable, clean water is our most fundamental need in life and in our district. It comes first before all other needs and is meant to be the greatest priority for our community. It is not an extra. It's a given. After consulting with two other well drillers, we feel that the quoted cost of drilling a well is inconsistent with the actual cost of well drilling. Could we please have the source of your quote and a list of quotes from other well drillers? This will give us reassurance that the quote is consistent with the actual cost of well drilling. Showing the community various quotes from local well drillers who would be more than happy to help, would make these numbers more understandable. Doubling our rates is too great a financial stress on many citizens. We would appreciate a reevaluation of the priorities for rural families and appreciate your help in redirecting money to help fund our most basic need of clean water.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180426045020</td>
<td>Email Not specified Concerned with costs, subsidies available</td>
<td>Refer to email train via TRIM Link for email and responses provided by WDC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180426045030</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>A - Treatment of existing source</td>
<td>Feel process has been rushed, lack of WDC investigation, UV Treatment suggested, l. We do not think that the WDC has investigated all options before presenting this. We are all aware that the Ministry of Health has given all councils a directive to improve water quality in New Zealand following the contamination issues in the Hawkes Bay area. As the Garrymere Water Scheme is already chlorinated and a vast proportion of this is used by stock we believe the option of providing UV treatment units for household use only has not been investigated thoroughly enough or given to us as an option. We understand that this option is currently being trialled in the Hurunui District at present. We would be happy as many other residents in Garrymere Road would to pay for a UV treatment unit for our house at a cost of around $1500 and any annual service fee. The proposed $1796 increase in rates per year is a substantial amount of money to find per household which will be ongoing. If household UV treatment units are not currently certified by the MOH then surely this could be explored to find a company who could produce one that would meet approved standards. We do not support the other 3 options ie. drilling a new well or connecting to the Summerhill Scheme. Thank you for your consideration of this matter.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180406036543</td>
<td>LTP</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Endorse Garrymere Landcare Group, support deferring decision on the upgrade, establish a Garrymere Water Advisory Group, meet compliance with the DWSNZ is transparent.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180409037235</td>
<td>LTP</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Support establishing a Garrymere Water Advisory Group, further investigation required, rushed project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180403034501</td>
<td>LTP</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Delay decision, conduct more research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180406036544</td>
<td>LTP</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Defer upgrade for 12 months, establish a Garrymere Water Advisory Group, undertake further investigation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180504048680</td>
<td>Web form</td>
<td>D - join with Summerhill and reduce allocation</td>
<td>Not supplied</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REPRESENTATIVES OF THE GARRYMERE LANDCARE GROUP WISH TO
SPEAK TO THE COUNCIL ON THIS SUBMISSION
Submission to Waimakariri District Council
Regarding the Garrymere Water Supply Scheme
Source Upgrade

Prepared by Steve Gregory on behalf of the Garrymere Landcare Group

On the 11 March 2018, the Garrymere Road Landcare Group was formed to address concerns the rate payers on the Garrymere Water Scheme, had with the four proposals put forward by the District Council for upgrading the Garrymere Water Scheme.

The Garrymere Landcare Group represents more than half the scheme users, they are unanimous in their views that the current proposals put before them to upgrade the water scheme were made without consultation with them, on what was the most efficient, cost effective and affordable method of upgrading the scheme.

The Landcare Group are seeking any decision on the upgrade to be deferred for 12 months so these matters can be addressed and propose the following.

PROPOSAL

The Garrymere Landcare Group respectfully ask the Council to defer the upgrade of the Garrymere Water Scheme for 12 months.

We ask that the Council set up a Garrymere Water Advisory Group to undertake further investigation into the upgrade including, what is the most efficient, cost effective and affordable method of upgrading the scheme.

Members of the group would include, but not be limited to;

Representatives of the Garrymere Water Scheme Users
Waimakariri District Council technical staff
Representatives of elected Council members
Local Community Board members
Representatives for Canterbury DHB and Health Department

It is envisaged that the core members of the group would continue after this matter was settled, to be able to address other water issues on the scheme as they arise.

We refer you to the attached documentation in support of this submission.

WATER QUALITY
There have been various comments made about the quality of the Garrymere Scheme water, some of which are misleading.

The technical specifications and overview of the scheme are covered in the **Garrymere Water Supply Scheme Activity Management Plan (2015)**

The existing treatment system comprises pH correction using soda ash and chlorine disinfection, which meets compliance with the microbiological requirements of the Drinking Water Standards.

The water at the heart of the Havelock North contamination in 2016, was contaminated water, that had got into the system from a pond less than 100 meters from the bore after a period of prolonged wet weather. The illness was caused by Campylobacter. They had a similar outbreak in 1998, as the inquiry report outlines;

\[12\] The Inquiry has found that the August 2016 outbreak was not Havelock North's first experience of drinking water contamination and that the lessons that should have been learned from an earlier contamination had been forgotten.

\[13\] In July 1998 the town had an outbreak of campylobacteriosis. Sampling of two of the Brookvale Road bores showed campylobacter in the bore heads. This was the same location that would feature in the August 2016 outbreak. An independent report by Stu Clark (“1998 Clark Report”) concluded that the two bores were a possible source of the campylobacteriosis, and that the likely point of entry for contaminated surface water was a leaking power supply cable gland.(1) The Clark Report raised doubts about the confined status of the Te Mata aquifer from which the bores drew water.(2) It recommended testing the aquifer to establish whether it was confined, along with measures to ensure the security of both bore heads.

\[14\] Regrettably, while the two outbreaks shared remarkable similarities, it appears nothing was learned from the July 1998 outbreak. The District Council, as the water supplier, did not take the 1998 outbreak seriously enough and implement enduring, systemic changes. Memory of the earlier outbreak simply faded.


The Garrymere Scheme water, cannot be compared to the Havelock North water as it is treated with chlorine and has been since 2009.

Chlorine kills campylobacter, so there is little if any chance of a campylobacter outbreak similar to that which occurred in Havelock North on the Garrymere Scheme.
The chlorine dosing is manually controlled and monitored through an analyser. The chlorine analyser warns of inadequate or failed chlorine treatment.

It is acknowledged that the treatment system provides little protection against protozoan contaminants, such as Cryptosporidium and Giardia.

However, the national rate of cases per 100,000 population is low, in 2015 – 16 there was:

- Cryptosporidiosis: 15 (2015) 22.6 (2016)
- Giardiasis: 32.9 (2015) 34.5 (2016)

Notifiable Diseases in New Zealand: Annual Report 2016 Institute of Environmental Science and Research Ltd.

From the 26 of March 2018, Christchurch City introduced a staged chlorination disinfection of the city’s water. The chlorination has been approved for a period of 12 months while work is being done to ensure all the city’s below ground well heads are sealed at the surface to protect them from contamination.

Christchurch City with a population of 341,469, (census 2013) has not seen the need to add a further level of protection for that 12-month period. We are 0.0351% the size of Christchurch City.

In our submission we believe that the risk of anyone catching either Cryptosporidiosis or Giardiasis from the Garrymere Scheme Water in the period of deferral is negligible.

To our knowledge there have been no cases of either, reported in the schemes lifetime.
COMPLIANCE

The Waimakariri District Council are Network suppliers as defined in the Health Act 1956, they are therefore bound by the Act, and the Drinking Water Standards for New Zealand. (DSW)

It is submitted that under the current legislation Council are meeting their compliance obligations under part (c) of the Health Act which imposes a range of duties on drinking-water suppliers, including duties to—

(i) monitor drinking water; and

(ii) take all practicable steps to comply with the drinking-water standards; and

(iii) implement risk management plans……

The Garrymere Water Supply Scheme Activity Management Plan (2015), outlines that;

Council monitor the drinking water.

Council take all practicable steps to comply with the DSW.

There is a risk management plan

The current legislation allows the supplier to “take all practicable steps to comply”

It is our submission that the Council need to comply with the legislation as it is today, not try to achieve a standard that has not yet been written.

We again refer to Christchurch City and their response. They are sealing well heads in order to meet the secure bore status requirements set out in the Drinking Water Standards of today, not what they maybe in the future.

We submit that deferral of the decision to upgrade the scheme will not affect the Councils compliance status, so long as it is added to the Risk Management Plan, and the reasons stated, namely a Water Advisory Group will be set up to investigate and implement a scheme upgrade, that is efficient, cost effective and affordable.
Relevant Legislation and Definitions

Health Act 1956
Part 2A
Drinking water


69A Purpose
(1) The purpose of this Part is to protect the health and safety of people and communities by promoting adequate supplies of safe and wholesome drinking water from all drinking-water supplies.

(2) Accordingly, this Part—
(a) provides for the Ministry to maintain a register of all drinking-water suppliers; and
(b) provides for the Minister to issue or adopt drinking-water standards; and
(c) imposes a range of duties on drinking-water suppliers, including duties to—
(i) monitor drinking water; and
(ii) take all practicable steps to comply with the drinking-water standards; and
(iii) implement risk management plans; and
(d) imposes a range of duties on water carriers; and
(e) provides for the appointment of drinking-water assessors to assess compliance with this Part, and sets out their functions and powers; and
(f) provides for the Director-General to recognise laboratories for the purposes of analysing drinking water; and
(g) sets out certain emergency powers that are available during public health emergencies relating to drinking water; and
(h) creates various offences; and
(i) provides for the dissemination of information about drinking water.

69G Interpretation

In this Part, unless the context otherwise requires, —

Networked supplier—

(a) means a drinking-water supplier who supplies drinking water from the place where the supply is to 1 or more other properties, by means of a pipe connecting those properties; but

(b) does not include a bulk supplier

The Garrymere Water Scheme are either a —

Small drinking-water supply means a drinking-water supply that—

(a) is used to supply drinking water to between 101 and 500 people (inclusive) for at least 60 days per year; and

(b) is not a drinking-water supply to which paragraph (a) or (b) of the definition of neighbourhood drinking-water supply applies or

Neighbourhood drinking-water supply means a drinking-water supply that is used to supply drinking water to—

(a) between 25 and 100 people (inclusive) for at least 60 days per year; or

(b) any number of persons for at least 60 days per year if—

(i) the number of those persons when multiplied by the number of days per year during which those persons receive water from that supply is 6000 or greater; but

(ii) the number of those persons is not greater than 100 on 60 or more days in any year.

69V Duty to take all practicable steps to comply with drinking-water standards

(1) Every drinking-water supplier must take all practicable steps to ensure that the drinking water supplied by that supplier complies with the drinking-water standards.

(2) A drinking-water supplier complies with subsection

(1) if the supplier implements those provisions of the supplier’s approved water safety plan relating to the drinking-water standards.
(3) Subsection (2) does not limit the ways in which a drinking-water supplier is able to comply with subsection (1).

(4) Subsection (1) applies to each drinking-water supplier subject to any exemption or variation that has been granted to that supplier under section 69ZZD(2)(k).

(5) Subsection (1) does not apply to those drinking-water standards that are identified in those standards as guideline values for aesthetic determinands for avoiding adverse aesthetic effects in drinking water.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

We understand that not upgrading the scheme is not an option for the Council, we know Council is bound by both the Health Act and the Drinking Water Standards.

The Garrymere Scheme services a small number of people, with only 41 connections. We also understand that under the current regime rates are targeted.

The cheapest proposal put forward sees the water rates increase for the majority of the rate payers by $1796 pa, to $3599pa. This will be ongoing for the term of the loan, stated by Council staff to be 25yrs.

Normal rating requirements are not taken into account in this figure, some rates including water will rise to in excess of $5500.

This is a considerable sum to find for families who live on residential lifestyle blocks, who unlike commercial businesses, can’t pass their costs on.

The Garrymere Water Scheme already has one of the highest costs per user of any water scheme in the country.

A report by Catherine McCallum of Simpson Grierson commented on the inquiry recommendations in regards to costs in an article titled “Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry, Stage 2 Report released,” saying;

> Despite the merits of reducing risk as much as possible, the Report does not fully address the cost of doing so. In fact, it specifically noted that an assessment of the financial implications of mandatory treatment was beyond the scope of the Inquiry. Councils are on limited budgets and therefore need to make strategic choices about what is the priority for local areas, which requires a balancing of all the different effects against the economic cost of different responses. Assuming a limited appetite for hiking rates, increased expenditure on drinking water protection is likely to come at the expense of other community initiatives.


The Garrymere Scheme users are an easy target, given the rate for water is targeted, like Councils, families are on limited budgets and it will be individual households who will need to carry out this balancing act with their financial obligations, rather than the Council.

It is therefore paramount that any decisions on the upgrade involve the community who are paying for it.
Dear Sir,

I am writing to you requesting some advice on the Government’s direction regarding the potential for Government funding to assist small drinking-water supplies in achieving compliance with the Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand.

Within the Waimakariri District we have a number of water supplies ranging in size from serving approximately 17,000 people in Rangiora to as few as 100 people on our smallest scheme. We have been proactive in undertaking upgrade projects to achieve compliance with the Drinking-water Standards for most of our schemes, but are now coming to a point where we are required to achieve compliance for our remaining smaller schemes. This has introduced the challenge of funding these upgrades, which can have a very significant impact on small communities as water rates are targeted.

In one case the upgrade we are proposing is forecast to cost approximately $400,000. This expenditure would double what are already the highest water rates in the district from approximately $1,800 per connection to $3,600 per connection. Note this is the rates just to supply water, not the full rates charge for the properties.

We are aware that funding was previously available for some schemes under a Drinking-water Assistance Programme, however this funding was not continued under the previous Government.

In light of consideration currently being given to drinking-water following the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry Stage 2 Report, we are seeking any guidance relating to the possibility of Government funding. In particular we understand the Government is currently considering the implementation of a National Regulator as recommended by the Stage 2 Inquiry Report, and would like to understand whether this regulator would cover or consider the funding of water supply upgrades.
We do not want to delay the need to upgrade our last remaining schemes due to the public health risk presented by them, however at the same time do not want to be disadvantaged by missing out on potential future funding by being proactive and carrying out upgrades earlier than others.

I would appreciate any thoughts or advice you have on this matter and look forward to your response.

Yours faithfully,

[Signature]

David Ayers
MAYOR