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WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

A meeting of the WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL will be held in the COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA on TUESDAY 7 FEBRUARY 2017 at 1.00PM.

Sarah Nichols
GOVERNANCE MANAGER

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

BUSINESS

1 APOLOGIES

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

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

3 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Acknowledgement of the passing of Karen Eastwood, Woodend-Sefton Community Board Member.

New Year’s Honours List

Vi Cottrell, Ohoka, Officer of the New Zealand Order of Merit (ONZM) recognised for over 40 years involvement with Trade Aid, an honorary member of the World Fair Trade Organisation and member of its monitoring committee.

Dr David Mitchell, Pegasus, Officer of the New Zealand Order of Merit (ONZM), recognised for his work in education for children with special needs.

Dr John Hyndman, Clarkville, Member of the New Zealand Order of Merit (MNZM) recognised for his services to health and innovation in the development of a low-cost portable anaesthetic machine.

4 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

4.1 Minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on Tuesday 6 December 2016

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 6 December 2016.
8 REPORTS

8.1 Draft Development Contribution Policy 2017/18 – Kelly LaValley (Project Delivery Manager)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No 170109000819.

(b) Approves the Draft Development Contribution Policy 2017/18 for consultation as part of the 2017/18 Annual Plan.

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

8.2 Draft submission to the Health Select Committee on the Health (Fluoridation of Drinking Water) Amendment Bill – Geoff Meadows (Policy Manager)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 161220131266.

(b) Approves the attached submission to the Health Select Committee (TRIM No. 161220131296);

(c) Authorises the points of this submission to be incorporated into the Canterbury-wide Regional submission (being led by Christchurch City Council), and the Local Government New Zealand national submission;

(d) Authorises the Mayor to represent the Council at the hearing before the Health Select Committee;

(e) Approves the distribution of the submission to Community Boards for their information.
8.3 **Triennial Agreement – Canterbury Authorities – Jim Palmer (Chief Executive)**

*RECOMMENDATION*

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 170130008140.

(b) **Ratifies** the Canterbury Local Authorities Triennial Agreement for the 2017-2019 term.

8.4 **Independent Member on the Audit and Risk Committee – Jeff Millward (Manager Finance and Business Support)**

*RECOMMENDATION*

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No 161205124862

(b) **Agrees** that no change to the existing Audit and Risk Committee structure is required for the balance of the triennium being to October 2019;

or

(c) **Agrees** to an independent external member with financial and governance expertise being appointed to the Audit and Risk Committee as soon as conveniently possible in the current triennium for a term of three years from the date of appointment; and

(d) **Notes** the independent external member remuneration would cost approximately $20,000; and

(e) **Approves** the amendment to the Council's Governance Structure and the Delegations document in relation to the Audit and Risk Committee accordingly; and

(f) **Approves** the external independent member be appointed with full voting rights at Audit and Risk Committee meetings; and

(g) **Approves** the external independent member be appointed as the Chair at Audit and Risk Committee meetings; and

(h) **Approves** that a selection panel comprising Mayor Ayers, Portfolio Holder of Audit and Risk (Deputy Mayor Felstead), the Chief Executive and Manager Finance and Business Support, be delegated the authority to manage the appointment of the external member for Council approval; and/or

(i) **Approves** additional Governance training for the Audit and Risk Committee.
9 MATTERS REFERRED FROM COMMITTEES

9.1 Financial Report for the period ended 30 September 2016 – Paul Christensen (Finance Manager)
(refer to attached copy of report no. 161114116574 to the Audit and Risk Committee meeting of 13 December 2016)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Approves the special dividend received from Transwaste Canterbury to be applied to the Earthquake Loan Rate account, to be used to offset the Earthquake Loan.

10 MATTERS REFERRED FROM COMMUNITY BOARD

10.1 Regeneration Steering Group – Craig Sargison (Manager Community and Recreation)
(refer to report no. 161129123237 to the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board meeting of 19 December 2016, distributed separately)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No.161129123237.

(b) Approves the establishment of a Regeneration Steering Group

(c) Approves the Terms of Reference for the Regeneration Steering Group (161129123269)

(d) Approves the appointment of the following to the Regeneration Steering Group:
   • Mayor
   • Council Portfolio Holder (Chair)
   • Kaiapoi - Tuahiwi Community Board (full Board)
   • Kaiapoi Ward Councillors
   • Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga (representative(s))
   • Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust (representative)
   • Environment Canterbury (representative)
   • Chief Executive
   • Manager, Community & Recreation
   • Implementation Programme Manager, District Regeneration

(e) Notes the Draft Project Structure.

11 HEALTH AND SAFETY

11.1 Health and Safety Report – Jim Palmer (Chief Executive)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report no. 170120005183.
12 COMMITTEE/WORKING PARTY/JOINT COMMITTEE MINUTES FOR INFORMATION

12.1 Minutes of a meeting of the District Planning and Regulation Committee held on Tuesday 22 November 2016
12-125

12.2 Minutes of a meeting of the Utilities and Roading Committee held on Tuesday 22 November 2016
126-142

12.3 Minutes of a meeting of the Community and Recreation Committee held on Tuesday 13 December 2016
143-150

12.4 Minutes of a meeting of the Audit and Risk Committee held on Tuesday 13 December 2016
151-162

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the information in Items 12.1 to 12.4 be received.

13 COMMUNITY BOARD MINUTES FOR INFORMATION

13.1 Minutes of a meeting of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board held on Thursday 8 December 2016
163-171

13.2 Minutes of a meeting of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board held on Monday 12 December 2016
172-177

13.3 Minutes of a meeting of the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board held on Wednesday 14 December 2016
178-186

13.4 Minutes of a meeting of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board held on Monday 19 December 2016
187-199

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the information in Items 13.1 to 13.4 be received.

14 CORRESPONDENCE

N/A

15 MAYOR’S DIARY FROM 29 NOVEMBER 2016 TO 31 JANUARY 2017

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report no. 170125006748.
16 COUNCIL PORTFOLIO UPDATES

16.1 Iwi Relationships

16.2 Canterbury Water Management Strategy

16.3 International Relationships

17 QUESTIONS

(under Standing Orders)

18 URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS

(under Standing Orders)

19 MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED WITH THE PUBLIC EXCLUDED

Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

RECOMMENDATION

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Minutes/Report of:</th>
<th>General subject of each matter to be considered</th>
<th>Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter</th>
<th>Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>Minutes of the public excluded portion of Council meeting of 6 December 2016</td>
<td>Confirmation of minutes</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>Report of Gerard Cleary (Manager Utilities and Roading)</td>
<td>Ocean Outfall Corrosion of Stainless Steel Components – Progress Report and Update for New/Returning Councillors</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>Report of Kelly LaValley, (Project Delivery Manager)</td>
<td>Report to approve an amendment to the Private Developer Agreement with Townsend Fields Ltd</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This resolution is made in reliance on section 48(1)(a) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987, and the particular interest or interests protected by section 6 or section 7 of that Act which would be prejudiced by the holding of the whole or relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Reason for protection of interests</th>
<th>Ref NZS 9202:2003 Appendix A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 19.1, 19.2 and 19.3 | Protection of privacy of natural persons  
To carry out commercial activities without prejudice | A2(a)  
A2(b)ii |

**CLOSED MEETING**

See Public Excluded Agenda (blue papers)

**OPEN MEETING**

**20 NEXT MEETING**

The next scheduled meeting of the Council is the Annual Plan Budget meeting commencing at 9am on Wednesday 15 February 2017.

**BRIEFING**

*At the conclusion of the meeting, a briefing will be held for members to discuss the issue of contaminated sites.*
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL HELD IN
THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA COMMENCING AT
1.00PM ON TUESDAY 6 DECEMBER 2016

PRESENT:

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

IN ATTENDANCE:

Messrs J Palmer (Chief Executive), G Cleary (Manager, Utilities & Roading), K Stevenson (Roading Manager), K Simpson (3 Waters Manager), G Meadows (Policy Manager), J Fraser (Utilities Planner), O Davies (Drainage Asset Manager), S de Roo (Utilities Engineering Officer), S Colin (Infrastructure Strategy Manager), and S Nichols (Governance Manager).

1 APOLOGIES

Nil.

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Councillor Brine noted a conflict with item 7.1, due to being a serving Police officer.

3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

3.1 Minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on Tuesday 1 November 2016

Moved: Councillor Atkinson Seconded: Councillor Gordon

THAT the Council:

(a) Confirms as a true and correct record the minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on Tuesday 1 November 2016.

CARRIED

4 DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

Nil.

5 ADJOURNED BUSINESS

Nil.
6 REGENERATION REPORTS

6.1 Earthquake Infrastructure Recovery Programme – November 2016 – G Boot (Senior Engineering Consultant)

J Palmer spoke to the report, confirming 44 projects have been completed and staff are awaiting the Kaiapoi Residential Recovery Plan finalisation from central government before several projects commence.

Councillor Atkinson enquired if there had been any indication on timing of Ministerial feedback/approval on the Recovery Plan. Mayor Ayers advised information would be provided to the councillors later in the meeting.

Moved: Councillor Meyer  Seconded: Councillor Felstead

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 161124121388.

(b) Notes that 44 of the 50 projects on the Earthquake Infrastructure Recovery Programme have been completed.

(c) Notes that the current estimate and budget for the capital component of the recovery works is $41,217,000.

(d) Authorises staff to enter into discussions with the property owner in the Kaiapoi South Red Zone at 50 Courtenay Drive regarding ongoing servicing solution.

(e) Notes the recovery works construction programme as presented in Attachment 1 of this report.

(f) Circulates this report to the Community and Advisory Boards.

CARRIED

Councillor Meyer commented on the continual progress steadily taking place.

7 REPORTS

7.1 Changes to Fernside Road, Flaxton Road and Todds Road Speed Limits – K Stevenson (Roading Manager) and H Davies (Roading Project Engineer)

Having declared an interest, Councillor Brine sat back from the table and took no part in discussions or decision.

K Stevenson spoke to the report highlighting key features of the proposal.

Councillor Williams, expressed concern at the reduction of speed with the back flow of speeds reducing, given the open environment. K Stevenson advised driver’s behaviour will dictate the environment and reiterated the assessment information.

Mayor Ayers enquired about the average speeds of the area and asked if an assessment is conducted after the new speed limit is in place. Staff advised a further speed assessment will occur to ascertain how effective the change is.
Councillor Gordon sought clarity on a more comprehensive traffic study of the general Southbrook environment. K Stevenson confirmed a study will occur during 2017 on the West Arterial road (Southbrook), Flaxton and the route between being a key route. It would also include the area incorporating Skew Bridge. Further matters would be workshoped with councillors and stakeholders during the first half 2017.

Moved: Councillor Allen Seconded: Councillor Gordon

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No 161116117803.

(b) **Approves** the speed limit change on Fernside Road, Flaxton Road, and Todds Road, as outlined below, and as shown on the plan (Trim doc160915095503).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Proposed Limit</th>
<th>Existing Limit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flaxton Road</td>
<td>From the end of existing 50km/h section at Kingsford Smith Drive to approximately 160m north of Camwell Park</td>
<td>80km/h</td>
<td>100km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernside Road</td>
<td>From the intersection with Flaxton Road to immediately north west of Townsend Road</td>
<td>80km/h</td>
<td>100km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todds Road</td>
<td>From the end of existing 70km/h section to the intersection with Fernside Road</td>
<td>80km/h</td>
<td>100km/h</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(c) **Notes** that the Register of Speed Limits will be updated to include these changed speed limits.

(d) **Notes** that the Speed Limits Bylaw 2009 allows speed limits to be changed by Council resolution following consultation as required by the Land Transport Rule: Setting of Speed Limits (2003).

(e) **Notes** that the submissions on this proposal have been distributed to the Rangiora Community Board for their information.

(f) **Circulates** this report to the Rangiora Community Board.

CARRIED

Against Councillor Williams

Councillor Allen commented that a clear view to reduce the speed had been signalled through the good consultation process. He supported additional signage advising of the speed change area before the affected zone to assist driver education and safety.

Councillor Gordon, supported the motion, noting the wider view points and the thorough consultation.

Councillor Atkinson spoke against the motion, commenting on the rural environment on Fernside Road lending itself to 100kph having observed experienced people travelling safely on that road, however he accepted Flaxton Road amended speed limit to 80kph as it was a more built up area. Councillor Atkinson cited other examples of the changing environment,
differing speed limits and how the rural environment with a lower speed limit is not abided by drivers.

Councillor Blackie, support in Flaxton/Fernside Road intersection speed change, however was neutral on the change at the Todds Road area. He noted one submission relating to access in/out of their property.

Mayor Ayers commented on the importance of traffic sign / advisory signs to assist the regular users transition into the new lower speed limit. He commented on road usage, reflecting on Townsend Road being 80kph, and described how people use the road, the environment and the different directions people drive.

7.2 Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016 Implementation – V Spittal (Senior Policy Analyst)

G Meadows spoke to the report, advising he had attended the Te Kohoka o Tuhaitara Trust open day where the proposed bylaw information was on public display, and received very positive feedback from attendees. G Meadows outlined the implementation group purpose.

Councillor Felstead, commented on Hurunui District Council undertaking separate consultation for their area and enquired if they could be involved in this process due to the close events. Staff advised the opportunity to re-engage with Hurunui District Council was possible. In a secondary question Councillor Felstead enquired if there was benefit having Hurunui District Council on the implementation panel. Staff confirmed there was benefit.

Moved: Councillor Blackie Seconded: Councillor Gordon

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 161116117879.

(b) Approves the establishment of the Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016 Implementation Plan Working Party.

(c) Approves the Terms of Reference for the Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016 Implementation Plan Working Party (Trim number 161115117053).

(d) Appoints Councillor Peter Allen to the working party, as Chairperson.

(e) Circulates this report to the Kaiapoi-Tuaihiwi and Woodend-Sefton Community Boards to confirm their representatives on the working party.

(f) Approves staff seeking representation from the nominated organisations, including the Hurunui District Council.

CARRIED

Councillor Blackie reflected on siting on an earlier associated committee. He believed signage is not particularly effective nor the enforcement factor as many occurrences happen early evening and weekends. Councillor Blackie hoped the working party would address the enforcement gaps, with increased budget to enable greater ranger presence in the area at peak usage and offending times.
Councillor Allen noted Councillor Felstead and Community Board member C Prickett met with Fenton Reserve holders as part of giving effect to the bylaw (an associated Memorandum of Understanding) and the Fenton entitlement to access the estuary. The meeting was very positive and constructive. Councillor Allen concurred with Councillor Blackie's comments with signage required but getting the balance right was important. He reflected on the current imbalance of signage and rangers budgets and his desire to see more funding for rangers. Councillor Allen stated the Bylaw does empower beach users to notify concerns to the Council and Environment Canterbury with a database capturing information. It was also important to involve Hurunui District Council, reflecting on interested parties in the Rakahuri (Ashley) River catchment such as Department of Conservation and primary industries was a major exercise.

Councillor Atkinson stated the motion was a positive move and there had been good communication through the consultation process. He commented on signage overload in some locations, the right balance and consideration of placement. Councillor Atkinson also commented on toxic bloom in the Ashley River, yet there was no signage advising not to eat shellfish from the area.

7.3 **Reconvene Kaiapoi River Rehabilitation Working Party – J Fraser (Utilities Planner) and O Davies (Drainage Asset Manager)**

O Davies outlined the key aspects of the report. J Fraser provided an update on the project progress with the tidal planting project commencing on 19 December, along with some tidying up of the area. The consultation documentation will be reviewed by the working party before being distributed to the public.

Moved: Councillor Atkinson Seconded: Councillor Stewart

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 161115117130.

(b) **Reconvenes** the Kaiapoi River Rehabilitation Working Party.

(c) **Notes** the current continuing work programme of the Kaiapoi River Rehabilitation Working Party, including the aquatic planting trial and proposed rehabilitation of the Courtenay confluence area.

(d) **Refers** this report to the Kaiapoi - Tuahiwi Community Board and requests the Board appoint two of its members to the Working Party.

(e) **Approves** the proposed budget allocation for the Waimakariri District Council in 2016/17, and notes the proposed cost share with Environment Canterbury:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Proposed Funding WDC</th>
<th>Proposed Funding Environment Canterbury</th>
<th>Other Funding (Immediate Steps)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic planting trial</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Public consultation | Up to $15,000 |
|-------------------|-------------|
Mahaanui Kurataiao | Cultural Impact | $5,000 |
| Courtenay Confluence | Area Rehabilitation | $20,000 |
| Dredging around coastguard ramp area (method to be) | $5,000 |
| **Total** | **$25,000** | **$25,000** | **$5,000** |

(f) **Notes** a funding allocation from the Waimakariri District Council of up to $15,000 is provided for public consultation, with any unused funds from this allocation applied to physical works, including to the rehabilitation of the Courtenay confluence and/or continuation of the additional aquatic planting trial and weed control.

**CARRIED**

Councillor Atkinson was pleased the project was moving forward and hoped it became more collaborative with the various agencies involved.

Councillor Stewart stated her pleasure that planting work was commencing this summer.

7.4 **Bringing Forward Budget for Extra Over Oxford Road Water Main – C Roxburgh (Water Asset Manager)**

K Simpson spoke to the report, highlighting key aspects of the report.

Councillor Felstead commented on recent road works, enquiring why the trench was being re-dug and at whose cost. K Simpson advised there had been issues with re-compaction of the trench, which was being rectified at the cost to the contractor, who had been employed by the developer (not the Council); however it was unfortunate it was causing additional disruption to the public.

Councillor Williams enquired if the pipe was the same quality, and whether the Council was only paying for pipe and not labour. Staff confirmed costs were apportioned between the developer and the Council, explaining the pipe sizing and associated costings.

Moved: Councillor Meyer Seconded: Councillor Brine

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 161128122682.

(b) **Approves** the Extra Over Oxford Road Supply Main budget being increased from $55,000 to $59,500 and being brought forward to the 2016/17 financial year from the 2019/20 financial year.

(c) **Circulates** this report to the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board for their information.

**CARRIED**
8 MATTERS REFERRED FROM COMMITTEES

8.1 Expenditure due to Reactive Maintenance Work Carried Out on Rangiora, Kaiapoi and Pegasus Water Supply Wells – S de Roo (Utilities Engineering Officer)
(referred to copy of report no. 161109115696 to the Utilities and Roading Committee meeting of 22 November 2016)

K Simpson spoke to the report, outlining working recently undertaken and reasons why. Pegasus related works were funded from existing budgets, but additional budgets were now requested for pump replacements. There would be an overspend on the Kaiapoi and Rangiora maintenance budgets for the current financial year.

Councillor Allen, directed a question to J Palmer asking if the decision not to seek other contractors prices was the appropriate action. J Palmer explained the report had been before the Utilities & Roading Committee, and matters pertaining to Clemence Drilling as a preferred Council supplier had been previously discussed at Committee level.

Councillor Blackie enquired about a particular leak in a street. K Simpson explained that a part replacement was required.

Councillor Gordon, enquired if there was insurance cover for issues relating to the pumps. G Cleary advised it was unlikely but staff would investigate further.

Councillor Williams queried impellers and pumps, parts requiring replacement and what was being purchased. K Simpson advised that once the pumps had been assessed as to what parts required replacement, the remaining portion of the pump would be retained for spare parts for another project. Staff were currently seeking full pump replacement.

Moved: Councillor Gordon Seconded: Councillor Blackie

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 161109115696.

(b) Notes that due to the urgent nature of the maintenance work and importance of the wells for the supply of water to Rangiora, Kaiapoi and Pegasus, it was necessary to undertake the maintenance without delay

(c) Notes that the maintenance work to Rangiora Smith Street Wells 1, 2 and 3 is projected to cost approximately $74,970 and will be funded from the Rangiora Headworks maintenance budget. This over expenditure will be covered by the Rangiora Water Supply surplus account but may have an estimated $0.80 a year impact on rates per property.

(d) Notes that the maintenance work completed on Kaiapoi Davie Street well has cost $7,281.56 and that this has been funded from the Kaiapoi Headworks maintenance budget. This over expenditure will be covered by the Kaiapoi Water Supply surplus account but may have an estimated $0.12 a year impact on rates per property.

(e) Notes that the maintenance work to Pegasus Equestrian well 1 is projected to cost approximately $45,000 and that this will be funded from the Pegasus Headworks maintenance budget. Additional work to
the fencing around the Equestrian wells has been completed to increase the security of the wells at an approximate cost of $40,000. Due to the amount of surplus within the Pegasus account it is envisaged that this should have no impact on rates.

(f) **Requests** renewal capital budget of $25,000 on the Pegasus Water Supply Scheme to replace Equestrian well 1 pump. This capital expenditure will be depreciated funded.

(g) **Requests** renewal capital budget of $25,000 on the Rangiora Water Supply Scheme to replace Smith Street well 3 pump. This capital expenditure will be depreciated funded.

(h) **Circulates** this report to the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board, the Woodend-Sefton Community Board and the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board for their information.

(i) **Request** staff respond to Council on potential insurance claim for damaged pumps.

CARRIED

8.2 **Ashley Rural Water Scheme WDC Representation – S Collin (Infrastructure Strategy Manager)**

*(referred to copy of report no. 161102113044 to the Utilities and Roading Committee meeting of 22 November 2016)*

S Collin spoke to the report, outlining the Hurunui District Council Committee reporting structure.

Moved: Councillor Atkinson Seconded: Councillor Meyer

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 161102113044,

(b) **Provides** a letter of thanks to the Hurunui District Council for its recognition of the representation issues with respect to the Ashley Rural Water Scheme, and for the opportunity it has provided to Waimakariri District Council to be represented on the Water Liaison Committee.

(c) **Nominates** Cr Williams, as WDC Water Supply and Wastewater Portfolio Holder, to be the WDC representative on the Water Liaison Committee for the duration of the 10th term of Council.

(d) **Requests** staff to approach HDC to request that the WDC representative on the Water Liaison Committee also be granted membership to the Ashley Rural Water Scheme Local Water Advisory Group. (This would be in addition to the representative selected from the Rangiora Ashley Community Board).

CARRIED

Mayor Ayers referred to recommendation (d) and advised the local water advisory group, covers two Community Board areas. He had held an informal discussion with the Woodend-Sefton Community Board suggesting one representative for the two community boards, subject to the Hurunui District Council approval.
Councillor Doody spoke of the benefits of representatives on such committees.

8.3 **Appointment of District Licensing Committee – M Johnston (Environmental Services Manager)**

(referred to copy of report no. 161104113935 to the District Planning and Regulation Committee meeting of 22 November 2016)

J Palmer spoke briefly to the report.

Moved: Councillor Meyer    Seconded: Councillor Williams

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Appoints** Councillors Peter Allen, Neville Atkinson, John Meyer and Wendy Doody to the District Licensing Committee.

(b) **Appoints** Councillor Peter Allen as Chairperson of the Waimakariri District Licensing Committee.

(c) **Appoints** Councillor Neville Atkinson as Deputy Chairperson of the Waimakariri District Licensing Committee.

(d) **Appoints** Rangiora-Ashley Community Board Chair Jim Gerard to the District Licensing Committee as a Commissioner until 31 January 2020.

**CARRIED**

9 **MATTERS REFERRED FROM COMMUNITY BOARDS**

No matters referred from the Community Boards.

10 **HEALTH AND SAFETY**

10.1 **Health and Safety Report – J Palmer (Chief Executive)**

J Palmer spoke to the report advising two further associated reports would be presented at the upcoming Audit and Risk Committee. No accidents or incidents had been reported in November. ACC recently conducted a workplace assessment and a report will be presented to the February Audit & Risk Committee; initial feedback was positive.

Moved: Councillor Williams    Seconded: Councillor Doody

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report no. 161125121643.

**CARRIED**

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

Nil.
12  COMMUNITY BOARD MINUTES FOR INFORMATION

12.1 Minutes of a meeting of the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board meeting of Tuesday 25 October 2016

12.2 Minutes of a meeting of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board meeting of Wednesday 26 October 2016

12.3 Minutes of a meeting of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board meeting of Wednesday 26 October 2016

12.4 Minutes of a meeting of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board meeting of Thursday 27 October 2016

12.5 Minutes of a meeting of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board meeting of Thursday 3 November 2016

12.6 Minutes of a meeting of the Rangiora-Ashley Board meeting of Wednesday 9 November 2016

12.7 Minutes of a meeting of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board meeting of Tuesday 15 November 2016

12.8 Minutes of a meeting of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board meeting of Monday 21 November 2016

Moved: Councillor Felstead    Seconded: Councillor Doody

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives for information Items 12.1 – 12.8.

CARRIED

Councillor Felstead commented on the positive and active start to new term by the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board, whom had also held two productive informal meetings relating to potential submissions.

13  CORRESPONDENCE

Nil.

14  MAYOR’S DIARY FROM 26 OCTOBER - 28 NOVEMBER 2016

Moved: Councillor Felstead    Seconded: Councillor Meyer

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report no. 161115117180.

CARRIED

15  COUNCIL PORTFOLIO UPDATES

15.1 Iwi Relationships

Mayor Ayers commented on meeting the King and Queen of the Netherlands, hosted by Te Ngai Tu Ahuriri Runanga at the Tuahiwi Marae hosting. A royal visit was special for the District.
15.2 **International Relations**
Councillor Felstead advised accommodation for the Passchendaele Commemorations had been confirmed for 9 to 13 October 2017, with Councillors undertaking their own travel arrangements.

15.3 **Waimakariri Water Zone**
Councillor Stewart commented on the number of workshops and meetings, including public meetings over the past six weeks. During November there would be another round of public meetings. Comment was made on differences between Council and the Water Zone Committee level of staff support, information provided and presented and how Councillor Stewart was seeking improvements for the Water Zone Committee. Councillor Stewart commented on Waimakariri District Council District Plan Review and associated work being scheduled by the Water Zone Committee, with a need to work closer together to get a good result for the population.

16 **QUESTIONS**
Nil.

17 **URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS**
Nil.

18 **MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED WITH THE PUBLIC EXCLUDED**

Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

Moved: Councillor Atkinson    Seconded: Councillor Gordon

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Minutes/Report of:</th>
<th>General subject of each matter to be considered</th>
<th>Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter</th>
<th>Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>Report of Ken Stevenson (Roading Manager) and Joanne McBride (Civil Projects Team Leader)</td>
<td>West Kaiapoi New Arterial Road – Approval to Award a Contract</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>Report of Chris Brown (Community Green Space Manager)</td>
<td>District Parks and Reserves Maintenance Tender Report</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>Report of Ric Barber (Development Manager, Project Delivery Unit)</td>
<td>Contract CON201547 – Central Rangiora Sewer Capacity Upgrade Stage 1 Tender Award Report</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No</td>
<td>Minutes/Report of:</td>
<td>General subject of each matter to be considered</td>
<td>Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter</td>
<td>Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>Report of Ric Barber (Development Manager, Project Delivery Unit)</td>
<td>Contract 16/45 Woodend Wastewater Treatment Plant Expansion Project – Tender Award</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>Report of Gary Stevenson (Utilities Projects Team Leader) and Ric Barber (Development Manager, Project Delivery Unit)</td>
<td>Contract 16/47 Parnham Lane Pump Station Rising Main Renewal Tender</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Reason for protection of interests</th>
<th>Ref NZS 9202:2003 Appendix A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18.1 to 18.5</td>
<td>Protection of privacy of natural persons To carry out commercial activities without prejudice</td>
<td>A2(a) A2(b)ii</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CARRIED

**CLOSED MEETING**

The public excluded portion of the meeting occurred from 2.05pm to 3.25pm.

**OPEN MEETING**

*Resolution to resume in Open Meeting*

Moved: Councillor Gordon Seconded: Councillor Atkinson

THAT open meeting resumes and the business discussed with the public excluded remains public excluded, with the exception of those resolutions and item 18.7 can be made public once the agreement is finalised.

CARRIED

**19 NEXT MEETING**

The next scheduled meeting of the Council is on Tuesday 7 February 2017, commencing at 1pm.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS THE MEETING CLOSED AT 3.26pm.

CONFIRMED:

__________________________________________
Chairperson

__________________________________________
Date
1. **SUMMARY**

1.1 The purpose of this report is to seek Council approval for the changes to the Draft Development Contribution Policy 2017/18 for consultation as part of the 2017/18 Annual Plan.

1.2 The existing Development Contribution Policy was adopted for the 2015/16 financial year, with no update in 2016/17. The policy is required to be reviewed every three years.

1.3 As part of the 2017/18 Annual Plan consultation there is an opportunity to address some inconsistencies within the policy.

1.4 Changes were made to the following main areas:

   - Provision of a reassessment of DC’s for a time extension or 10 year lapse period on a resource consent.
   - Charging roading DC’s without subdivision in rural areas
   - Definition of the EDSS
   - Water source upgrades spread over 35 years
   - Private developer agreements
   - Timing of DC’s charged at building consent

1.5. There were some areas that were deliberately not addressed in this policy revision as they were considered to be major changes, therefore will be looked at next financial year and consulted as part of the Long Term Plan.

   - Assessment of roading DC’s on commercial developments
   - Potentially charging DC’s the year of 224 issue – not having any DC’s within the decision
- DC assessment for big box retail developments.
- Inclusion of a solid waste DC – district wide
- New water DC for ENE Kaiapoi

**Attachments:**

a. Draft 2017/18 Development Contribution Policy

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

a. **Receives** report No 170109000819.

b. **Approves** the Draft Development Contribution Policy 2017/18 for consultation as part of the 2017/18 Annual Plan.

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

3. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

3.1. The purpose of this report is to seek Council approval for the changes to the Draft Development Contribution Policy 2017/18 for consultation as part of the 2017/18 Annual Plan.

3.2. The existing Development Contribution Policy was adopted for the 2015/16 financial year, with no update in 2016/17. These are required to be reviewed every three years.

3.3. The Development Contribution Internal Review Group met on 28th November to discuss the main points to be reviewed and to delegate the policy updating process to a DC working group consisting of:

- Kalley LaValley, Project Delivery Manager
- Geoff Meadows, Policy Manager
- Ric Barber, Development Manager

3.4. As part of the 2017/18 Annual Plan consultation there is an opportunity to address some inconsistencies within the policy.

3.5. A number of issues have been found whilst implementing this policy over the last two financial years, particularly in regards to the following areas:

- When to charge roading DC's without subdivision in rural areas
- Duration that we are using for calculating DC's for water supply source upgrades
- Private developer agreements
• When to charge DC’s against a Building Consent

3.6. Some further clarification regarding the following point was also considered to be a worthwhile addition to this policy:

• A definition of the Eastern District Sewer Scheme (EDSS)

3.7. There were also some issues that were highlighted that were thought to be too broad to be covered in this update and will be covered next financial year and consulted as part of the Long Term Plan. These were:

• How to charge businesses for roading DC’s. The current policy uses the household unit equivalent (HUE) method based on 8 vehicle movements per HUE, however this results in cost prohibitive DC’s for commercial developments.

• Potentially charging DC’s the year of 224 issue, therefore not having any DC’s within the resource consent decision.

• How to charge big box retail developments.

• Inclusion of a district wide solid waste DC.

• A new DC for ENE Kaiapoi for water supply.

3.8. Two further issues were discussed but thought to not require any change to the existing DC policy. These were:

• The ability to charge Ministry of Education schools development contributions. Under the Local Government Act, schools are not required to pay development contributions, therefore there has previously been inconsistency about invoicing them or not. Council staff had legal advice confirming that Ministry of Education schools are exempt from paying DC’s, therefore it was considered whether to include this in the policy, however it was determined that as Ministry of Education schools are not required to pay, it should be Council practice not to invoice them DC’s, therefore it does not need to be explicitly stated in the policy.

• Consistent application of the formulas within the DC policy. We currently do not take into account development contributions previously received for any project or area. It was determined that the policy represented best practice, and our practice of how they are calculated should change to reflect this policy.

3.9. Table 1 shows the main changes that have been incorporated into the draft 2017/18 Development Contribution Policy. A full copy of the policy with tracked changes has also been appended.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section Number</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>Page Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2</td>
<td>Population forecasting</td>
<td>Updated to latest population statistics</td>
<td>Latest Stats NZ data used for most relevance</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section Number</td>
<td>Section Content</td>
<td>Justification</td>
<td>Page Number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Definitions</td>
<td>EDSS Definition</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDSS Definition</td>
<td>Clearer defined EDSS including Ocean Outfall and four contributing wastewater treatment plants.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6.3</td>
<td>Timing of Payment of Contributions</td>
<td>Change to timing of payment for DC’s levied against a building consent</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To achieve consistency of when to invoice and ensure payment is made on all BC’s.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6.3</td>
<td>Timing of Payment of Contributions</td>
<td>Addition of clause to cover 10 year lapse periods in resource consents.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ensuring the most appropriate DC’s are collected when a subdivision opts to extend the resource consent over 10 years.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6.7</td>
<td>Developer Agreements</td>
<td>Sets out circumstances for entering into PDA’s</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provides specific circumstances for entering into a PDA, criteria for Council consideration of PDA requests and requirements of the agreement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule 3.1.5.1</td>
<td>Water Scheme New Source Projects</td>
<td>Inclusion of all other water schemes with water source upgrades to be spread over 35 years</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Water source upgrades are all designed to cater for more growth than the usual 10 year horizon, therefore a 35 year period has been proposed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule 3.4.2</td>
<td>Roading Charges</td>
<td>Changing the wording so that a 2nd property in a rural area can be charged a roading DC</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consistency with the intent of the policy and now reflects reserves and solid waste wording.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Main changes between 2015/16 DC Policy and Draft 2017/18 DC Policy

3.10. The Development Contribution Internal Review Group met again on 14th December to agree to the content of the draft policy.

3.11. Options

3.12. The Council has two main options:

1. The Council could approve the Draft 2017/18 Development Contribution Policy to be consulted on as part of the 2017/18 Annual Plan.

2. The Council could decide not to consult on the changes in the Draft 2017/18 Development Contribution Policy as they could be considered potentially minor in nature.
4. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

Community views have not yet been sought on this project, however the recommended option is to consult this as part of the 2017/18 Annual Plan.

5. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

5.1. The changes in the Draft 2017/18 Development Contribution Policy aim to provide clarification and ensure the growth component of any capital projects are correctly levied against new developments.

5.2. There is little risk involved with adopting this Draft 2017/18 Development Contribution Policy that staff can foresee.

6. **CONTEXT**

6.1. **Policy**

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

6.2. **Legislation**

6.3. The Local Government Act 2002 (LGA2002) introduced powers to levy development contributions. The power to require contributions is set out in Section 198 of LGA2002:

6.4. A territorial authority may require a development contribution to be made to the territorial authority when:

(a) a resource consent is granted under the Resource Management Act 1991 for a development within its district:

(b) a building consent is granted under the Building Act 2004 for building work situated in its district (whether by the territorial authority or a building consent authority):

(c) an authorisation for a service connection is granted.

6.5. LGA2002 Section 198 (4A) also provides for the levying of development contributions when granting a certificate of acceptance (under the Building Act 2004 Section 98), if a development contribution or contributions would have been payable on the building consent had one been obtained for the work that is the subject of the certificate of acceptance.

6.6. The principles which underpin decision-making with respect to development contributions are set out in LGA2002 Section 197AB.

6.7. **Community Outcomes**

All of the community outcomes are considered to be relevant to ensure that growth is catered for and funded appropriately within the District.

Written by

Ric Barber

*Development Manager*
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INTRODUCTION

Development contributions are the contributions that the Council levies on the developers of new properties, and new development that place additional demand on infrastructure in the District. These funds are used to provide the additional reserves, roads and/or water, sewer and stormwater services needed to meet the demands generated by the residents who move into these new developments. Contributions are, therefore, used to cater for the growth in demand for infrastructure that comes from new properties or activities.

This Development Contributions Policy sets out the basis on which development contributions will be charged. The aim of the Policy is to share the cost of infrastructure fairly between the owners of existing properties, and the owners and developers of new properties or developments.

This document provides the core policy which states what the Council will do in relation to levying development contributions. Accompanying it are the Schedules and related maps. The Schedules provide the basis on which various Development Contributions are calculated, the amounts budgeted and the amounts payable for each Contribution for each scheme area and Development Contribution area across the District.

POLICY CONTEXT

2.1 Statutory context

2.1.1 Development contributions

The Local Government Act 2002 (LGA2002) introduced powers to levy development contributions. The power to require contributions is set out in Section 198 of LGA2002:

- A territorial authority may require a development contribution to be made to the territorial authority when—
  (a) a resource consent is granted under the Resource Management Act 1991 for a development within its district;
  (b) a building consent is granted under the Building Act 2004 for building work situated in its district (whether by the territorial authority or a building consent authority);
  (c) an authorisation for a service connection is granted.

LGA2002 Section 198 (4A) also provides for the levying of development contributions when granting a certificate of acceptance (under the Building Act 2004 Section 98), if a development contribution or contributions would have been payable on the building consent had one been obtained for the work that is the subject of the certificate of acceptance.
The principles which underpin decision-making with respect to development contributions are set out in LGA2002 Section 197AB.

2.1.2 Financial contributions

Financial contributions are contributions levied under the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA). Section 108 (10) of the RMA provides the conditions under which financial contributions can be imposed on resource consents.

Financial contributions, imposed under the District Plan, can be taken to address environmental effects of activities irrespective of whether they result from growth, for example, to pay the costs of services such as roads, water supplies, sewerage and drainage systems which must be developed to address adverse effects on the environment. Financial contributions can also be taken to offset adverse effects that may result from developments, as environmental compensation.

Financial contributions will be used when the effect of development directly contributes to the need for physical works on Council services and when the effect of the development has not been foreseen in the Long Term Plan (LTP). Financial contributions are based on actual expenditure.

2.2 Assumptions

2.2.1 Introduction

This Policy uses a range of assumptions and forecasts about population growth, and the demand that will be placed on infrastructure by different types of development. These assumptions assist with planning for growth, and help determine how the cost of growth will be recovered for different types of development.

2.2.2 Population forecasting

The key assumption underpinning this Policy is that the District’s population will continue to grow. The household unit equivalents (HUEs) are the basis upon which development contributions will be assessed. For the purposes of calculating the additional residential HUEs for a given period, the estimated number of households that is anticipated at the end of the LTP period is determined by dividing the projected population by the anticipated average number of people per household across the District. The additional households required to accommodate the projected population is then determined by subtracting the number of households at the beginning of the period from the estimated number at the end of the period.

The 2017/28 Policy is based on the District having a projected population of 71,500 by 30 June 2028, and that an estimated 28,600 HUEs based on the assumption of 2.5 people per household will be required to accommodate this projected population. This projection is consistent with Statistics New Zealand’s medium variant projection for the District for 2028.
The following table sets out the anticipated population across the District based on the population projections for 30 June 2028.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Resident Population</th>
<th>Estimated Resident Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 June 2016</td>
<td>30 June 2028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 2015/25 Policy is based on the District having a projected population of 63,000 by 30 June 2025, and that an estimated 4,300 additional HUEs based on the assumption of 2.5 people per household will be required to accommodate this projected population. This projection is consistent with Statistics New Zealand’s medium/high variant projection for the District for 2026.

The following tables sets out the anticipated distribution of population across the District based on the population projections for 30 June 2015 and 2026 respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Estimated Resident Population 30 June 2015</th>
<th>Estimated Resident Population 30 June 2026</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikuku</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pines Beach—Kairaki</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pegasus</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandeville／San Dona</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>2,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance of District</td>
<td>18,800</td>
<td>18,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>63,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The projections for different infrastructural services such as water and sewer may vary from the above population figures, because the areas served by each scheme do not always correspond with the boundaries of the urban areas.

2.2.3 Business Zone subdivision
New allotments in Business Zones will be treated for development contributions purposes as for any other new allotment created in any other Zone within the District. Contributions equivalent to 1 HUE will be charged for any new allotment created by subdivision in a Business Zone, and prior to the release of the Section. 224C Certificate. Further contributions may be levied on land-use or building consents if the proposed activity will place additional demand on infrastructure.

2.2.4 District Wide Reserves assumption

A smaller contribution is required for Rural Zones which is made on the assumption that people living in these areas will provide their own local open spaces, but still generate demand for District-wide reserves of various categories.

2.2.5 Network infrastructure assumptions

- General

It is assumed that all Residential Zone allotments consume the same unit of demand, except as provided for under multi-unit developments and as provided for drainage.

The District will continue to grow in line with population forecasts and new infrastructure assets designed to cater for additional growth related capacity will be required.

- Water

As for the general network infrastructure above.

A standard water connection is a 15mm pipe, and that a higher contribution will be levied if a larger connection is requested.

- Sewer

The costs of reticulating, treating and disposing of sewage for lots connected to sewer systems are in proportion to the volume of sewage produced.

No adjustment is made for geographical, sewage strength or seasonal flow variations.

Sewerage disposal assessment is in relative proportion to the inflow of water to the lot assuming the standard water connection is a 15mm pipe.

Adjustments to contributions payable will be made for connections where the pipe size exceeds the standard connection size.

- Drainage
The drainage from Residential 1, 2, 3, 5, 6 and 6A Zone allotments will have the same volume of runoff. Exceptions may occur when developments are undertaken which provide for a significantly higher run-off co-efficient than is anticipated for residential development.

- **Roading**

The District’s roading network is a single integrated network, and the components of upgrades and additions represent improvements to strategic and arterial roads on network designed to cater for growth are separate from projects that cater solely for growth and relate to development contributions areas.

Additional growth of allotments in the District will result in additional volumes of vehicle movements, and developers, therefore, should contribute to the cost of providing an appropriate roading network. For planning purposes, the number of vehicle movements per day will be the same regardless of lot size, for a single household unit.

The growth related component of projected expenditure of strategic and arterial roads as set out in the Council’s Long-Term Plan will provide the basis for calculating the general roading contribution.

Development contributions will only be sought for roads for the growth component of expenditure on strategic and arterial roads and Development Contribution Areas. The funds required for upgrading local roads will be obtained from other sources.

New allotments created in Business Zones will be charged the same development contributions as for a new allotment created in any other zone. Additional development contributions may be charged on building consents depending on the demand on infrastructure to be generated by the associated activity.
2.2.4 Network infrastructure assumptions

General

It is assumed that all Residential Zone allotments consume the same unit of demand, except as provided for under multi-unit developments and as provided for drainage.

The District will continue to grow in line with population forecasts and new infrastructure assets designed to cater for additional growth-related capacity will be required.

Water

As for the general network infrastructure above.

A standard water connection is a 15mm pipe, and that a higher contribution will be levied if a larger connection is requested.

Sewer

The costs of reticulating, treating and disposing of sewage for lots connected to sewer systems are in proportion to the volume of sewage produced.

No adjustment is made for geographical, sewage strength or seasonal flow variations.

Sewerage disposal assessment is in relative proportion to the inflow of water to the lot, assuming the standard water connection is a 15mm pipe.

Adjustments to contributions payable will be made for connections where the pipe size exceeds the standard connection size.

Drainage

The drainage from Residential 1, 2, 3, 5, 6 and 6A Zone allotments will have the same volume of runoff. Exceptions may occur when developments are undertaken which provide for a significantly higher run-off coefficient than is anticipated for residential development.

Roading

The District’s roading network is a single integrated network, and the components of upgrades and additions represent improvements to strategic and arterial roads on network designed to cater for growth are separate from
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projects that cater solely for growth and relate to development contributions areas.

Additional growth of allotments in the District will result in additional volumes of vehicle movements, and developers, therefore, should contribute to the cost of providing an appropriate roading network. For planning purposes, the number of vehicle movements per day will be the same regardless of lot size, for a single household unit.

The growth related component of projected expenditure of strategic and arterial roads as set out in the Council’s Long-Term Plan will provide the basis for calculating the general roading contribution.

Development contributions will only be sought for roads for the growth component of expenditure on strategic and arterial roads and Development Contribution Areas. The funds required for upgrading local roads will be obtained from other sources.

New allotments created in Business Zones will be charged the same development contributions as for a new allotment created in any other zone. Additional development contributions may be charged on building consents depending on the demand on infrastructure to be generated by the associated activity.

2.3 POLICY OBJECTIVE

The Council is levying development contributions to ensure that the growth related capital expenditure identified in the LTP (future and past expenditure) is appropriately recovered from those who are directly benefiting, rather than having existing ratepayers bear all of the costs. Development contributions will be levied when the effect of the development, or the cumulative effects of developments, contributes to the need for the development of physical works or Council services and when these works or services have been allowed for in the LTP.

4 POLICY STATEMENT

4.1 Definitions

*Development Contribution Area (DCA)* – means a mapped area within the District which defines an area for which specific development contributions will be payable. Development Contribution Area maps are included with the Schedules that accompany this Policy.
Eastern District Sewer Scheme (EDSS) – means the Ocean Outfall and all four wastewater treatment plants (Kaiapoi, Rangiora, Woodend and Waikuku Beach) that discharge directly or indirectly into the Ocean Outfall under one discharge consent. The sewer development contribution has an additional component if the development is connected to the Eastern Districts Sewer Scheme. Developments connecting to the EDSS are assessed as an EDSS DC as well as a reticulation DC based on the geographical location within the EDSS. The EDSS DC includes expenditures for both the ocean outfall, the four wastewater treatment plants and associated connecting trunk pipelines.

Household unit equivalent (HUE) – means a “unit of demand” that equates to the typical demand for infrastructure by an average household unit assessed at 2.5 persons per household.

Household unit - means a building or part of a building intended to be used as an independent residence, including, but not limited to, apartments, semi-detached or detached houses, units, and town houses. For the purposes of calculating development contributions, a dwellinghouse with two separate self-contained areas consented for family use only will be treated as one household unit. In addition, a secondary independent dwellinghouse as defined in the District Plan shall not be treated as a household unit for the purposes of calculating Development Contributions. To avoid any doubt, visitor accommodation units that are separately unit-titled shall be considered as separate household units.

Note: If a subdivision results in the principal dwellinghouse on one lot and a secondary dwellinghouse on a separate lot, development contributions will apply to the secondary dwellinghouse as if it were a new principal dwellinghouse.

Multi-unit residential development – means any development involving more than one household unit (as defined above) per allotment including flats, townhouses, retirement villages and traveller’s accommodation. Contributions will be levied on the increase in the number of dwellinghouses over those already existing at the commencement of the development.

Residential activity – means a building or part of a building that is intended to be lived in that does not meet the definition of a household unit or visitor accommodation. This includes but is not limited to the portion of a retirement village and residential health care facilities where 24-hour on-site medical support to residents is provided accommodation is shared.

Note: To assess the HUEs for residential activity, the number of people to be accommodated in the facility that meets this definition should be divided by the number of people per household that is used to determine the number of HUEs for development contributions purposes for the 10 years under consideration.

Multi-unit non-residential development – means a development involving more than one self-contained structure, either attached or separate from other structures on the same allotment, designed to be used for non-residential activity.
Note: Multi-unit non-residential developments will be treated for development contribution purposes as if subdivision had occurred, i.e. that each unit will attract the contributions equivalent to those to be paid for 1 HUE for the district-wide, District Plan Zone and DCA specific contributions, as well as relevant network infrastructure connections at the time building consents are lodged irrespective of location within the District.

**Notional lot** – means an area of land within a site that meets the minimum lot area and dimensions for the Zone, and is shown by defined boundaries, legal or otherwise, which encompasses a proposed building platform for a dwellinghouse or an existing or second or subsequent dwellinghouse.

**Reserve** – means land that is vested in and managed by the Waimakariri District Council, under the Reserves Act 1977.

**Development Contribution Area (DCA)** – means a mapped area within the District which defines an area for which specific development contributions will be payable. Development Contribution Area maps are included with the Schedules that accompany this Policy.

**Residential activity** – means a building or part of a building that is intended to be lived in that does not meet the definition of a household unit or visitor accommodation. This includes but is not limited to the portion of a retirement village or residential health care facility where 24-hour on-site medical support to residents is provided.

**Run-off coefficient** – the anticipated proportion run-off from impervious surfaces from an allotment and is the basis for assessing the impact that a development will have on the stormwater infrastructure. The average run-off coefficient for a 600m² Greenfields development is 55 percent and this is the basis for establishing the stormwater HUE.

**Section 224C Certificate** – means the certificate that is issued to formalise the establishment of a new allotment. New allotments may also be created by way of Resource Management Act 1991 Section 226, and Local Government Act 1974 Section 306.

**Reserve** – means land that is vested in and managed by the Waimakariri District Council, under the Reserves Act 1977.

**Vehicle crossing** – means an area of land from the carriageway up to and including the road frontage of any site or allotment that is used by vehicles to access a site or allotment from the carriageway.

**Zoned** – means the various areas identified as zones shown on the Waimakariri District Plan: District Plan Maps.
4.2 Types of development contributions charged

4.2.1 Contributions levied on new allotments anywhere in the District

The District-wide development contributions are based on assumptions about the increase in population anticipated over the period covered by the policy and the number of additional “units of demand” that will be needed to accommodate the increased population. District-wide contributions are collected for roading and reserves.

When determining the amount to be paid in development contributions for roading and community facilities’ improvements, to cater for growth, the Council also takes into account the amount of the total expenditure needed to meet any existing deficiency or shortcomings in the infrastructure. This means that not all the cost of a particular project is necessarily collected from development contributions.

This Policy provides the Council with the ability to take contributions for past growth-related expenditure incurred during the previous 10 years, and growth related spending over the next 10 years.

4.2.2 Development Contribution Areas

This Policy includes maps and details concerning the specific contributions that are payable for each of the DCAs. These contributions relate to infrastructure such as water, sewer, roading, and drainage that is provided specifically for a particular area, and are spread over the estimated number of new lots in each area. Development contributions for DCAs are levied in addition to other contributions.

Schedules and DCA maps accompany this Policy.

Works schedules identifying the projects to be funded or part funded by development contributions are posted on the Council’s website.
4.3 Reserves contributions

4.3.1 Introduction

The Council aims to develop a reserves network within the District to enable recreation activities to be undertaken, to retain areas with conservation value and to develop sports surfaces for the purpose of encouraging physical as well as passive activity.

4.3.2 Provision for reserves contributions

The use of reserves development contributions is for the land purchase and development of reserves.

The two main types of reserves are those that are used by the community as a whole, and those that are used more often by people living in the immediate vicinity of the reserve. For this reason the reserves schedule is divided into neighbourhood reserves and District-wide reserves. While residents in urban areas will likely make the most use of neighbourhood reserves, people living in rural areas will be likely to make use of District-wide reserves. Accordingly the formula for calculating contributions recognises the zone the residential development is in.

Development contributions payable for reserves are also subject to the statutory maxima set out in LGA2002 Section 203, namely that:

“(1) Development contributions for reserves must not exceed the greater of –
(a) 7.5% of the value of the additional allotments created by a subdivision; and
(b) the value equivalent of 20 square metres of land for each additional household unit or accommodation unit created by the development.

For the purpose of Section 203(1)(a), the Council will assess the value of additional allotments created by a subdivision by reference to the land value recorded for similar allotments in the vicinity of the subdivision in the District valuation roll. The council will assess the value equivalent of 20 square metres of land for the purposes of Section 203(1)(b) by reference to the value of reserve land (including all improvements thereon) in the vicinity of the subdivision. In each case the assessment of value shall be the Council’s discretion.

LGA2002 Section 198 (3) also specifies that “…reserves does not include land that forms or is to form part of any road or is used or is to be used for stormwater management purposes.

Open space within subdivisions which provide walkways/cycleways are regarded as road reserves and are excluded from calculations with respect to the development contributions payable for reserves.
4.3.3 Land in lieu of cash for reserve development contributions

The Council will generally take development contributions towards providing reserves for open space and recreation in cash. In some circumstances the Council may, at its sole discretion consider taking land in lieu of, or in addition to, cash. Where it does so, any land taken will be valued in accordance with the Council’s land valuation policy.

4.3.4 Reserve land valuation policy

Land valuation for the purpose of assessing the value for land to be vested as reserves in lieu of cash development contributions will be determined by the Council on the basis of the market value of the land at the time the application for subdivision consent is lodged. A request for a reserve land valuation will be made by the Council to an independent valuer within 20 working days from the date the resource consent application is lodged with the Council. The cost of the initial valuation will be met by the developer. The Council is not required to provide an updated valuation before the issue of a section 224 (c) certificate.

The valuation of reserve land for vesting must be carried out according to the following valuation principles:

- the value of any improvements to the land will be excluded;
- an appropriate adjustment will be made on account of any easements or other rights to which the land is subject;
- where there are different density zonings within a subdivision or outline development plan, the value will be based on the lowest density zoning;
- the value will include any rights and configuration given by the consents already granted; and
- the value will be based on the highest and best use for the particular parcel of land valued (based on the lowest density zoning).

Unless otherwise agreed in writing between the Council and developer, the valuation of reserve land will occur in a manner consistent with the Public Works Act 1981 and relevant case law.

If the developer and the Council cannot agree on the valuation of the land to be vested, either party may, by written notice to the other party, refer the matter to independent valuation. If the parties do not agree on the valuer within 5 business days of either party giving a notice of valuation, either party may request that the Arbitrators’ and Mediators’ Institute of New Zealand appoint the valuer as soon as is reasonably practicable. The onus on the independent valuer will be to seek the correct valuation rather than to mediate a mid-point answer. The findings of the independent valuation as to the value of the land will be the final determination of value for the purposes of this policy.

The cost of this further valuation will be met equally by the developer and the Council.
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If having received the final determination of the value of the land proposed to be vested, the Council determines that, at that price the land does not represent a prudent acquisition for the wider community and the Council’s broader portfolio of open spaces, it may, at its discretion, notify the developer that it chooses to take the development contribution for reserves in money rather than in land.

If having received the final determination of the value of the land proposed to be vested, the developer determines that it does not wish to sell the land at that price, the developer may, at its discretion, notify the Council that it chooses to pay the development contribution for reserves in cash rather than in land.

Notices given by the Council or the developer, as referred to in the previous two paragraphs, must be given to the other party no later than 20 working days after the final determination of the value of land proposed to be vested is issued.

4.3.5 Circumstances for refunds or reductions for reserves contributions

In the event that planned reserve developments or alternative upgrades are not undertaken, then development contributions will be refunded, after allowing for the associated administrative costs.

Development contributions are being applied to general reserve purposes as specified under Section 205 of the LGA2002 not for specific reserves under Section 210 of the LGA2002.

If the Council does not use the land for reserve purposes within 10 years of acquiring the land that has been vested to Council, it will be returned to the developer.
4.4 Network infrastructure development contributions

4.4.1 Introduction

There are separate schedules for the assessment of development contributions for water, sewerage, drainage and roading but each policy has been developed on the broad principle that costs associated with the development of assets, to meet the demands associated with growth of the population, should be spread as equitably as practicable among the beneficiaries of those developments.

The growth of the District and the resulting additional connections to the system will increase the demand on existing services. The Council considers it should be developing long term sustainable solutions to cater for users of today and tomorrow, therefore any scheme it develops or extends will have a planned growth component within it.

4.4.2 Water

4.4.2.1 Introduction

The Council provides potable water to avoid the risk of water borne diseases affecting public health.

The Council operates several different water supply schemes and while the policies are methodology for calculating development contributions are the same for each scheme, the actual level of contribution varies because of different growth and planned expenditure.

The policy differentiates between residential, non-residential and DCA developments and there is a different basis for assessing the development contribution payable for each type of development.

The policy also provides for the levying of additional contributions where the size of the pipe required to service a development is larger than the standard 15mm water pipe. Provision is nevertheless made for the applicant to negotiate the connection rate where the applicant can show larger pipe size is required for fire-fighting or fire prevention.

Schedule 3 details the different amounts applicable to developments within each scheme.

4.4.2.2 Basis for assessment

Current users and future users benefit equally from the maximum capacity of a water supply system. Based on the assumption that one current user will consume the same amount of system capacity as a future user, they should equally share the cost of providing that maximum capacity.
Residential Zones:
The unit of demand relating to the water systems is the average number of litres per day consumed by a household. Each additional household increases the consumption of water by approximately 2,000 litres per day.

Growth in water consumption volumes and the system's maximum capacity has been translated into a HUE for the purposes of planning and calculating development contributions. Each new lot established will be charged one development contribution as per the accompanying Schedule. Any additional dwelling house established (except a secondary dwelling as permitted under the District Plan) on the same lot will be assessed as one HUE and charged a development contribution as per the attached Schedule.

Rural Zones:
The contribution is assessed on the same basis as for residential zones.

Business Zones (excluding Southbrook):
For these lots, the contribution is payable in two parts. Firstly, when each new lot is created, a contribution equal to the Residential contribution will be charged. If a larger than standard 15mm pipe connection is required there will be an additional cost. This contribution will be in direct relation to the size of the water inflow pipe. See accompanying schedule for the formula.

Southbrook:
For these lots, the contribution is assessed based on the area of the block being subdivided or developed less the area of land used for roading and stormwater utilities.

In calculating the area of lots being subdivided or developed, the total block being subdivided or developed shall be counted.

4.4.2.3 Circumstances for refunds or reductions for water contributions

In the event that planned system upgrades, or alternative upgrades, are not undertaken, then development contributions will be refunded, after allowing for the cost of investigating the upgrade options.

In the case of the Southbrook DCA development, where a subdivision results in a substantial balance block which is expected to be developed at a later date, the Council may defer charging water development contributions in respect of the balance block until such time as further subdivision or building or connection occurs in respect of the balance block (whichever is the earlier). This discretion will only be available where the area of the balance block is at least 50% of the area of the original block as at 1 July 2007.

Other than as detailed above, there will be no postponements of payments or remissions of payments.
4.4.3 Sewer

4.4.3.1 Introduction

The Council provides reticulated sewer treatment and disposal systems to achieve high quality public health and to minimise adverse effects on the receiving environment. There is an expectation from Maori and the community that high environmental standards will be met.

The Council operates seven different sewerage schemes (areas) - Eastern District, Oxford, Swannanoa, Ohoka Meadows, Mandeville, Fernside and Loburn Lea, and while the policies and methodology for calculating Development Contributions are the same for each scheme, the actual level of contribution varies because of different growth and the level of planned expenditure.

Schedule 3 details the different amounts applicable to developments within each area.

4.4.3.2 Basis for assessment for treatment and disposal costs and reticulation costs

Current users and future users benefit equally from the maximum capacity of a sewerage system. Based on the assumption that one current user will consume the same amount of system capacity as a future user, they should equally share the cost of providing that maximum capacity.

Residential Zones:
The unit of demand relating to the sewerage system is the volume of sewage to be treated and disposed of off the site it is generated from. Each additional residential household adds approximately 1,380 litres of sewage per day. Growth in sewage volumes and the system’s maximum capacity has been translated into the equivalent demand for the typical household.

Each new residential lot established will be charged one sewerage development contribution as per the attached Schedule. Any additional dwellinghouse, or multi-unit development established on the same lot, will be subsequently charged additional sewerage development contributions as per the attached Schedule depending on the number of additional dwelling units involved.

Rural Zones:
The contribution is assessed on the same basis as for residential zones.

Business Zones (excluding Southbrook):
For these lots the contribution is payable in two parts:
(i) When each new lot is created, a contribution according to the formula for residential zone contribution will be charged.
(ii) If a larger water inflow pipe is requested then a further contribution will be sought for sewage disposal. This contribution will be in direct relation to the size of the water inflow pipe – see attached schedule for the formula.
Southbrook:
For these lots, the contribution is assessed based on the area of the block being subdivided or developed less the area of land used for roading and stormwater utilities.

In calculating the area of lots being subdivided or developed, the total block being subdivided or developed shall be counted.

The funding costs associated with the Southbrook DCA sewer scheme development are met from drainage rates.

4.4.3.3 Circumstances for refunds or reductions for sewer contributions

In the case of the Southbrook DCA development, where a subdivision results in a substantial balance block which is expected to be developed at a later date, the Council may defer charging sewer development contributions in respect of the balance block until such time as further subdivision or building or connection occurs in respect of the balance block (whichever is the earlier). This discretion will only be available where the area of the balance block is at least 50% of the area of the original block as at 1 July 2007.

Other than as detailed above, there will be no postponements of payments or remissions of payments.

4.4.4 Drainage

4.4.4.1 Introduction

The Council provides drainage systems to achieve high quality public health and to minimise adverse effects on the receiving environment. Effective drainage systems and networks remove a constraint on land development.

There is an expectation from Maori and the community for high environmental standards to be met.

The Council operates five urban drainage areas and eight rural drainage areas. The methodology for calculating development contributions are the same for each scheme, but the actual level of contribution varies depending on the growth component.

Schedule 3 details the different amounts applicable to developments within each area.
4.4.4.2 Basis for assessment

Current users and future users benefit equally from the maximum capacity of a drainage system. Based on the assumption that one current user will need the same amount of system capacity as a future user, they should equally share the cost of providing that maximum capacity.

Residential 1, 2, 3, 5, 6 and 6A Zones:
The unit of demand relating to drainage systems is the peak run off, measured in cubic metres per second, to cope with a 5-year storm. Each additional household increases the potential run off into the reticulated drainage network by approximately 8 litres per second. Growth in the system’s maximum capacity has been translated into a ‘per lot’ equivalent for the purposes of planning and calculating development contributions. Each new lot established will be charged one HUE as per the accompanying Schedule.

Rural and Residential 4 Zones:
No development contribution for drainage is being sought from new subdivisions in these zones on the basis that development will not significantly impact on the level of run-off from the land.

Business Zones (excluding Southbrook DCA):
For these lots, the contribution is payable when each new lot is created, a contribution equal to the residential zone contribution will be charged.

Southbrook DCA:
For these lots, the contribution is calculated based on the area of the block being subdivided or developed, but excludes that part of a block which is assessed as having been developed.

4.4.4.3 Circumstances for refunds or reductions for drainage contributions

In the event that planned system upgrades, or alternative upgrades, are not undertaken, development contributions will be refunded, after allowing for the costs of investigating the upgrade options and associated administrative costs.

Other than as detailed above, there will be no postponements of payments or remissions of payments.
4.4.5 Roading

4.4.5.1 Introduction

The Council provides for growth of the District roading network to ensure people have access, and to contribute to a healthy community.

The growth related component of projected expenditure on strategic and arterial roads as set out in the Council’s Long-Term Plan will provide the basis for calculating the general roading contribution.

4.4.5.2 Basis for assessment

There are two types of roading developments identified which will be funded by development contributions. These are for the general contribution and developments in DCAs.

In recognition of the fact that some of these works will assist in remedying some existing deficiencies in the roading network and that there is a renewal component to some of these works, the Council has apportioned only part of the costs of each project to growth.

Schedule 3 details the different amounts applicable to developments within each DCA.

4.4.5.3 Circumstances for refunds or reductions for roading contributions

In the event that planned transport network upgrades, or alternative upgrades, are not undertaken development contributions will be refunded, after allowing for the costs of investigating the upgrade options and associated administrative costs.

Other than as detailed above, there will be no postponement of payments or reimbursement of payments.
Community infrastructure development contributions

4.5.1 Introduction

Community infrastructure is essential to the ongoing economic, social, cultural and environmental wellbeing of the community. This infrastructure provides opportunities for members of the community and visitors to the District to participate in activities, recreation, service to others and to participate in life-long learning experiences.

4.5.2 Basis for assessment

Community Infrastructure provides benefits for future residents and the existing community. It is therefore equitable to share these between the owners of future and existing properties and the costs will be allocated on a per household basis. Each project has been assessed to ascertain the amount attributable to growth and the amount attributed to current dwelling houses.

4.5.3.4.5.2.1 Circumstances for refunds or reductions community infrastructure

In the event that planned community infrastructure upgrades are not undertaken, or alternative upgrades are not completed, then development contributions will be refunded, after allowing for the costs of investigating the upgrade options and associated administrative costs.
Other than as detailed above, there will be no postponements of payments or remissions of payments.

Where the Council and a developer agree to the transfer of community infrastructure assets to the Council which will have benefits to the community and which would have otherwise been provided for by way of community infrastructure development contributions, the Council may agree to a reduction in the community infrastructure contribution to acknowledge the benefit.
4.6 Administration

4.6.1 Basis for assessment

The detailed basis for assessment for development contributions is explained in the formula for each contribution. There are two broad groups of formula. Those that apply to services and facilities for which benefit will accrue to the occupants of new allotments and/or new household units anywhere in the District with the costs are apportioned across the whole district, and include roading and reserves. The second group has benefits for a defined group of users, for which the costs are apportioned to the direct beneficiary and include sewer, water and drainage. These are set out in the respective schedules accompanying to this Policy.

4.6.2 The application of HUEs

All new allotments irrespective of zone will attract development contributions payable for one HUE at the time that the subdivision occurs. Assessments will be made of all development proposals either at the time that a resource consent or building consent is granted or a new or enlarged connection to an infrastructure service is approved. This will ascertain if further development contributions are payable to take account of the additional demand that the development will place on one or more of the Council’s infrastructure services. The bases for these assessments for water, sewer, drainage, roading and community infrastructure are set out in the respective Schedules to this Policy.

Each new lot created, irrespective of zone and proposed activity, will attract the district-wide development contributions payable at the time of creation. Each lot in a DCA will attract the development contributions payable for the DCA in which it is located. New lots in an area serviced by water, sewerage and/or drainage systems will attract the development contributions or connection charges payable for each of these systems.

Any additional dwelling on an allotment which does not comply with the definition of a secondary dwelling will attract development contributions, as will any secondary dwelling which is subsequently subdivided off from its original allotment.

Any allotment, which is created as the result of a boundary adjustment involving an allotment the size of which is below the threshold to qualify for the construction of a dwellinghouse as a permitted activity under the District Plan, to create an allotment of a size that allow the construction of a dwellinghouse as a permitted activity will attract development contributions.

The developers of multi-unit residential developments may apply to the Waimakariri District Council for relief from the payment of roading and community infrastructure and reserves development contributions. The matters that the Council will take into account when making its decision as to whether any relief will be granted, will include (but are not limited to):
The number of units;
- The size of the units;
- The purpose of the development; and
- The future ownership arrangements proposed for the development.

No relief will be granted that reduces the amount of development contributions payable for road and community infrastructure below the level equivalent of 0.5 HUE for each of these development contributions at the time that the application for relief is received by the Council.

No relief will be granted for water, sewer and stormwater development contributions. An assessment for the liability for stormwater development contribution will be made based on the anticipated proportion run-off from the site.

4.6.3 Timing of payment of contributions

Development contributions are levied on subdivision, resource consents, building consents and on requests for connection to infrastructure services. Those that are levied on subdivision are payable prior to issue of s.224(c) certificate. Those levied on land use consents will be invoiced prior to the uplifting of the consent, and those levied on building consents will be invoiced on receipt of the building consent. Those levied on service connections are payable prior to connection, and those levied on building consents will be payable prior to issue of the building consent.

The invoicing of development contributions on land use consents may nevertheless be delayed until the level of servicing required has been determined by the developer in collaboration with the Council.

Payment is required for land use consents when the land use development is completed and for building consents prior to the issue of Code Compliance Certificate. Development Contributions assessed and advised on a subdivision consent shall have a lapsing period of 5 years to give effect to the consent (i.e. section 223 certificate) and then 3 years to plan deposit (i.e. section 224c certificate). If a consent holder is granted an extension or a lapse period of greater than 5 years to give effect to the consent, the development contributions shall be re-assessed at s224c application if this occurs outside of the timeframes as stated above.

4.6.4 Price indexation

For work that is forecast to be undertaken in the period of the LTP, the Council may apply indexation to the development contribution calculations based on the Producer Price Index Outputs for Construction as provided in LGA2002 Sections 106 (2B) and (2C). These provisions, however, exclude interest and financing costs from the adjustments for increases in this producer price index.
4.6.5 Holding costs

The Council will apply holding costs for growth related expenditure that has been incurred prior to the commencement of the current financial year.

(a) For past capital expenditure, other than for roading, where that expenditure contains a growth component, the Council will annually increase the relevant development contributions by the Council’s cost of funding (currently 6.7%).

(b) For past capital expenditure on roading, where the expenditure was incurred for the purposes of allowing development, the Council allocates the full interest cost and recovers the associated holding cost from the developers.

(c) For past capital expenditure, where the expenditure is incurred for the purposes of allowing development in DCAs, the Council allocates the full interest cost to the development area and recovers the associated holding cost from the developers. The development contribution reflects both the capital cost and the holding cost.

Where funding costs are added to development contributions for historical expenditure in accordance with this clause, the Council will review the level of development contributions at least once every three years with regard to the impact that the inclusion of holding costs may be having on the development of the DCA. On completion of this review, if it is considered in the best interests of the Council and the district to do so, then the Council may exclude some or all of the funding costs from the calculation of a contribution.

There are a small number of capital works for the purposes of enabling development in defined areas for which the Council has decided that the funding costs should not be funded by development contributions e.g. Southbrook DCA drainage, where it is considered that there is district wide benefit arising from the works.

4.6.6 Historical capital expenditure

Where provided for in this Policy, development contributions may be charged in respect of historical capital expenditure, as well as for projected capital expenditure.

In determining when development contributions will no longer be charged for historical capital expenditure, a distinction is made between various types of historical expenditure with a growth related component:

1. DCA related expenditure
2. General growth related expenditure

3. Very large projects where the denominator used for calculating Development Contributions in the LTP reflects growth which is likely to occur beyond the LTP period.

With DCA expenditure, it is possible to identify when historical costs have been fully funded. Development Contributions will no longer be charged where the costs have been fully recovered or the asset has come to the end of its useful life (whichever is the earlier).

With general growth related expenditure, development contributions will be collected for future expenditure within the period of the LTP and for historical expenditure incurred in the previous 10-12 years. The number of years of historical expenditure to be included will be 20 years less the number of years covered by the LTP. Accordingly, in Year 1 of the LTP, development contributions will be charged for growth related expenditure for both the next 10 years and the past 10 years. In Year 2, development contributions will be charged for growth related expenditure for the next 9 years and the past 11 years, and so on.

The third category of expenditure identified above will continue to be part of the development contributions charge until the growth provided for in the development contributions denominator has eventuated, e.g. a certain number of dwelling houses have been developed. However, contributions will not be charged beyond the useful life of the asset.

4.6.7 Developer agreements

Section 207A(1) of the LGA2002 provides that territorial authorities may enter into a developer agreement if formally requested by a developer or the Council itself.

When a DCA is established, the Council will work with the developer or developers of the area concerned to establish which party or parties will undertake various works. The Council will only charge development contributions for that DCA for infrastructure work which is undertaken and funded by the Council. The extent of the infrastructure work undertaken by the Council in each DCA will vary according to the nature of the development and the type of work involved.

It is the responsibility of the developer to provide infrastructure solutions for the area of the proposed development. In the event that the Council requires the provision of additional capacity in the infrastructure to be provided or improvements to existing infrastructure affected by the development, Council will fund the extra-over portion of the work.

If a developer desires to enter into a developer agreement with Council, the developer shall make an application to Council in writing. This application shall include the following information for consideration by Council:

1. Scale of the development. Typically a development greater than 75 lots or with the value of infrastructure works exceeding $250,000 will be considered for an
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In considering an application for a developer agreement, the Council will consider the following:

1. The value of the works to be completed by the developer that have a wider Council benefit.
2. The degree of benefit to the wider community.
3. Options for completing the work.
4. Consideration of any increase in resilience to a Council infrastructure network.
5. Alignment of works with Council’s level of service requirements.
6. Alignment of works with the Regional Policy Statement, Council’s District Plan and strategic directions.
7. Risk to Council of development not proceeding as intended by the Developer.
8. Developer’s credit worthiness.
9. Council’s intended funding of the infrastructure works to be included in the agreement.

If as a result of these discussions, a decision is made to establish a formal development agreement under LGA2002, this agreement shall set out the following as relating to shared works:

1. Methodology for determining the share of costs that are the responsibility of the Council.
3. Effects of the completion of the proposed works on the development contributions payable under this Policy. Any departure(s) from the Council’s Development Contribution Policy shall be explicitly stated within the agreement.
4. Timeframe for validity of agreement.

Unless explicitly stated, developer agreements shall not alter the applications of Development Contributions under this Policy. Development Contributions may be locked in for a period of 8 years from agreement to the issuance of 224c at the discretion of Council.

When a DCA is established the Council will work with the developer or developers of the area concerned to establish which party or parties will undertake various works. The Council will only charge development contributions for that DCA for infrastructure work which is undertaken and funded by the Council. The extent of the infrastructure work undertaken by the Council in each DCA will vary according to the nature of the development and the type of work involved.
With respect to stormwater management, it is the responsibility of the developer to provide a stormwater solution for the area of the proposed development. In the event that the Council requires the provision of an additional capacity to contribute to a wider stormwater solution, the Council will negotiate the appropriate compensation with the developer.

If as a result of these discussions, a decision is made to establish a formal development agreement under LGA2002, this agreement will set out clearly any departure(s) from the Council's Development Contributions Policy.

4.6.8 Requests for reconsideration of development contributions

LGA2002 Section 199A establishes the right for people on whom the Council is proposing to level development contributions to request a reconsideration of the amounts involved. The bases on which such requests can be based are that:

- The amount was incorrectly calculated or assessed under the Council’s Development Contributions Policy;
- The Council has incorrectly applied its Development Contributions Policy; or
- The information used to assess the development contributions payable by the person seeking reconsideration was incorrect, has been recorded or used incorrectly, was incomplete or contained errors.

LGA2002 Section 202A (2) requires the Council's Development Contribution Policy to establish a process for addressing requests for reconsideration, which must indicate how these are to be lodged, and the steps that the Council will take in making its determination regarding the request for reconsideration.

The reconsideration process established under this policy will involve the delegation of responsibility for the determination of the outcome of the reconsideration to the Chief Executive. The process to be used to reach this determination is set out in Schedule A to this Policy.

5 LINKS TO OTHER POLICIES AND COMMUNITY OUTCOMES

- There is a safe environment for all
- Transport is accessible, convenient, reliable affordable and sustainable
- There is sufficient clean water to meet the needs of communities and ecosystems
- Businesses in the District are diverse, adaptable, and growing
- Core utility services are provided in a timely, sustainable and affordable manner
- Public spaces and facilities are plentiful, accessible and high quality
ADOPTEO BY AND DATE

Adopted by Waimakariri District Council on ………………………………………..

REVIEW

Review every three years in preparation for the LTP.
SCHEDULE A: RECONSIDERATION PROCESS

1 Requests for reconsideration of the development contribution which the Council proposed to levy on a development must follow within 10 working days of the formal receipt of a notice of the sums involved from the Council. The Council will give formal notice of the development contributions payable as soon as it is practicable after:
   - the decisions have been made with respect to the servicing of a new subdivision, for contributions payable prior to the release of RMA S.224C certificates;
   - the decision have been released with respect to the impact on Council infrastructure assets for contributions triggered by a land use consent; or
   - the plans for a new building have been assessed for a Project Information Memorandum (PIM).

2 Applications for reconsideration must be lodged on the prescribed form attached to this schedule, and must state which ground(s) for requests for reconsideration set out in LGA2002 S199A apply to the application.

3 The Council will only accept applications for reconsideration which provide sufficient information to allow Council officers to fully evaluate the basis on which the reconsideration is sought and the concerns of the applicant with respect to the Council’s original process in assessing the contributions payable.

4 The Council reserves the right to suspend the time of 15 working days required to provide determination of its response to a request for a reconsideration set out in LGA2002 Section 199B (1) if, in order to ensure natural justice, further information is required from the applicant regarding the basis for the request for reconsideration.

5 The Council will make its determination of the application for reconsideration based on the information provided by the applicant and the original Council documentation setting out the basis for the original decision regarding the development contributions applicable and the sums to be levied.

6 The reconsideration decision will be made by the Chief Executive on advice from a staff committee.

7 The Council’s reconsideration process will not involve formal hearings or other representations in person for the applicant or parties representing the applicant.
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Waimakariri District Council

Notice of request for a reconsideration of development contributions

Under S199A Local Government Act 2002

Name of person/company requesting reconsideration………………………………………………
Address……………………………………………………………………………………………………
Phone……………………………………………….
e-mail………………………………………………………

Development Contribution(s) for which reconsideration is sought …………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………
Please quote the relevant notice number …………………………………

Reasons for request for reconsideration (please tick the appropriate statutory reason(s))

(a) Incorrect calculation or assessment
(b) Development Contributions Policy incorrectly applied
(c) Information used incomplete or contains errors

Please provide further information relevant to your request for reconsideration:
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………….(use additional paper if necessary)

Relief sought …………………………………………………………………………………………….
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………

(To be signed by or on behalf of person/company making the request)
Signature ……………………………………………….Date:……………………………
Name of signatory ……………………………………………….(Please print)
Status of signatory ……………………………………………….(Please print)
SCHEDULE 1: FRAMEWORK FOR RECOVERING FINANCIAL AND DEVELOPMENT CONTRIBUTIONS

Development occurring within the District

Levied under the Local Government Act 2002:
- A Development Contribution (for projects identified in the LTP) to cater for the planned growth of:
  - Sewer, water & drainage services
  - Roading
  - Reserves
  - Community Infrastructure
  - Community Infrastructure

Levied at the time of:
- Subdivision or
- Land Use or Building Consent or
- (If applicable) connection to services and
- (If applicable) connection to the roading network

Levied under the Resource Management Act 1991:
- A Financial Contribution to:
  - Enable the adverse effects of each development proposal to be offset e.g. land to vest as road, or money to enable the local capacity of services to be increased.

Levied at the time of:
- Subdivision or land use consent.

A Works & Services Condition for:
  - Physical works to be undertaken, e.g. construction of a new road

Levied at the time of:
- Subdivision or land use consent.
SCHEDULE 2: RESERVES DEVELOPMENT CONTRIBUTIONS

2.1 Calculation of contributions

There are two reserves contributions – one for District-wide reserves applicable to all residential developments and the other for neighbourhood reserves, which is only applicable to residential zoned subdivisions.

The capital expenditure is divided into two categories:

1. Growth related development – this applies to new developments that are needed to cater for the growth of the District.
2. Development of reserves – this category covers development of existing reserves to cater for future residents and also for the changing needs of the community. It is therefore equitable to share these costs between future property owners and existing owners.

District and neighbourhood reserve contributions are levied at the lesser of either the maximum allowable contribution or the per lot contribution calculated on the cost of the capital expenditure as detailed in the LTP associated with the development of reserves. The maximum allowable contribution is the greater of 7.5 percent of the values of the additional lots created by a subdivision, or the market value equivalent of 20 square metres of land for each additional household unit or accommodation unit created the development.

2.1.1 Charges are levied

A charge is levied either:
- On each new residential allotment, or
- On each second or subsequent dwelling, or
- On each residential resource consent or building consent.

Accompanying this policy are the Schedules and related maps. The Schedules provide the basis on which various Development Contributions are calculated, the amounts budgeted and the amounts payable for each Contribution for each scheme area and Development Contribution area across the District.

2.1.2 Rural and Residential 4 Zoned – subdivisions and second and subsequent dwellinghouses

Where:
- \( cg \) = capital expenditure relating to growth for District Wide Reserves
- \( cd \) = capital expenditure relating to the development of existing reserves and facilities
- \( s \) = subsidies, if any
- \( h \) = total estimated number of additional dwellinghouses in the District at the end of the LTP period
- \( th \) = total estimated dwellinghouses at the end of the LTP period
- \( r \) = the funding rate applied in respect of each year from the time of the works being carried out
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Contribution per lot equals the lesser of:

(i) the greater of 7.5% of the land value of the additional lot or notional lot or the value equivalent of 20 square metres of land

or

(ii) For future expenditure:

\[(\frac{(cg - s)}{h} \times \frac{1}{h}) + (\frac{(cd - s)}{th} \times \frac{1}{th})\]

Plus in respect of historical expenditure, for each year in which capital expenditure including a growth component has been incurred:

\[\left(\frac{(cg - s)}{h} \times \frac{1}{h}\right) + \left(\frac{(cd - s)}{th} \times \frac{1}{th}\right)\]

x a multiplier reflecting funding costs

Where the multiplier is calculated along the following lines for each year in which historical expenditure occurred:

\[(1 + r_{t-1}) \times (1 + r_{t-2}) \times \ldots (1 + r_{t-h})\]

2.1.3 Residential 1, 2, 3, 5, 6 and 6A Zoned Subdivisions

Where:

cg = capital expenditure relating to growth for District Wide Reserves

 cn = capital expenditure relating to growth for Neighbourhood Reserves

 cd = capital expenditure relating to the development of existing reserves and facilities

 s = subsidies, if any

 h = total estimated number of additional dwellinghouses in the District at the end of the LTP period

 hi = total estimated number of additional residential zone dwellinghouses in the District at the end of the LTP period

 th = total estimated households at the end of the LTP period

 r_{t-a} = the funding rate applied in respect of each year from the time of the works being carried out

Contributions per lot equals the lesser of:

(i) The greater of 7.5% of the land value of the additional lot or the value equivalent of 20 square metres of land created by the development
or

(ii) For future expenditure:

\[ ((cg - s) \times \frac{1}{h}) + ((cn - s) \times \frac{1}{hi}) + ((cd - s) \times \frac{1}{th}) \]

Plus in respect of historical expenditure, for each year in which capital expenditure including a growth component has been incurred:

\[ ((cg - s) \times \frac{1}{h}) + ((cn - s) \times \frac{1}{hi}) + ((cd - s) \times \frac{1}{th}) \]

\* x a multiplier reflecting funding costs

Where the multiplier is calculated along the following lines for each year in which historical expenditure occurred:

\[ (1 + r_{t-1}) \times (1 + r_{t-2}) \times \ldots (1 + r_{t-x}) \]

2.1.4 Increased densities and multi-unit residential developments

Where:

\[ vm = \text{ the value of 20 sq metres of land} \]

\[ h = \text{ total dwellinghouse unit equivalents created by the Development} \]

Contribution = \( vm \times h \)

Multi-unit residential includes, but is not limited to, flats, town houses, retirement villages, traveller’s accommodation. As set out in Section 203 of the Local Government Act 2002, the formula may be applied at the discretion of the Council.

The formula is based upon the value equivalent of 20 square metres of land for each additional residential unit or accommodation unit created by the development, instead of 7.5% of the total land value:
3 Water

3.1.1 Calculation of contributions

The contribution is calculated on the cost of the capital expenditure associated with increasing the capacity of the system, less any subsidies, less the total of the replacement cost of the existing asset (if any) less the depreciation cost of the existing asset then dividing by the number of dwelling houses that the area is capable of servicing, or the number of units of water that the scheme can deliver. The schemes that the later applies to are Summerhill, Poyntz's Road, Oxford Rural 1 and 2 and West Eyreton.

3.1.2 Charges are levied

A charge is levied either:
- On each new lot and/or connection granted, or
- On each second or subsequent dwelling or connection on a pre-existing lot.
- Or resource consent, building consent or application for a larger service which will lead to additional demand on the water network, or
- On each second or subsequent connection or application for consent which will lead to additional demand on the water network.

Note: Developments in DCAs incur Development Contributions for the particular DCA area they are in, and in addition, incur Development Contributions for the large scheme area.

Accompanying this policy are the Schedules and related maps. The Schedules provide the basis on which various Development Contributions are calculated, the amounts budgeted and the amounts payable for each Contribution for each scheme area and Development Contribution area across the District.

3.1.3 Calculation of Contribution for developments outside DCAs water scheme projects other than the Rangiora Water Scheme new source projects (3.1.5.1): 

Where:
- \( c \) = capital expenditure that includes a growth component
- \( s \) = subsidies, if any
- \( r \) = replacement cost of any infrastructure replaced
- \( d \) = depreciated replacement cost of any infrastructure replaced
- \( n \) = total estimated number of dwelling houses in the area planned to be serviced as at the end of the LTP period.
- \( w \) = water connection size factor (for calculating water development contributions)
- \( r_{1-a} \) = the funding rate applied in respect of each year from the time of the works being carried out

Contribution per lot equals:
In respect of future expenditure:

\[ ((c - s) - (r - d)) \times \frac{1}{n} \times w \]

Plus in respect of historical expenditure, for each year in which capital expenditure including a growth component has been incurred:

\[ ((c - s) - (r - d)) \times \frac{1}{n} \times w \times \text{a multiplier reflecting funding costs} \]

Where the multiplier is calculated along the following lines for each year in which historical expenditure occurred:

\[(1 + r_{t-1}) \times (1 + r_{t-2}) \times \ldots (1 + r_{t-x})\]

The significance of the adjustment for replacement cost and depreciated replacement cost is that some assets have years of useful life left but are only being replaced to cope with the demand for extra capacity resulting from new subdivisions.

The effect of this adjustment is that if a new asset is to be replaced those causing the growth should pay for the cost of upgrading the asset as the existing asset would provide many years of future benefit and it is only being replaced because of the growth.

3.1.4 The water scheme development contribution (100% growth projects)

3.1.4.1 Developments outside DCAs:

Where:

- \( c \) = growth component of capital
- \( s \) = subsidies, if any
- \( r \) = replacement cost of any infrastructure replaced
- \( d \) = depreciated replacement cost of any infrastructure replaced
- \( h \) = total estimated number of additional dwelling houses in the area planned to be serviced by the end of the LTP period.
- \( W \) = water connection size factor (for calculating water development contributions)
- \( r_{t-a} \) = the funding rate applied in respect of each year from the time of the works being carried out.

Contribution per lot equals:

In respect of future expenditure:

\[ ((c - s) - (r - d)) \times \frac{1}{h} \times w \]

Plus in respect of historical expenditure, for each year in which capital expenditure including a growth component has been incurred:

\[ ((c - s) - (r - d)) \times \frac{1}{h} \times w \times \text{a multiplier reflecting funding costs} \]
3.1.5 The Water Scheme Development Contribution

3.1.5.1 Rangiora Water scheme new source projects

These include any water supply scheme with a water supply source upgrade and shall be levied over 35 years as below.

Where:

- \( c \) = capital expenditure that includes a growth component
- \( s \) = subsidies, if any
- \( r \) = replacement cost of any infrastructure replaced
- \( d \) = depreciated replacement cost of any infrastructure replaced
- \( n \) = total estimated number of dwelling houses in the area planned to be serviced as at the end of a period of 35 years from the date of completion of the project.
- \( W \) = water connection size factor (for calculating water development contributions)
- \( r_{t,a} \) = the funding rate applied in respect of each year from the time of the works being carried out

Contribution per lot equals:

**In respect of future expenditure:**

\[
\frac{((c - s) - (r - d))}{n} \times \frac{1}{n} \times W
\]

**Plus in respect of historical expenditure, for each year in which capital expenditure including a growth component has been incurred:**

\[
\frac{((c - s) - (r - d))}{n} \times \frac{1}{n} \times W \times \text{multiplier reflecting funding costs}
\]

*Where the multiplier is calculated along the following lines for each year in which historical expenditure occurred:*

\[(1 + r_{t,1}) \times (1 + r_{t,2}) \times \ldots (1 + r_{t,x})\]

For an existing asset, which is at the end of its useful life and due for replacement, people who connect in the future will only pay for the cost of increasing the system’s size, not the full cost of replacing the existing asset.
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3.1.6 Outline Development Plan Areas

In addition to the above Water Scheme Development Contribution calculation, the DCAs have an additional contribution which recognises the costs of the development of infrastructural services that are unique to that particular development.

3.1.6.1 The DCA Water Scheme Development Contribution (except Southbrook)

Where:
- $c_0$ = capital expenditure relating to growth in the DCA
- $f$ = funding costs in respect of historical expenditure, if any
- $s$ = subsidies, if any
- $p_c$ = development contributions previously received, if any
- $r$ = replacement cost of any infrastructure replaced
- $d$ = depreciated replacement cost of any infrastructure replaced
- $d_{ca}$ = estimated number of additional lots planned to be serviced over the remainder of the LTP period
- $w$ = water connection size factor (for calculating water development contributions)

Contribution per lot equals:

$$\frac{((c_0 + f - s - p_c) - (r - d))}{d_{ca}} x \frac{1}{w}$$

The schedule details the actual costs relating to each Scheme.

3.1.6.2 The Southbrook DCA Water Scheme Development Contribution

Where:
- $c_0$ = capital expenditure that includes a growth component
- $f$ = funding costs in respect of historical expenditure, if any
- $s$ = subsidies or income received from other sources, if any
- $r$ = replacement cost of any infrastructure replaced
- $d$ = depreciated replacement cost of any infrastructure replaced
- $m$ = area in m$^2$ of lot(s) being subdivided or developed
- $a$ = [Total area of the Southbrook DCA area in m$^2$ less the area dedicated to the stormwater retention pond] less a 15% allowance for roading and reserves
- $w$ = water connection size factor (for calculating water development contributions)

Contribution per lot equals:

$$\frac{((c_0 + f - s) - (r - d))}{a} x \frac{1}{m} x m x w$$

The schedule details the actual costs relating to this Scheme.
### 3.1.7 Water Connection Size Factor (for calculating Water Development Contributions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water Connection Size (mm)</th>
<th>Development Contribution Multiplication Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15mm</td>
<td>1.0 x Standard D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20mm</td>
<td>1.5 x Standard D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25mm</td>
<td>2.1 x Standard D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32mm</td>
<td>3.2 x Standard D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40mm</td>
<td>4.9 x Standard D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50mm</td>
<td>7.8 x Standard D.C.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The connection rate may be negotiated where the applicant can show larger pipe size is required for fire fighting or fire prevention.
3.2 Sewer Calculation of Contribution

The contribution is calculated on the cost of the capital expenditure associated with increasing the capacity of the system, less any subsidies, less the difference between the total of the replacement cost of the existing asset (if any), the depreciated cost of the existing asset, with the total then divided by the number of lots that are planned to be serviced by the scheme. For historical costs, an adjustment is made to reflect funding costs. The result is the cost that will apply to each new lot.

For the purposes of calculating the sewer development contribution the volume flows are calculated on the size of the water inflow pipe as the outflow of sewage from a property is proportional to the inflow of water.

3.2.2 Charges are levied

A charge is levied either:

- On each new lot and/or connection granted, or
- on each second or subsequent dwelling or connection on a pre-existing lot.
- Or resource consent or application for a larger service which will lead to additional demand on the sewer network, or
- on each second or subsequent connection or application for consent which will lead to additional demand on the sewer network.

Note: Developments in DCAs incur Development Contributions for the particular DCA area they are in, and in addition, incur Development Contributions for the large scheme area.

Accompanying this policy are the Schedules and related maps. The Schedules provide the basis on which various Development Contributions are calculated, the amounts budgeted and the amounts payable for each Contribution for each scheme area and Development Contribution area across the District.

3.2.2.1 All developments outside DCAs

Sewer Scheme Development Contributions other than the Ocean Outfall Project (Partial Growth)

Where:

- \( c \) = capital expenditure that includes a growth component
- \( s \) = subsidies, if any
- \( r \) = replacement cost of any infrastructure replaced
- \( d \) = depreciated replacement cost of any infrastructure replaced
- \( n \) = total estimated number of lots in the area planned to be serviced as at the end of the TPY period
- \( w \) = water connection size factor (for developing sewer development contributions)
- \( r_{t-a} \) = the funding rate applied in respect of each year from the time of the works being carried out

Contribution per lot equals:

\[
\frac{c - s - (r - d)}{n} \times w \times r_{t-a}
\]
In respect of future expenditure:
\[((c - s) - (r - d)) \times \frac{1}{n} \times w\]

Plus in respect of historical expenditure, for each year in which capital expenditure including a growth component has been incurred:
\[((c - s) - (r - d)) \times \frac{1}{n} \times w \times \text{a multiplier reflecting funding costs}\]

Where the multiplier is calculated along the following lines for each year in which historical expenditure occurred:
\[(1 + r_{t-1}) \times (1 + r_{t-2}) \times \ldots \times (1 + r_{t-x})\]

### 3.2.3 The Sewer Scheme Development Contribution (100% growth projects)

#### 3.2.3.1 Developments outside DCAs - Sewer Scheme Development Contributions

Where:
- \(C\) = growth component of capital
- \(s\) = subsidies, if any
- \(r\) = replacement cost of any infrastructure replaced
- \(d\) = depreciated replacement cost of any infrastructure replaced
- \(h\) = total estimated number of additional lots in the area planned to be serviced by the end of the LTP period
- \(w\) = water connection size factor (for calculating sewer development contributions)
- \(r_{t-a}\) = the funding rate applied in respect of each year from the time of the works being carried out

Contribution per lot equals:

For future expenditure:
\[((c - s) - (r - d)) \times \frac{1}{h} \times w\]

Plus in respect of historical expenditure, for each year in which capital expenditure including a growth component has been incurred:
\[((c - s) - (r - d)) \times \frac{1}{h} \times w \times \text{a multiplier reflecting funding costs}\]

Where the multiplier is calculated along the following lines for each year in which historical expenditure occurred:
\[(1 + r_{t-1}) \times (1 + r_{t-2}) \times \ldots \times (1 + r_{t-x})\]
3.2.3.2 Ocean Outfall Project

Where:
- \( c \) = capital expenditure that includes a growth component
- \( s \) = subsidies, if any
- \( r \) = replacement cost of any infrastructure replaced
- \( d \) = depreciated replacement cost of any infrastructure replaced
- \( n \) = total estimated number of dwelling houses in the area planned to be serviced as at the end of a period of 35 years from the date of completion of the project.
- \( w \) = water connection size factor (for calculating water development contributions)
- \( r_{1:a} \) = the funding rate applied in respect of each year from the time of the works being carried out

Contribution per lot equals:

\[
\frac{((c - s) - (r - d))}{n} \times \frac{1}{n} \times w
\]

Plus in respect of historical expenditure, for each year in which capital expenditure including a growth component has been incurred:

\[
\frac{((c - s) - (r - d))}{n} \times \frac{1}{n} \times w \times \text{a multiplier reflecting funding costs}
\]

Where the multiplier is calculated along the following lines for each year in which historical expenditure occurred:

\[
(1 + r_{1}) \times (1 + r_{1}) \times (1 + r_{1})
\]

The significance of the adjustment for replacement cost and depreciated replacement cost is that some assets have years of useful life left but are only being replaced to cope with the demand for extra capacity resulting from new subdivisions.

The effect of this adjustment is that if a new asset is to be replaced those causing the growth should pay for the cost of upgrading the asset as the existing asset would provide many years of future benefit and it is only being replaced because of the growth.

Conversely, for an existing asset, which is at the end of its useful life and due for replacement, people who connect in the future will only pay for the cost of increasing the system’s size, not the full cost of replacing the existing asset.

3.2.4 Development Contribution Areas

In addition to the above Sewer Scheme Development Contribution calculation, the DCAs have an additional contribution which recognises the costs of the development of infrastructural services that are unique to that particular development.
There are two formulae – one for Southbrook and the other for all other DCAs.

### 3.2.4.1 The DCA Sewer Scheme Development Contribution (except Southbrook):

Where:
- \( c_o \) = capital expenditure relating to growth in CDA
- \( f \) = funding costs in respect of historical expenditure, if any
- \( s \) = subsidies, if any
- \( pc \) = development contributions previously received, if any
- \( r \) = replacement cost of any infrastructure replaced
- \( d \) = depreciated replacement cost of any infrastructure replaced
- \( dca \) = estimated number of lots planned within the DCA over the remainder of the LTP period
- \( w \) = water connection size factor (for calculating sewer development contributions)

Contribution per lot equals:
\[
\left( (c_o + f - s - pc) - (r - d) \right) \times \frac{1}{dca} \times w
\]

The schedule details the actual costs relating to each Scheme.

### 3.2.4.2 The Southbrook DCA Sewer Scheme Development Contribution:

Where:
- \( c_o \) = capital expenditure which includes a growth component
- \( f \) = funding costs in respect of historical expenditure, if any (Council’s current policy is to fund these from rates rather than development contributions)
- \( s \) = subsidies or income received from other sources, if any
- \( r \) = replacement cost of any infrastructure replaced
- \( d \) = depreciated replacement cost of any infrastructure replaced
- \( m \) = area in m\(^2\) of lot(s) being subdivided or developed
- \( a \) = area in m\(^2\) of the Southbrook DCA area in m\(^2\) less the area dedicated to the stormwater retention pond less a 15% allowance for roading and reserves
- \( w \) = water connection size factor (for calculating sewer development contributions)

Contribution per lot equals:
\[
\left( (c_o + f - s) - (r - d) \right) \times \frac{1}{a} \times m \times w
\]
3.2.5 Water Connection Size Factor (for calculating Sewer Development Contributions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water Connection Size (mm)</th>
<th>Development Contribution Multiplication Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15mm</td>
<td>1.0 x Standard D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20mm</td>
<td>1.2 x Standard D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25mm</td>
<td>1.6 x Standard D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32mm</td>
<td>2.1 x Standard D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40mm</td>
<td>2.9 x Standard D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50mm</td>
<td>4.4 x Standard D.C.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The connection rate may be negotiated where the applicant can show larger pipe size is required for fire fighting or fire prevention.
3.3 Drainage

3.3.1 Calculation of Contribution

The contribution is calculated on the cost of the capital expenditure associated with increasing the capacity of the system, less any subsidies, less the total of: the replacement cost of the existing asset (if any) less the depreciated cost of the existing asset and then divided by the number of properties that the area is capable of servicing. The result is the cost that will apply to each new lot.

3.3.2 Charges are levied

(Exemptions: Utility Lots and Boundary Adjustments):

Residential Zones
On subdivision creating additional allotment/s and subsequently for each additional dwelling house on the same lot (when either resource consent or building consent is granted).

Business Zones
For business properties, on subdivision creating additional allotment/s or on additional connection or network load on the same lot (when either a resource consent or a building consent is granted or at the time of connection).

Note: Developments in DCAs incur Development Contributions for the particular DCA area they are in, and in addition, incur Development Contributions for the large scheme area.

Accompanying this policy are the Schedules and related maps. The Schedules provide the basis on which various Development Contributions are calculated, the amounts budgeted and the amounts payable for each Contribution for each scheme area and Development Contribution area across the District.

3.3.3 Drainage Contribution

Where:
- \( c \) = capital expenditure including a growth component
- \( s \) = subsidies, if any
- \( r \) = replacement cost of any infrastructure replaced
- \( d \) = depreciated replacement cost of any infrastructure replaced
- \( n \) = total estimated number of lots in the area planned to be serviced as at the end of the LTP period
- \( r_{t-a} \) = the funding rate applied in respect of each year from the time of the works being carried out
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Contribution per lot equals:

For future expenditure:

\[
\frac{(c - s) - (r - d)}{n}
\]

Plus in respect of historical expenditure, for each year in which capital expenditure including a growth component has been incurred:

\[
\frac{(c - s) - (r - d)}{n} \times \text{a multiplier reflecting funding costs}
\]

Where the multiplier is calculated along the following lines for each year in which historical expenditure occurred:

\[
(1 + r_{t-1}) \times (1 + r_{t-2}) \times \ldots \times (1 + r_{t-n})
\]

3.3.4 The Drainage Scheme Development Contribution (100% growth projects)

3.3.4.1 Developments outside DCAs Drainage Scheme Development Contributions:

Where:

- \(c\) = growth component of capital
- \(s\) = subsidies, if any
- \(r\) = replacement cost of any infrastructure replaced
- \(d\) = depreciated replacement cost of any infrastructure replaced
- \(h\) = total estimated number of additional lots in the area planned to be serviced at the end of the LTP period.
- \(r_{t-n}\) = the funding rate applied in respect of each year from the time of the works being carried out

Contribution per lot equals:

For future expenditure:

\[
\frac{(c - s) - (r - d)}{h}
\]

Plus in respect of historical expenditure, for each year in which capital expenditure including a growth component has been incurred:

\[
\frac{(c - s) - (r - d)}{h} \times \text{a multiplier reflecting funding costs}
\]

Where the multiplier is calculated along the following lines for each year in which historical expenditure occurred:
The significance of the adjustment for replacement cost and depreciated replacement cost is that some assets have years of useful life left but are only being replaced to cope with the demand for extra capacity resulting from new subdivisions.

The effect of this adjustment is that if a new asset is to be replaced those causing the growth should pay for the cost of upgrading the asset as the existing asset would provide many years of future benefit and it is only being replaced because of the growth.

Conversely, for an existing asset, which is at the end of its useful life and due for replacement, people who connect in the future will only pay for the cost of increasing the system’s size, not the full cost of replacing the existing asset.

3.3.4.2 Rangiora / Southbrook Stormwater

Where:

- “Subdivision” is a subdivision of land into separate title, or the signing of a long term lease exceeding 15 years on a portion of the land.
- “Development” is improvement of the land to allow commercial or industrial activity to take place, and includes erecting a building, or changing the use of land.

\[ \text{co} = \text{capital expenditure due to growth} \]
\[ m = \text{area in } m^2 \text{ of that part of the lot(s) to be subdivided less the area which is assessed as having been developed as at 1 July 2007} \]
\[ a = 0.85X + 0.1 (Z-0.85X) \]
\[ X = \text{area in } m^2 \text{ of all lots identified as Area X lots on Plan 2878, (those that are largely undeveloped) less the area of each of those lots assessed as developed at 1 July 2007} \]
\[ Y = \text{lots identified as Area Y lots on Plan 2878 (those that are largely developed)} \]
\[ Z = \text{gross area in } m^2 \text{ of all lots within the DCA, less that area contributing to pond B shown on Plan 2878} \]
\[ M = 4.0, \text{ or other factor as agreed by the Council} \]
\[ p = \text{area in } m^2 \text{ of built-on or surfaced or compacted land that is assessed as contributing to stormwater runoff.} \]

For Subdivision within the Southbrook Industrial Area, the square metre Development Contribution rate is calculated as follows:

\[ (\text{co} \times m/a) – (3,519,739 \times 1/542,158) = 6.49 \text{ per } m^2 \]

For Development of an area within the Southbrook Industrial Area, the square metre Development Contribution rate is calculated as follows:

\[ (\text{co} \times M \times p/a) \times 3,519,739 \times 4 \times 1/542,158 = 25.97 \text{ per } m^2 \]
3.3.5 Drainage Adjustment Factor

The stormwater HUE is based on the expected runoff from impermeable surfaces. A typical Greenfields residential development on a 600m² allotment is assumed to have a run-off coefficient (or anticipated proportion of run-off) of 55 percent. Runoff coefficient assessments are based on the Compliance Document for New Zealand Building Code Clause E1 Surface Water, which provides a list of typical runoff coefficients. Adjustments for drainage contributions for non-residential activity will be made on resource consent or building consent.

In the case of developments outside of DCAs and special stormwater management areas such as Southbrook, the stormwater development contribution will be calculated on the basis of the run-off coefficient. If the run-off coefficient is greater than 55 percent, additional development contributions will be charged for development serviced by the District's reticulated stormwater collection systems.
3.4 Roading

3.4.1 Calculation of contribution

The contribution is calculated on the cost of the capital expenditure associated with increasing the capacity of the network, less any subsidies. The value of roading necessary to service the development is subtracted also, so the contribution relates to extra work in the system. This value is then divided by the number of projected new dwellinghouses in the District. For historical costs, an adjustment is made for funding costs. The result is the cost that will apply to each new lot.

The calculation of roading contributions for DCAs relates to the cost of construction of collector roads (if any) that are required to connect the DCA to the District-wide roading network. The development contribution payable for these DCAs is based on the estimated cost of the collector road divided by the number of new allotments to be created in that DCA.

3.4.2 Charges are levied

**Residential Zones**

A charge is levied either:

- On each new residential allotment, or
- On each second or subsequent dwelling, or
- On each residential land use resource consent or building consent.

When subdivision consent is granted and subsequently for each additional dwelling house on the same lot (either when a resource consent or a building consent is granted).

**Business and Rural Zones**

When subdivision consent is granted and subsequently if new vehicle crossings are created.

Accompanying this policy are the Schedules and related maps. The Schedules provide the basis on which various Development Contributions are calculated, the amounts budgeted and the amounts payable for each Contribution for each scheme area and Development Contribution area across the District.

3.4.2.1 The District Roading Development Contribution

Where:

- \( C \) = capital expenditure for that project
- \( f \) = funding costs in respect of historical expenditure, if any
- \( s \) = subsidies, if any
- \( pc \) = development contributions previously received in respect of that project
- \( fc \) = financial contribution applicable to that roading project, if any
- \( h \) = total estimated number of additional dwellinghouses in the District over the remainder of the LTP period.
CONTRIBUTION per lot equals:

\[
\text{The sum of the following for each identified district roading project:} \\
((c + f - s - pc) - fc) \times \frac{1}{h}
\]

3.4.2.2 Development Contribution Areas

In addition to the above development contribution calculation, the Outline Development Plan Areas have an additional formula which apportions the costs of the development of main trunk roads that are unique to that particular development.

3.4.2.3 The Outline Development Plan Area Roading Development Contribution

Where:
- \(c\) = capital expenditure relating to growth in DCA
- \(f\) = funding costs in respect of historical expenditure, if any
- \(s\) = subsidies, if any
- \(pc\) = development contributions previously received in respect of that project
- \(fc\) = financial contribution applicable to roading developments
- \(dpa\) = estimated number of lots capable of being serviced within the development over the remainder of the LTP period

Contribution per lot equals:

\[
((co + f - s - pc) - fc) \times \frac{1}{dca}
\]

3.4.3 Roading adjustment factor

The Council calculated the HUE for roading based on the typical number of vehicle movements generated by a development. A typical household is assumed to generate 8 vehicle trips a day.
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4.1 Calculation of contribution

The contribution is calculated on the cost of the capital expenditure relating to the development of community infrastructure to cope with growth of the District, less any subsidies, less the total of the replacement cost of the existing asset (if any), less the depreciated replacement cost of the existing asset and then divided by the total estimated number of dwellinghouses in the District at the end of the LTP period. For historical expenditure, an adjustment is made for funding costs. For 100 percent growth project, the calculation is based on the estimated number of additional dwellinghouses projected for the LTP period.

4.2. Community Infrastructure Development Contribution:

Where:

\[ c \] = growth component of capital expenditure
\[ s \] = subsidies, if any
\[ r \] = replacement cost of any infrastructure replaced
\[ d \] = depreciated replacement cost of any infrastructure replaced
\[ n \] = total estimated number of rating units in the District as at the end of the LTP period.
\[ r_{t, a} \] = the funding rate applied in respect of each year from the time of the works being carried out.

Contribution per lot equals:

For future expenditure:

\[
\frac{((c - s) - (r - d))}{n}
\]

Plus in respect of historical expenditure, for each year in which capital expenditure including a growth component has been incurred:

\[
\frac{((c - s) - (r - d))}{n} \times \text{a multiplier reflecting funding costs}
\]

Where the multiplier is calculated along the following lines for each year in which historical expenditure occurred:

\[
(1 + r_{t, 1}) \times (1 + r_{t, 2}) \times \ldots \times (1 + r_{t, n})
\]
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1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to seek Council approval of a draft submission to the Health Select Committee on the Health (Fluoridation of Drinking Water) Amendment Bill.

1.2. The Bill was introduced on 17 November 2016 and passed its first reading on 6 December 2016. It was referred to the Health Select Committee who will receive submissions from the public before 2 February 2017. A holding submission has been lodged with the Select Committee before the 2 February due date pending Council’s decision on the full submission attached. The Bill provides powers for District Health Boards (DHB) to make decisions and give directions about fluoridation of local government drinking water supplies.

1.3. The draft Council submission makes two main points:

- National leadership is required in relation to decisions of fluoridation of drinking water supplies; and
- Territorial authorities are legislatively required to consider community views before making decisions whereas District Health Boards are not required to consider community views.

1.4. The draft council submission makes the following additional points:

- The provision of water supplies to communities is a legislative core function of Territorial Authorities;
- The Bill provides for some aspects of the management of drinking water to be administered by DHB (fluoridation), while other aspects of public health of drinking water (bacteria and protozoal compliance) remain with Territorial Authorities;
- It is not clear whether the cost of fluoridation of drinking water will have to be borne by ratepayers;
- Territorial Authorities will remain the decision-maker about whether to fluoridate water if DHB do not elect to use the new powers;
• The Bill does not seem to have taken the cost-effectiveness obligations of the Local Government Act 2002 into account in relation to multiple smaller drinking water schemes;

• Shifting the responsibility from Territorial Authorities to DHB will not rule out a series of locally fought campaigns over fluoride;

1.4 The Canterbury Policy Forum resolved on 2 December 2016 for Christchurch City Council to lead the development of a Canterbury-wide Regional submission on the Bill.

Attachments:

i. Draft submission to the Health Select Committee on the Health (Fluoridation of Drinking Water) Amendment Bill. (TRIM No. 161220131293)

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report no. 161220131266.

(b) Approves the attached submission to the Health Select Committee (TRIM No. 161220131293);

(c) Authorises the points of this submission to be incorporated into the Canterbury-wide Regional submission (being led by Christchurch City Council), and the Local Government New Zealand national submission;

(d) Authorises the Mayor to represent the Council at the hearing before the Health Select Committee;

(e) Approves the distribution of the submission to Community Boards for their information.

3. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

3.1. Fluoridation of drinking water supplies is an increasingly contentious issue for local authorities because of active lobbying and court action against councils by anti-fluoridation groups and controversy at local body elections.

3.2. A number of High Court challenges have been brought against local authorities, notably during 2014 against South Taranaki District Council and Hamilton City Council. At the 2014 Local Government New Zealand (LGNZ) conference, local authorities called for either the Director-General of Health or DHB to take responsibility for decisions on fluoridation.

3.3. The Bill as currently drafted has not adequately taken into account that the provision of community water supplies is a core function of local government (section 11A of the Local Government Act 2002). This leads to a number of possibilities of the Bill giving rise to perverse outcomes including;

   a) dual management responsibility for public health aspects of drinking water between DHB (fluoridation) and Territorial Authorities (bacteria and protozoal compliance);

   b) potentially not meeting the cost-effectiveness provisions of the purpose of local government (section 10 of the Local Government Act 2002)
since the Ministry of Health acknowledge the lower cost effectiveness of fluoridation of multiple smaller water supply schemes; and

c) a disconnect between the legislative consultative obligations of DHB and Territorial Authorities. Section 14(1)(b) of the *Local Government Act 2002* legally binds Territorial Authorities to have regard to the views of their communities before making a decision, however the Bill does not place this obligation on DHB who can make a decision to fluoridate without regard to community views.

3.4. The Bill as currently drafted will not ensure that DHBs will make decisions about the fluoridation of drinking water supplies, because Territorial Authorities will remain the decision-maker about whether to fluoridate drinking water supplies if DHB do not elect to use the new powers.

3.5. The Regulatory Impact Statement accompanying the Bill acknowledges that the policy objectives of the Bill may not be achieved because:

"The boards of DHBs would face the same scrutiny that Territorial Authorities have experienced at election time, and the election of anti-fluoride advocates could lead to a stalemate or a reversal of fluoridation in some areas. Secondly, DHB decision-making would not rule out a series of locally-fought campaigns over fluoridation". (page 19).

4. COMMUNITY VIEWS

4.1. Community views have not specifically been sought on the draft Council submission. The Departmental Disclosure Statement states that public consultation was not carried out during the development of the Regulatory Impact Statement (3.6 on page 8).

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

5.1 The Departmental Disclosure Statement accompanying the Bill notes the Government’s intention to consider the question of funding prior to implementation (3.7 on page 8), however if Central Government consideration does not translate into funding for fluoridation, the costs of fluoridating sixteen separate water supplies in this District will have to be borne by ratepayers. This raises the question of the cost of fluoridation not being met by the decision-maker.

6. CONTEXT

6.1. Policy

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

6.2. Community Outcomes

There is sufficient clean water to meet the needs of communities and ecosystems.

Geoff Meadows, Policy Manager
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1 Introduction

Thank you for the opportunity to submit on the Health (Fluoridation of Drinking Water) Amendment Bill.

The Waimakariri District Context

The Waimakariri District lies to the north of the Waimakariri River in North Canterbury and extends from Pegasus Bay in the east to the Puketeraki Range in the west. It is bounded to the north by the Hurunui District. The major urban areas are Rangiora and Kaiapoi. There are other urban settlements including Woodend/Pegasus and Oxford, as well as a number of village and beach settlements.

The District had a population of 49,989 as at the March 2013 census, and had a Statistics New Zealand estimated population of 57,800 as at 30 June 2016. The District has experienced a rapidly growing population that is predicted to continue to increase in the short to medium term.

The Waimakariri District Council is responsible for public water supply schemes for water quality, continuity of supply, and public health risk. It is important to note that all of the Waimakariri District Council public water supply schemes have Water Safety Plans (WSPs) (previously known as Public Health Risk Management Plans) that have been approved by Community and Public Health.

The District’s water supply schemes are required to achieve compliance with the Drinking Water Standards for New Zealand (DWSNZ), and where these standards are not met, the Council is required to have plans in place to carry out the necessary upgrades.

Each scheme within the District is required to demonstrate compliance with the DWSNZ by providing barriers to protect against two key types of potential contamination.

1. Bacterial Compliance: Each scheme is required to provide protection against contamination from bacteria. This is achieved either by sourcing water from a deep and secure well, or by treating to disinfect the water against bacterial contamination.

2. Protozoal Compliance: Each scheme is required to provide protection against contamination from protozoa (such as cryptosporidium or giardia). This can be achieved by sourcing the water from a deep and secure well, or treating the water by means of filtration, ozone or ultra-violet (UV) disinfection.

There are 16 public water supply schemes in the District. The attached table (Table 1) summarises each scheme’s bacterial and protozoal compliance with the DWSNZ. Where compliance is not achieved on a given scheme, a plan has been put in place to upgrade the scheme to achieve compliance. The proposed methodology to upgrade each scheme has been documented in the respective Water Safety Plan for each scheme. These plans have been submitted to and approved by Community and Public Health. The approved proposed upgrades for each scheme are also documented in the attached table (Table 1).
2 Main Points of submission and summary

The two principal points of Council's submission are that:

1. National leadership is required in relation to decisions on fluoridation of drinking water supplies; and
2. Community water supplies remain the province of Territorial Authorities who are required by the Local Government Act 2002 to consider community views before making decisions. Community Health Boards are not legislatively required to consider community views.

Other points of submission include:

- The provision of water supplies to communities is a legislative core function of Territorial Authorities;
- The Bill provides for some aspects of the management of drinking water to be administered by District Health Boards (fluoridation), while other aspects of public health of drinking water (bacteria and protozoal compliance) remain with Territorial Authorities;
- It is not clear whether the cost of fluoridation of drinking water will have to be borne by ratepayers;
- Territorial Authorities will remain the decision-maker about whether to fluoridate water if District Health Boards do not elect to use the new powers;
- The Bill does not seem to have taken the cost-effectiveness obligations of the Local Government Act 2002 into account in relation to multiple smaller drinking water schemes;
- Shifting the responsibility from Territorial Authorities to District Health Boards will not rule out a series of locally fought campaigns over fluoride;

A core function of local government in performing its role, as set out in section 11A of the Local Government Act 2002 is the provision of network infrastructure which includes the provision of water supplies to communities (sections 5 and 197 (2)). The performance of local government in providing community drinking water supplies is measured quarterly, and reported andaudited annually, through the Annual Report. Section 261B of the Local Government Act 2002 enabled the Secretary for Local Government (the Chief Executive of the Department of Internal Affairs) to make rules for non-financial performance measures, and mandatory rules relating to community drinking water supplies came into force for all Territorial Authorities in New Zealand on 30 July 2014. These mandatory rules measure some aspects of public health in relation to drinking water, specifically compliance with bacteria and protozoal parameters.

There is a clear disconnect between the Health (Fluoridation of Drinking Water) Amendment Bill, which provides for some aspects of the management of drinking water to be administered by District Health Boards (DHB), and the obligations and responsibilities placed on local government as set out in its core functions, which provide for other aspects of community drinking water to be managed at Territorial Authority level.

Clearly there is a need for national leadership in relation to fluoridation of drinking water. Shifting the responsibility from Territorial Authorities to DHBs for a decision on fluoridation of community drinking water supplies is not helpful in achieving nation-wide consistency. The Bill as drafted will result in some health aspects of
drinking water being managed by a DHB (fluoridation) and some health aspects of drinking water being managed by Territorial Authorities (bacteria and protozoal compliance).

Although the costs of fluoridation of drinking water are not great, these costs still have to be borne by ratepayers, and in the case of this District, will have to be multiplied by 16 (although the Departmental Disclosure Statement acknowledges that the Government's intention is to consider the question of funding prior to implementation). The Bill creates situations where DHBs may not have to bear the costs of their direction, and where Territorial Authorities will be forced in those circumstances to pass on the costs of fluoridation of drinking water to ratepayers without having any control of the decision.

Furthermore, Territorial Authorities will remain the decision-makers on the issue of fluoridation of drinking water if the relevant DHB does not elect to use the Bill's new powers. The Departmental Disclosure statement accompanying the Bill makes the general policy statement that the Bill “replaces Territorial Authorities' decision-making responsibilities about fluoridation of drinking water”, however the proposed Bill does not make a full transfer of decision-making responsibility from Territorial Authorities. Instead it empowers DHBs to make directions to Territorial Authorities to introduce or cease fluoridation of drinking water. DHBs however are neither required to consider fluoridation nor consult communities on their views. This will lead to further national inconsistency and continue the current practice throughout New Zealand where some water supplies are fluoridated and some are not.

The Sapere Research Group report (2015), commissioned by the Ministry of Health notes the lower cost-effectiveness of fluoridating water at smaller water treatment plants. For this District with 16 community water supplies, it is important to note that cost-effectiveness is now a requirement of the purpose of local government (section 10) and subject to regular cost-effectiveness reviews (section 17A). The regulatory impact analysis in the Departmental Disclosure Statement does not seem to have taken these requirements into account.

The Regulatory Impact Statement (RIS) accompanying the Bill has the stated policy objective of relieving the burden on Territorial Authorities' having to decide about fluoridation. However the RIS goes on to say (on page19) that DHBs will face exactly the same opposition to their fluoridation proposals as local authorities. The RIS states:

“
The boards of DHBs would face the same scrutiny that Territorial Authorities have experienced at election time, and the election of anti-fluoride advocates could lead to a stalemate or a reversal of fluoridation in some areas. Secondly, DHB decision-making would not rule out a series of locally-fought campaigns over fluoridation”.

This begs the question about the efficacy of the Bill, and brings into question whether the stated policy objectives can be achieved by the Bill as currently drafted.

3 Specific comments on the Bill

Section 5 of the Bill amends section 69A (2) of the Act and inserts part 3(a) and (b) enabling DHBs to give direction to a local government drinking water supplier. However a DHB is not required to direct a local government drinking water supplier, and if the DHB remains silent on the issue, the local government drinking water supplier will still be the decision-maker.
Section 8 of the Bill inserting a new section 69ZJA requires a DHB to consider scientific evidence of adding fluoride to drinking water, but does not have any requirement to consider community views. This provision of the Bill is inconsistent with the provisions of section 14 of the Local Government Act 2002 where Territorial Authorities are legally bound to have regard to the views of their communities (section 14(1)(b)), and take into account the diversity of the community and the community’s interests (section 14(1)(c)(i)). Furthermore, section 82 of the Local Government Act 2002 sets out the principles of consultation which bind Territorial Authorities to considering community views before making decisions that impact on their communities (section 82(1)). DHBs are not bound by these principles of consultation, yet community water supplies continue to be the province of Territorial Authorities. The Bill as drafted may give fertile ground for legal challenge unless the principles of consultation in section 82 of the Local Government Act 2002 are cross-referenced in the Health (Fluoridation of Drinking Water) Bill.

In summary this Council supports the policy intention of the Bill to relieve local government of having to make decisions about public health matters, however the Bill as currently drafted does not seem to achieve this policy objective. Furthermore, the strong legislative requirements on Territorial Authorities to consult with their communities and glean the views of the public have not been given adequate consideration in this Bill as currently drafted.

The Council wishes to be heard in support of this submission.
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT

FILE NO: GOV-26 / 170130008140

REPORT TO: Council

DATE OF MEETING: 7 February 2017

FROM: Jim Palmer, Chief Executive

SUBJECT: Triennial agreement – Canterbury authorities

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

1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to ratify a triennial agreement relating to all local authorities in the Canterbury region. The agreement contains protocols for communication and coordination amongst the authorities during the period until the next triennial general election of members. This agreement will replace the existing Canterbury Local Authorities Triennial Agreement dated March 2014. The co-ordination and communication in relation to the agreement is primarily through the Canterbury Mayoral Forum.

1.2. The Charter of Purpose for the Canterbury Mayoral Forum is attached to the triennial agreement.

Attachments:

i. Canterbury Local Authorities Triennial Agreement 2017-2019 (Trim No.140115003294).

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No.170130008140.
(b) Ratifies the Canterbury Local Authorities Triennial Agreement for the 2017-2019 term.

3. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

3.1. Not later than 1 March after each triennial general election of members, all local authorities within each region must enter into a triennial agreement under Section 15 of the Local Government Act 2002.

3.2. The purpose of this agreement is to ensure that appropriate levels of communication, coordination and collaboration are maintained between local authorities within the region. The agreement must include:

- protocols for communication and co-ordination between the councils
- the process by which councils will comply with section 16 of the Act, which applies to significant new activities proposed by regional councils
- processes and protocols through which all councils can participate in identifying, delivering and funding facilities and services of significance to more than one district.
3.3. Agreements may also include commitments to establish joint governance arrangements to give better effect to the matters set out above.

3.4. A triennial agreement may be varied by agreement between all the local authorities within the region, and remains in force until local authorities ratify a new agreement.

**Proposed triennial agreement 2017–19**

3.5. The attached Triennial Agreement 2017–19 was prepared at the direction of the outgoing Mayoral Forum by the Chief Executives Forum, and was agreed by the Mayoral Forum at its first meeting on 27 January 2017.

3.6. While a non-statutory body, the Mayoral Forum is the primary mechanism to give effect to a statutory requirement (the Triennial Agreement). The Mayoral Forum’s Charter of Purpose (terms of reference) is part of the Triennial Agreement.

3.7. The Mayoral Forum is supported by the Chief Executives Forum, which is also mandated by the Triennial Agreement (Section 5). The Canterbury Policy Forum and other regional forums and working groups support the Chief Executives Forum to provide advice to the Mayoral Forum and implement its decisions.

3.8. Only minor changes are proposed to the 2013–16 Triennial Agreement. The most significant of these are explicit reference in Section 3 (collaborative commitment) to:

- collective ‘voice’ – a shared vision and joint advocacy for Canterbury and its communities
- continuing to develop and implement the Canterbury Regional Economic Development Strategy
- an explicit focus on civil defence and natural hazard risk management.

**Next steps**

3.9. If Council agrees, the Mayor will sign the 2017–19 Triennial Agreement, on behalf of the Council.

3.10. When all councils have ratified the Agreement, it will be published on the regional forums website at [http://canterburymayors.org.nz](http://canterburymayors.org.nz).

4. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

4.1. The functions of the Canterbury Mayoral Forum will have due regard to tangata whenua and the cultural diversity of the Canterbury community.

5. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

5.1. There is a requirement under the Local Government Act to have an agreement in force by 1 March 2017.

5.2. The parties agree to work collaboratively and in good faith for the good governance and success of their districts, cities and region.

6. **CONTEXT**

6.1. **Policy**

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

6.2. **Legislation**

Section 15 Local Government Act 2002:

(1) Not later than 1 March after each triennial general election of members, all local authorities within each region must enter into an agreement containing protocols for communication and co-ordination among them during the period until the next triennial general election of members.
(2) Each agreement must include a statement of the process for consultation on proposals for new regional council activities.

(3) After the date specified in subsection (1), but before the next triennial general election of members, all local authorities within each region may meet and agree to amendments to the protocols.

(4) An agreement remains in force until replaced by another agreement.

6.3. **Community Outcomes**

There are wide ranging opportunities for people to contribute to the decision-making by public organisations that affects our district.

Jim Palmer
Chief Executive
1. Purpose

Not later than 1 March following triennial local government elections, local authorities within a regional council area are required to enter into a Triennial Agreement (S.15 of the Local Government Act 2002). The purpose of the Triennial Agreement is to ensure appropriate levels of communication, co-ordination and collaboration between local authorities within the region.

The Triennial Agreement is ratified by all member councils.

2. Agreement

The parties:
Ashburton District Council
Canterbury Regional Council (Environment Canterbury)
Christchurch City Council
Hurunui District Council
Kaikōura District Council
Mackenzie District Council
Selwyn District Council
Timaru District Council
Waimakariri District Council
Waimate District Council
Waitaki District Council

agree to work collaboratively and in good faith for the good governance and success of their districts, cities and the region.

As signatories to this Agreement, each local authority will ensure that pursuant to Section 15, Local Government Act, 2002:

early notification to affected local authorities party to this Agreement through the distribution of draft documentation of major policy initiatives or proposals that may have implications beyond the current geographic boundaries (or for constituent authorities) of the decision-making authority. This includes the requirement of Section 15 (2) of the Local Government Act for consultation on proposals for new regional council activities where the following process will be followed.

any new significant activity, as defined in Section 16 (1) of the Act, proposed by the Canterbury Regional Council, will be advised to the appropriate meeting of the Canterbury Mayoral Forum, in addition to any Section 16 (1) requirement

any new activity proposed by the Canterbury Regional Council not considered significant will be advised to the appropriate territorial authorities in the Canterbury Region

the application of a “no surprises” policy where early notice will be given of potential disagreements between, or actions likely to have significant impact on, other local authorities.
3. Collaboration

The local authorities in Canterbury, as signatories to this Agreement, commit to working collaboratively to drive efficiencies and better provide for the needs of their communities through the provision of good quality local infrastructure, local public services and performance of regulatory functions. This collaboration may either be Canterbury wide or on a sub-regional basis.

Collaborative commitment for the 2016-2019 term will include but is not restricted to:
- an effective Canterbury Mayoral Forum (Charter of Purpose attached)
- developing and voicing a shared vision for Canterbury
- continuing to develop and implement the Canterbury Regional Economic Development Strategy, and advocating on economic and social development opportunities for Canterbury
- continuing to implement the Canterbury Water Management Strategy (CWMS)
- integrated transport planning for the region
- investigating options for the delivery of integrated transport and 3 Water services in Canterbury
- supporting regional and sub-regional collaborative opportunities, such as refreshing and implementing the Urban Development Strategy (UDS) for greater Christchurch
- developing a three-year work programme for the Canterbury Chief Executives Forum, including a framework for collaboration in the governance and management of effective and efficient delivery of services, infrastructure and regulatory functions across the region
- working through the Canterbury Policy Forum to address common strategic policy issues, generating where possible common positions and submissions, and facilitating the co-ordinated sharing and reporting of information
- implementing a collaborative planning and decision making process including integrated RMA planning
- ensuring effective resilience and response to civil defence and emergency management, and natural hazard risk management.

4. Canterbury Mayoral Forum

Co-ordination, communication and collaboration in relation to this Agreement will be primarily through, but not limited to, the Canterbury Mayoral Forum (the Forum). The Forum will meet at least three-monthly and operate in accordance with its agreed Charter of Purpose (attached).

The Forum will be supported by:
- the Chief Executives Forum
- the Canterbury Policy Forum
- other regional and sub-regional forums and working groups as required.

5. Chief Executives Forum

There will be a Chief Executives Forum reporting to the Canterbury Mayoral Forum, which will develop a three-year work programme that:
- implements and manages collaborative projects and agreed actions of the Canterbury Mayoral Forum
- identifies and escalates strategic issues and opportunities for collaboration on strategy, policy and planning from the Canterbury Policy Forum to the Canterbury Mayoral Forum
- includes a framework for collaboration in the governance and management of effective and efficient delivery of services, infrastructure and regulatory functions across the region.
6. **Review and Agreement to Review**

The parties to the Triennial Agreement will meet to consider and agree on progress on and to amendments, if any, to the agreement annually before the end of each calendar year. In addition, following a request for amendment from any one or more authorities party to this agreement in writing to the Chair of the Forum, received at least two weeks prior to the meeting date, the Forum will meet to consider the amendment at the next available Forum meeting.

This Agreement will be placed on the Forum agenda at the final Forum prior to a triennial election to review, with the purpose of recommending changes (if any) to the incoming councils.

7. **Local Government Structure**

Notwithstanding the spirit of co-operation and collaboration embodied within this Agreement, the local authorities, individually or collectively, reserve the right to promote, consult, and/or research change to the structure of local government within the Region.

This right is consistent with the intent of effective and efficient governance sought in the Local Government Act 2002, having particular relevance to the ideals of community interest and community representation.

Local authorities will participate in the review of the regional council’s representation arrangements, as required under statute, and the Mayoral Forum will also participate in the review providing the Forum’s views.

8. **Other Agreements**

This Agreement does not prevent local authorities entering into other agreements among themselves or outside the region to facilitate their responsibilities. Any other such agreement should not be contrary to the purpose and spirit of this Agreement.

9. **Regional Policy Statement Review**

This Triennial Agreement will apply to any change, variation or review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement.
10. Authority

This agreement is signed on this ________ day of ______________________ 2017 by the following on behalf of their respective authorities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNCIL</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashburton District Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury Regional Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch City Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurunui District Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaikōura District Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mackenzie District Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selwyn District Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timaru District Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waimakariri District Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waimate District Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitaki District Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Name

The name of the group shall be the Canterbury Mayoral Forum.

2. Objectives

(a) To provide a forum to enable Canterbury councils to work more collaboratively with each other and with central government and other key sector leaders in Canterbury to identify opportunities and solve problems together.

(b) To identify and prioritise issues of mutual concern and foster co-operation, co-ordination and collaboration to address these issues (including where appropriate joint work plans).

(c) To formulate policies and strategies on matters where all member councils may act collaboratively in determining plans for the co-ordination of regional growth.

(d) To ensure increased effectiveness of local government in meeting the needs of Canterbury communities.

(e) To act as an advocate to central government or their agencies or other bodies on issues of concern to members.

(f) To develop and implement programmes, which are responsive to the needs and expectations of the community.

3. Principles

In pursuit of these objectives the Canterbury Mayoral Forum will observe the following principles.

(a) Establish and maintain close liaison with other local government networks to ensure as far as possible the pursuit of common objectives and the minimisation of duplication.

(b) Establish and maintain close liaison with Ministers of the Crown and local Members of Parliament.

(c) Establish and maintain close liaison with a wide number of diverse stakeholders and key sector organisations within the region.

(d) Exercise its functions with due regard to the tangata whenua and cultural diversity of the Canterbury community.

(e) Keep the local community informed about its activities by proactively releasing information about key projects in a timely manner, as agreed by the member councils.

(f) Encourage member councils to promote and apply cross-boundary structures and systems.

(g) Establish a provision for reporting back to its respective Councils.
4. **Powers**

(a) The Canterbury Mayoral Forum shall have the power to:

(i) levy for any or all of its objects in such amount or amounts as may be mutually determined and acceptable to individual local authorities

(ii) determine and make payments from its funds for any or all of the purposes of its objects

(iii) receive any grant or subsidy and apply monies for the purposes of such grant or subsidy

(iv) fund appropriate aspects of the Forum’s activities regionally.

(b) The Canterbury Mayoral Forum does not have the power to legally bind any council to any act or decision unless that act or decision has been agreed to by decision of that council.

5. **Membership**

(a) Membership of the Canterbury Mayoral Forum shall be open to the following councils:

- Ashburton District Council
- Canterbury Regional Council (Environment Canterbury)
- Christchurch City Council
- Hurunui District Council
- Kaikōura District Council
- Mackenzie District Council
- Selwyn District Council
- Timaru District Council
- Waimakariri District Council
- Waimate District Council
- Waitaki District Council

(b) Each member council shall be represented by its Mayor (or Chairperson in the case of Environment Canterbury) and supported by its Chief Executive. On occasions where the Mayor or Chair cannot attend, a council may be represented by its Deputy Mayor or Chair.

(c) The Canterbury Mayoral Forum will have the power to co-opt other members on a permanent and/or issues basis.

6. **Chairperson**

(a) The Canterbury Mayoral Forum shall select a Chairperson at the first meeting immediately following the Triennial Elections. This appointment may be reviewed after a period of 18 months.

(b) The Chairperson selected will preside at all meetings of the Canterbury Mayoral Forum.

(c) The Canterbury Mayoral Forum shall select a Deputy Chairperson at the first meeting immediately following the Triennial Elections.

(d) The Canterbury Mayoral Forum may appoint spokespersons from its membership for issues being considered, in which case each member council agrees to refer all requests for information and documents to the duly appointed spokespersons.
7. **Meetings**

(a) Meetings will be held as required with an annual schedule, covering a calendar year, to be determined by the members. It is anticipated that meetings would be held three-monthly at venues to be determined.

(b) Special meetings may be called at the request of four Mayors/Chairpersons.

(c) A working group of Chief Executives will facilitate preparation of material for consideration by the Canterbury Mayoral Forum.

(d) Agendas for meetings will be issued and minutes will be taken and circulated.

(e) A summary of each meeting will be drafted, agreed by the Chair, and circulated by the secretariat to the Mayors / Chair with the intention that the Mayor / Chair will distribute within each Council as a high level record of the meeting.

(f) Approved minutes and approved final reports and papers will be made available via a Mayoral Forum website as agreed by the Canterbury Mayoral Forum.

8. **Decision making**

(a) The practice of the Forum will be to determine issues before it by consensus.

(b) If the consensus is to determine issues by voting, the determination shall be determined by a majority of votes of the authorities represented at the meeting through the Mayor (or Chair) or their nominated representative.

9. **Secretariat**

The Canterbury Mayoral Forum will appoint Environment Canterbury to carry out the secretariat function on such terms and conditions as it shall decide for the discharge of duties, including the taking of minutes and the keeping of any books and accounts and attending to any other business of the forum.
1. **SUMMARY**

1.1. This report is for the Council to consider the appointment of an independent member to the Audit and Risk Committee (A&R).

1.2. During the formation of the A&R for the triennium it was raised whether Council should include an independent member on the A&R and requested a staff report to consider the merits of an independent member being included on the audit committee.

1.3. The A&R receives its delegations from the Council. The primary purpose of an A&R is to provide oversight of the financial reporting process, risk, health and safety, audit process, the system of internal controls, oversight of council controlled organisations and other council organisations and compliance with laws and regulations pertaining to the Council. The full delegations to the A&R from Council is provided in attachment one.

1.4. The Council empowers the Chief Executive, to deliver operational efficiencies and effectiveness, developing the strategies for dealing with Council business and to report back on the progress and future direction for consideration.

1.5. The Local Government Act 2002, requires that a Council’s annual planning and reporting processes undergo independent interim and annual report audits that will also measure the effectiveness of controls and the operating environment that is in place. The results of these audits are in the form of audit opinions and the interim and annual management reports provided is to the Council by Audit New Zealand (on behalf of the Office of the Auditor General).

1.6. Given the diversity and nature of Council business, the Council and staff will seek external assistance where the expertise does not exist in-house or the subject matter is significant enough to obtain independent advice/assurance. The advice sought will come from a number of experts depending on nature of the matter, whether it be engineering, financial or legal advice.

1.7. The Council and A&R in deciding whether to appoint an independent member would need to decide whether sufficient experience and expertise exist within the Governance membership to fulfil its general governance purpose. Regardless of an independent member being included onto the A&R, it is likely the external expertise sought on various matters would still be required.

**Attachments:**

i. Delegations to the Audit and Risk Committee
2. **RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) Receives report N° 161205124862

(b) Agrees that no change to the existing Audit and Risk Committee structure is required for the balance of the triennium being to October 2019; or

(c) Agrees to an independent external member with financial and governance expertise being appointed to the Audit and Risk Committee as soon as conveniently possible in the current triennium for a term of three years from the date of appointment; and

(d) Notes the independent external member remuneration would cost approximately $20,000; and

(e) Approves the amendment to the Council’s Governance Structure and the Delegations document in relation to the Audit and Risk Committee accordingly; and

(f) Approves the external independent member be appointed with full voting rights at Audit and Risk Committee meetings; and

(g) Approves the external independent member be appointed as the Chair at Audit and Risk Committee meetings; and

(h) Approves that a selection panel comprising Mayor Ayers, Portfolio Holder of Audit and Risk (Deputy Mayor Felstead), the Chief Executive and Manager Finance and Business Support, be delegated the authority to manage the appointment of the external member for Council approval; and/or

(i) Approves additional Governance training for the Audit and Risk Committee.

3. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

3.1. The Waimakariri District Council has not made provision for an independent member within the Council’s Governance Structure since it was established in 1989. In contrast to an independent member being on the committee the Council will often seek professional expertise or peer review on matters where the expertise is not available in-house or where it requires additional assurance.

3.2. The appointment of an independent member primarily rests with the Council in deciding whether the expertise exists within the Governance framework to fulfil its duties and functions.

3.3. Members of the Audit & Risk Committee are: Deputy Mayor Kevin Felstead, Councillors Neville Atkinson, Al Blackie, Sandra Stewart, Paul Williams and Mayor David Ayers (ex officio). Other Council members attend with speaking rights.

3.4. The Council Treasury Policy requires an independent member to be appointed to provide specialist treasury advice. The current contractual arrangement is held with Bancorp Treasury Services.

3.5. Having an independent member on A&R may be seen to be beneficial, as it may introduce additional finance expertise that will help test and challenge new ideas as well as business-as-usual operations to ensure that the entity is improving, as well as meeting expectations.

3.6. Independent members are a way of assisting and strengthening governance activities, and are more prevalent in Local Government Audit Committee’s since recent events have been reported in the media. Two recent examples were at the Dunedin and Kaipara Councils. At Dunedin City major fraud had occurred, estimated at $1.58 million involving its vehicle fleet. Accountancy firm Deloitte, found a range of fraudulent activities, spanning nearly 11 years, with a single employee appearing to be “at the centre” of the fraud. At the Kaipara District Council, there were failures of internal controls and project expenditure “blowouts”. In both cases consequential reviews have
resulted in an independent member being appointed to the Audit and Risk Committee. However in the case of the Dunedin City Council it is doubtful whether an independent member would have stopped the fraud.

3.7. As a consequence of the Dunedin City Council fraud discovery, Canterbury Councils at a staff management level in conjunction with Deloitte have established a number of reviews on a shared service basis; the first being a review on sensitive expenditure, member interests and vehicle policies. The review found that the Waimakariri District Council has appropriate policy and internal controls in place to mitigate fraudulent activities. A member’s interest register is to be introduced. The review and findings were reported to the A&R in July 2016. It has been agreed by Canterbury Finance Managers as part of the shared services work, to continue to work with Deloitte and to carry out a number of financial reviews, share best practice and knowledge and build the skill base. The findings will be reported to the A&R. The next review will cover Procurement and Contract Management. These reviews provide for the “best” practice policies and working procedures to be adopted by membership Councils.

3.8. In 2008 the Office of the Auditor General (OAG) published a report called Audit Committees in the Public Sector. This guidance has been since updated, however most of the principles can be related to Local Authorities. The suggested good practice for the operation of an audit committee in that report includes:

a) the governing body or departmental chief executive should appoint an audit committee in which most of the members are independent of the management team.

b) the audit committee should have between three and five members.

c) the chairperson of the audit committee should be someone other than the chairperson of the governing body or the chief executive.

d) people appointed as audit committee members should have skills and experience adequate for the role of the committee. Specifically, the OAG recommends the following expertise is required on the audit committee:

i. financial expertise, specifically:
   • financial reporting
   • a good understanding of internal control and assurance frameworks, and
   • a good understanding of the roles of internal and external audit

ii. knowledge of governance, assurance, and risk management best practice

iii. a good knowledge of the sector or industry in which the public entity operates, and

iv. other attributes as deemed appropriate (for example, legal or information technology experience).

3.9. The 2008 guidance has been superseded with a more general guidance termed “Are you making the most of audit committees” Rather than being prescriptive it now provides principles that help an audit committee add value. The guidance still promotes having financial expertise and independency on the A&R providing added value.

3.10. Although Council’s A&R already meet a number of the best practice guidelines technically it could be argued that it does not have an independent member on the Governance group.

Council Standing Orders and Voting rights of independent members

3.11. If the Council approves an independent member onto the A&R it would need to determine on what basis the independent member is appointed. It would need to determine the following rights on appointment:
3.11.1. Chair of the A&R

It should be decided whether the Council permits the independent member to be the Chair of the A&R. An independent member in a majority of NZ LG cases appears to assume the Chair;

3.11.2. Speaking and Voting rights

The Council would need to consider whether the independent member has speaking rights and voting rights. Anecdotally other councils provide independent members with both speaking and voting rights.

3.11.3. The term of an independent member

The length of an independent members’ term on the A&R should also be set out in the Governance Structure and Delegations Document. It is logical for this to be three years so that councillors appointed to the A&R could serve their three year terms during a single election cycle. To assist with continuity, independent external members should be appointed midway through the triennium for a term of three years from the date of appointment.

3.12. The Council’s Standing Orders will need to be amended to reflect an additional independent member onto the A&R. The two key paragraphs currently provide:

3.12.1. Council’s Standing Orders (Standing Orders) clause 2.5 further provides that ‘the acts of a local authority must be done, and questions …must be decided at a meeting by vote and the majority of members that are present and voting.’

3.12.2. Standing Orders section 1.3 defines a ‘member’ as ‘any person elected or appointed to the local authority or to any committee or subcommittee of the local authority…’

3.13. Therefore the following clause would be added to amend the Governance Structure & Delegations:

“The membership to the Audit and Risk Committee shall also include a suitably qualified independent external member with speaking and voting rights, for a term of three years from the date of appointment”.

3.14. If the Council approves the appointment of an independent member, the process will involve seeking an expression of interest (EOI). There are a number of individuals and organisations that provide these services. An EOI has been provided in attachment two.

Training

3.15. Alternatively or in conjunction with the options identified below, the Council may wish to staff to seek additional training for its A&R members, specifically targeted to the A&R Governance role. There are a number of service providers that are also able to assist in Governance training that could be specifically targeted towards the A&R Governance role.

Options

3.16. The Council can take to following options:

- Retain the current A&R structure and delegations;
- Appoint an Independent Member onto the A&R, as Chair or not, with or without voting rights;
- Defer the decision to a later date and/or request further information to be provided to the Council before making a decision;
- Separately or in conjunction with either of the options request staff to provide additional Governance training to A&R members, specifically targeted to the A&R Governance role.
3.17. The Management team has reviewed this report and support the recommendations.

4. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**
   4.1. There is no need to consult on the issues contained in this report.
   4.2. There are no Tāngata Whenua issues.

5. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**
   5.1. The direct cost associated with an appointment of an independent committee member is in the vicinity of $10,000 - $15,000 plus disbursement costs, such as travel.
   5.2. The Position may also include attendance at Annual Planning and review meetings.
   5.3. The Council currently receives the external audit reports and review action to be taken by management on significant issues and audit recommendations raised within the management letter. This process is still required by legislation and would continue to add value.

6. **CONTEXT**
   6.1. This matter is not a matter of significance in terms of the Council’s Significance Policy.
   6.2. There are no policy implications. However, there would be an amendment to Council’s Governance Structure in relation to the A&R.
   6.3. Delegations - Council has the authority to consider this matter.

7. **REFERENCES**

Jeff Millward
Manager Finance & Business Support
Jurisdiction of the Audit and Risk Committee

Jurisdiction

The Audit and Risk Committee shall enjoy all the powers granted to a standing committee under this Manual. It shall be responsible for the following activities:

1. Financial management and reporting
2. Liability management
3. Investment management
4. Revenue and Financing policy
5. Rating policy
6. Grants policy
7. Risk management
8. Statutory compliance and legal matters (where not covered by any other committees’ delegations)
9. Economic development and district promotions policy and projects
10. Camping Grounds
11. Housing for the elderly and Council housing
12. Plant and Vehicles
13. Health and Safety

Specific Jurisdiction

1. Financial Management and Reporting
   (a) Monitor implementation of the Annual Plan quarterly (both financial and non-financial).
   (b) Review annual financial statements prior to the Council adoption and ensure disclosures are in accordance with statutory requirements and consistent with best practice.
   (c) Review and recommend changes to accounting policies as required.
   (d) Liaise with and manage the Council’s relationship and arrangements with the Council’s external auditors.
   (e) Receive and consider management reports and any other information received from the Council’s external auditors.

2. Oversight of Council Controlled Organisation and other council organisations
   (a) Review draft Statements of Intent for Council controlled organisations and advise Council controlled organisations of any comments. When finalised, Statements of Intent are to be referred to Council for information.
   (b) Monitor performance of Council controlled organisations on a six monthly basis.
   (c) Receive the draft Annual Plan and the Annual Report for other council organisations where the Audit and Risk Committee considers this appropriate.
   (d) Monitor performance of other council organisations where the Audit and Risk Committee considers this appropriate.
   (e) Recommend to Council appointments to the following council organisations:
       Te Kohaka O Tuhaitara Trust
       Waimakariri Irrigation Ltd

3. Investment and Liability Management
   (a) Review Investment and Liability Management Policies and recommend changes to the Council.
   (b) Monitor performance against investment and liability management policies quarterly.
   (c) Monitor property and forestry investments
   (d) Recommend to the Council investment acquisition and disposal options where this has not been delegated to another standing committee

4. Revenue and Financing Policy and Rating
(a) Review Revenue and Financing Policies as required and recommend changes to Council.

(b) Review Rating Policies (including remissions and postponements) annually, and recommend changes to the Council where required.

(c) Decide any appeal on an application that has been declined for remission of rates on Maori Freehold Land.

(d) Decide any applications for remissions of rates or rates penalties in excess of $5,000 in any one account.

(e) Make a final decision on any appeal on an application for rates postponement on the grounds of financial hardship that has been declined.

(f) Hear and consider appeals on applications for rates remissions that have been declined where such applications have been referred to the Committee by the Manager Finance and Business Support.

5. Risk Management and Insurance

(a) Review corporate risk assessment and internal risk management practices.

(b) Review insurance arrangements annually.

(c) Monitor insurance claims.

6. Statutory Compliance and Legal Matters (where not covered by other committees’ delegations)

(a) Review proposed changes to legislation or regulations or other legal obligations relating to any matters within the Audit and Risk Committee’s jurisdiction.

(b) Monitor any areas of statutory non-compliance where not covered by other committees’ delegations and advise Council of steps being taken to ensure future compliance.

(c) Monitor and review Health and Safety related matters.

7. Other

(a) Review grants policy as required and recommend changes to the Council, as required

(b) Write off to bad debts sundry debtor accounts of $10,000 or more.

(c) Make recommendations to the Council in respect of emerging financial issues of which the Council needs to be informed.

8. Reviews of Significant Activities

Review significant Council activities and expenditure, including Reviews under Section 17A of the Local Government Act 2002, and recommend to the Council any proposed changes to services, levels of service and the method of funding, or significant changes in the method of service delivery. The review programme will be agreed in advance with the Council.

Lead preparation and monitoring of the programme of Service Reviews giving effect to the requirements of S.17A and in particular S.17A(3)(b) in exercising discretion on behalf of the Council in relation to whether a review of a particular activity is justified and if so the priority and timing of that review.

9. Special Reviews

a) Subject to the agreement of a majority of all members of the Committee, the Committee shall have the authority to nominate and undertake investigations that examine policies, administration and expenditure of the Council’s programmes.
b) The Committee is authorised to appoint ad-hoc subcommittees from amongst its members for such specific investigations and prepare reports where it is considered appropriate to do so. Subcommittees shall consult with any relevant standing committees, where appropriate. Any reports prepared by an ad-hoc subcommittee shall be considered and approved by a publicly notified meeting of the Audit and Risk Committee before being submitted to the full Council for its consideration.

10. **Economic Development and District Promotions**

   (a) Development and review of the implementation of Council's policies guiding its economic development activities and in particular Policy S-CP1405 Council's Role in Economic Development.

   (b) Maintaining a broad monitoring oversight on behalf of the Council of the District's economic development, including liaison with key stakeholders such as business and promotional associations.

   (c) In addition to the Committee’s monitoring responsibilities in relation to Enterprise North Canterbury as a CCO under Section 2 above, liaison with ENC and consideration and recommendation to the Council of ENC’s Annual District Promotions Business Plan.

   (d) Oversight of and recommendation to the Council in relation to economic development projects
1. **SUMMARY**

The purpose of this report is to advise the Audit & Risk Committee of the financial result for the quarter ended 30 September 2016.

The Council’s net operating surplus for the three month period is $3,262,000 (Budget - surplus of $1,419,000).

The surplus contains items that are received through operating revenues that fund capital works. These are development contribution revenue of $2,900,000 and subsidies received for capital works of $1,159,000.

Capital expenditure, including work in progress carried forward (excluding loan repayments) for the period ended 30 September 2016 totalled $21.7 million (Full year budget $80.0 million), including earthquake recovery work.

The Capital Projects report (File No: 161114116589) provides further detail on the capital expenditure for the year.

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Audit & Risk Committee:

(a) Receives report no. 161114116574

Recommends to Council

(b) Approves the special dividend received from Transwaste Canterbury to be applied to the Earthquake Loan Rate account, to be used to offset the Earthquake Loan.

3. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

3.1. **Operating Surplus**

The operating surplus for the period ended 30 September 2016 for the Council is $3,262,000 against a budget of $1,419,000.
3.2. Operating Revenue

Revenue received for the period ended 30 September was $24.5 million compared with budget $23.1 million.

Fees and charges revenue was $753,000 over budget which includes $253,000 rates penalties over budget and an interim cash settlement of $288,000 for repair work on the Ocean Outfall.

Dividends Gross dividends are $859,000 over budget. This includes a special dividend from Transwaste Canterbury of $542,000. The options are to apply this amount to:
   I. the General rate account to offset general rates, as with the current dividend;
   II. the Earthquake loan account to offset the Earthquake loans. This appears to be the most appropriate use of the fund, given the dividend was primarily derived from the additional waste streams going through the landfill. The earthquake loan is currently $31.5m;
   III. other activity in full or in part, or a mixture of funding to the above.

3.3 Operating Expenditure

Operating Expenditure for the period was $0.4 million under budget (actual $21.2 million vs. budget $21.6 million). The largest variances from budget were as follows

- Roading $202,000 under budget – Interest expense under budget due to delays in the capital program from 2015-16.
- Sewer $214,000 under budget – Maintenance costs under budget including desludging work in Kaiapoi which has not started yet.

3.4 Capital Expenditure

Total Capital Expenditure for the period totalled $21.7 million, compared with the revised budget of $26.2 million.

This included $2.9m (Budget $3.9m) of capital work for Earthquake recovery.

Further details of capital works carried out to date are available in the Capital Projects Progress Report to 30 September 2016.

3.5 Balance Sheet

The Council’s position remains sound. The Council is within all Policy limits.

Debt

The Council’s external debt is $90.0m as at 30 September 2016 (September 2015: $96.0). The Annual forecast Council external debt to be $125m by 30 June 2017.

External debt is 6.0% of the Council’s total assets. The Council’s Liability management policy requires debt as a percentage of total assets to be less than 15%.

Interest costs were $1,067,000 which is 4.9% (budget 8.3%) of operating revenue (Council Policy requires it must not exceed 12%).

Interest costs were 8.1% of Rates revenue (per Annual Plan 12.6%). Interest as a percentage of Rates income must not exceed 25%.
3.6 **Hedging profile**
Based on current projections, the Council will maintain its hedging arrangements in accordance with policy. Staff are continually reviewing both the cash flow projections and hedging levels to ensure they are maintained at an appropriate level.

As at 30 September 2016, Council is currently 76% hedged. Under the Treasury Policy, Treasury management advice is sought from Bancorp Treasury Management Services.

The loans and hedging profile is provided on pages 12 & 13 of the financial information.

3.7 The financial results have been discussed with the relevant managers.

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

3.9 The Council’s credit rating is generally reviewed in March each year.

4. **CONTEXT**

4.1. These issues are not matters of significance in terms of the Council’s Significance Policy.

4.2. This report has been prepared and provided with reference to the financial provisions relating to the Local Government Act 2002 and Financial Reporting Standards.

4.3. **Community Outcomes**

The quarterly report contributes to the outcome:

> “There are wide ranging opportunities for people to contribute to the decision-making by public organisations that affects our District

- Public organisations make information about their plans and activities readily available.

- Public organisations make every effort to accommodate the views of people who contribute to consultations.”

4.4. Delegation S-DM 1022 provides that the Audit & Risk Committee has jurisdiction to “Monitor implementation of the Annual Plan quarterly”.

Paul Christensen  
Finance Manager
1. **SUMMARY**

1.1. The purpose of this report is to seek approval from the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board to establish the Regeneration Steering Group. This Steering Group would guide the implementation of a Recovery Plan for the Kaiapoi, The Pines Beach and Kairaki regeneration areas. The Current Riverbanks Steering Group will be disestablished.

**Attachments:**

i. Regeneration Draft Project Structure (161213128509)

ii. Regeneration Steering Group Draft Terms of Reference (161129123269)

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Community Board recommends to Council:

(a) **Receives** report No.161129123237

(b) **Approves** the establishment of a Regeneration Steering Group

(c) **Approves** the Terms of Reference for the Regeneration Steering Group (161129123269)

(d) **Approves** the appointment of the following to the Regeneration Steering Group:

- Mayor
- Council Portfolio Holder (Chair)
- Kaiapoi - Tuahiwi Community Board (full Board)
- Kaiapoi Ward Councillors
- Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga (representative (s))
- Te Kohaka o Tūhaitara Trust (representative)
- Environment Canterbury (representative)
- Chief Executive
- Manager, Community & Recreation
- Implementation Programme Manager, District Regeneration

(e) **Notes** the Draft Project Structure.
3. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

3.1. On 1 August 2016 the Council presented the Draft Waimakariri Residential Red Zone Recovery Plan to the Crown. The Draft Recovery Plan was the culmination of extensive consultation with the community and plan preparation over the past year. It outlined possible future uses for the areas Kaiapoi, The Pines Beach and Kairaki which were red-zoned in 2011.

3.2. The Crown subsequently notified the Draft Recovery Plan for further public comment. The Crown is currently considering the approval of the Draft Recovery Plan, including whether any amendments are required. At the time of writing this report, no decision on the Draft Recovery Plan had been received from the Crown.

3.3. Should a recovery plan be approved the next step is the implementation of this plan. This involves land divestment, planning, design, consultation and physical construction. The implementation of the Recovery Plan is a long-term project. Some projects could occur in the short to medium term (over the next two to five years) others will take longer (over the next ten to thirty years).

3.4. A Regeneration Draft Project Structure has been prepared to enable the implementation of the Recovery Plan (refer Attachment i). This structure includes a number of core project teams supported by a Project Control Group and the Kaiapoi Regeneration Steering Group. At the head of the project is the Council with key relationships with the Crown and a Co-Governance Group. The Crown and Co-Governance Group arrangements are yet to be agreed. This will occur after the approval of a Recovery Plan. A report to the Community Board and Council will be made in the future to approve the Project Structure.

3.5. However, to assist with early planning and the implementation of a Recovery Plan it is proposed to establish the Regeneration Steering Group (as shown on the Draft Project Structure). The purpose of this Steering Group is to provide advice and recommendations to the Council on key decisions relating to the implementation of the Recovery Plan and to lead and support partner and community engagement.

3.6. The role of the Regeneration Steering Group is to:

- Govern the Regeneration programme;
- Make recommendations to Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board, Council or Council Committees, and oversee the implementation of Board, Council or Council Committee decisions;
- Lead and support community and partner engagement;
- Strategic level decision making and guidance, in accordance with the Decision Framework;
- Make recommendations to Council regarding the division of the overall budget for specific projects;
- Recommend approval of any material changes to the Implementation Strategy;
- Review and monitor overall progress (including budget tracking);
- Provide a regular project overview to the Council, Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board or relevant Council Committee, and the Crown (if required) reporting on milestones, programme, budget, issues and risk;
- Provide recommendations on key documents where necessary, including but not limited to:
  - Implementation Strategy
  - Participation Strategy
  - Reports or briefings to Council, Council Committees or Boards
Recommend approval of master plans, concept plans, and strategies to Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board;
Participate in design and planning workshops;

3.7. A Draft Terms of Reference for the Regeneration Steering Group is included in Attachment ii.

3.8. It is expected that the Regeneration Steering Group would meet monthly, starting in 2017.

3.9. It is suggested that membership of the Regeneration Steering Group is extended to the following:

- Mayor
- Council Portfolio Holder (Chair)
- Kaiapoi - Tuahiwi Community Board (full Board)
- Kaiapoi Ward Councillors
- Te Ngāi Tōāuriri Rūnanga (representative(s))
- Te Kohaka o Tūhaitara Trust (representative)
- Environment Canterbury (representative)
- Chief Executive
- Manager, Community & Recreation
- Implementation Programme Manager, District Regeneration

3.10. At the first meeting of the Steering Group in 2017 a Chair will be elected, and a media spokesperson nominated.

3.11. There is currently a Kaiapoi Riverbanks Steering Group which is involved with the wharf and marine precinct, Riverbank Walkway, rowing precinct, recreation precinct, Murphy Park redevelopment and general landscaping of the riverbanks area. This group will be disestablished in 2017, and replaced by the Regeneration Steering Group. All members of the Kaiapoi Riverbanks Steering Group (plus others) will become members of the Regeneration Steering Group. Note that the final meeting of the Riverbanks Steering Group will be on the 13 February as the first Monday in February 2017 is Waitangi Day.

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

4. COMMUNITY VIEWS

4.1. Community views on possible future land uses for the Kaiapoi, The Pines Beach and Kairaki regeneration areas were sought during the preparation of the Draft Recovery Plan. There will be further opportunities and a need for community participation during the implementation of a Recovery Plan. A Draft Participation Strategy is currently being developed which will outline the need for community participation through the implementation of the Recovery Plan. As one of the roles of the Steering Group is to lead and support community and partner engagement we will work with the Steering Group on this draft strategy in early 2017.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

5.1. The Council has allocated $6 million for the implementation of a Recovery Plan (excluding separate budgets for infrastructure and roading). This will not enable full implementation of Recovery Plan. Future funding will need to be sought through alternative funding sources and/or the Long Term Plan process.
5.2. Note that the full implementation of the Draft Recovery Plan requires additional funding in the order of $10 million dollars.

6. **CONTEXT**

6.1. **Policy**

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

6.2. **Legislation**

Greater Christchurch Regeneration Act (2016)

Local Government Act (2002)

6.3. **Community Outcomes**

- There is a safe environment for all
- There are areas of significant indigenous vegetation and habitats for indigenous fauna
- The community’s cultures, arts and heritage are conserved and celebrated
- Public spaces and facilities are plentiful, accessible and high quality
- The distinctive character of our towns, villages and rural areas is maintained
- People are friendly and caring, creating a strong sense of community in our District
- Transport is accessible, convenient, reliable, affordable and sustainable
- Businesses in the District are diverse, adaptable and growing
- There are wide ranging opportunities for people to contribute to the decision making by local, regional and national organisations that affects our District
- Public effect is given to the spirit of the Treaty of Waitangi.
REGENERATION - DRAFT PROJECT STRUCTURE

DRAFT AS AT 13 DECEMBER 2016

Re regeneration steering group

- Mayor
- Council portfolio holder (chair)
- Kaipoi ward councillors
- Kaipoi-Tuahiwi community board (full)
- Te Ngai Tuhuriri Rūnanga (rep(s))
- Te Kohaka o Tūheitara trust (rep)
- Environment Canterbury (rep)
- Chief executive
- Manager, community & recreation
- Implementation programme manager

Project control group

- Implementation programme mgr (chair)
- Manager, community & recreation
- Eq infrastructure recovery manager
- Community green space manager
- 3 Waters manager
- Roading manager
- Development planning manager
- Business & centres manager

Core project teams

- Implementation programme manager
- Planning
- Infrastructure
- Green space
- Town centres
- Communications & engagement
- Council support functions (property, AIM, GIS, finance, PDU)
TERMS OF REFERENCE
REGENERATION STEERING GROUP

1. PURPOSE
The purpose of the Regeneration Steering Group (RSG) is to provide advice and recommendations to the Kaiapoi - Tuahiwi Community Board and Waimakariri District Council on key decisions relating to the implementation of the Waimakariri Residential Red Zone Recovery Plan.

2. MEMBERSHIP
- Mayor
- Council Portfolio Holder – Kaiapoi Regeneration (Chair)
- Kaiapoi - Tuahiwi Community Board (full Board)
- Kaiapoi Ward Councillors
- Te Ngāi Tūhuriri Rūnanga (representative(s))
- Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust (representative)
- Environment Canterbury (representative)
- Chief Executive
- Manager, Community & Recreation
- Implementation Programme Manager, District Regeneration

3. ROLE
The members of the RSG will engage in a positive and collaborative manner to enable the efficient and effective implementation of the Recovery Plan. This includes (but is not limited to) the following roles:
- Govern the District Regeneration programme;
- Make recommendations to the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board, Council or Council Committees, and oversee the implementation of Board, Council or Council Committee decisions;
- Lead and support community and partner engagement;
- Strategic level decision making and guidance, in accordance with the Decision Framework;
- Make recommendations to Council regarding the division of the overall budget for specific projects;
- Recommend any material changes to the Implementation Strategy;
- Review and monitor overall progress (including budget tracking);
TERMS OF REFERENCE
REGENERATION STEERING GROUP

- Provide a regular project overview to the Council, Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board or relevant Council Committee, and the Crown (if required) reporting on milestones, programme, budget, issues and risk;
- Provide recommendations on key documents where necessary, including but not limited to:
  - Implementation Strategy
  - Participation Strategy
  - Reports or briefings to Council, Council Committees or Boards
- Recommend approval of master plans, concept plans, and strategies
- Participate in design and planning workshops;

Members have a key role to ensure the effective flow of information between member organisations and the Steering Group.

4. MEETING FREQUENCY
The RSG shall meet every four weeks or when requested to do so for urgent matters, or matters relating to the purpose of the RSG.

A quorum is considered to be 50 percent of members.

5. ADMINISTRATION
The agenda and minutes for the RSG meeting will be prepared by the Core Project Team Project Administrator. The agenda and minutes will be filed in TRIM and distributed to all members. The agenda for the meeting shall generally be as follows:
1. Introductions / Apologies
2. Previous Minutes
3. Implementation Programme Manager Report (milestones, programme, issues, budget, risk)
4. Community participation review
5. Reports to Council, Committee or Community Board
6. General Business

6. DURATION
The RSG will function until December 2018. The need and make-up of the group will be reviewed in light of implementation progress annually thereafter.
1. SUMMARY

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

1.2. There are no significant issues or events that occurred over the Christmas / New Year period.

Attachment

1. Discharging Officer Health and Safety Duties
2. November 2016 Health and Safety Dashboard Report

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report 170120005183.

3. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

3.1. There were five accidents of a minor nature occurred during the December period – a knee strain, two burns/scoldings from hot drinks, a mild repetitive strain soreness, and a cut.

3.2. The near-miss incident related to an air conditioning unit dripping water on Xmas tree lighting in the Council foyer.

3.3. We have received confirmation that we secured tertiary accreditation (the top rating) in the ACC Workplace Safety audit conducted in December. That will see the Council secure a 20% discount on its ACC premium.

3.4. The H&S work programme is being updated currently and a revised plan will be submitted along with the next report to the Council.
4. COMMUNITY VIEWS

4.1. N/A.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

5.1. N/A

6. CONTEXT

6.1. Policy

N/A

6.2. Legislation

Key extracts from the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015, especially as it relates to Officers, were provided to the first meeting of this term of Council on 25 October 2016.

Jim Palmer
Chief Executive
## Discharging Officer Health and Safety Duties

### OFFICER DUTIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KNOW</th>
<th>EXAMPLES OF ACTIVITIES TO SUPPORT DISCHARGE OF DUTIES</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(To acquire, and keep up to date, knowledge of work health and safety matters)</td>
<td>Updates on new activities/major contracts</td>
<td>Various Committee reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council reports to include Health and Safety advice as relevant</td>
<td>Monthly, as required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Audit Committee to receive minutes of Health and Safety Committee meetings</td>
<td>Two-monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Update on legislation and best practice changes to Audit Committee</td>
<td>As required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNDERSTAND</th>
<th>EXAMPLES OF ACTIVITIES TO SUPPORT DISCHARGE OF DUTIES</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(To gain an understanding of the nature of the operations of the business or undertaking of the PCBU and generally of the hazards and risks associated with those operations)</td>
<td>Induction of new Council through tour of District and ongoing site visits.</td>
<td>Start of each new term and as required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H&amp;S Risk register to Audit Committee</td>
<td>Six monthly, or where major change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training on H&amp;S legislation and best practices updates</td>
<td>At least annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CCO activities reported to the Audit Committee</td>
<td>At least annually</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESOURCES</th>
<th>EXAMPLES OF ACTIVITIES TO SUPPORT DISCHARGE OF DUTIES</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(To ensure that the PCBU has available for use, and uses, appropriate resources and processes to eliminate or minimise risks to health and safety from work carried out as part of the conduct of the business or undertaking)</td>
<td>LTP or Annual Plan to have a specific report on H&amp;S resources</td>
<td>Annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reports to Committees will outline H&amp;S issues and resourcing, as appropriate</td>
<td>As required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONITOR</th>
<th>EXAMPLES OF ACTIVITIES TO SUPPORT DISCHARGE OF DUTIES</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(To ensure that the PCBU has appropriate processes for receiving and considering information regarding incidents, hazards, and risks and for responding in a timely way to that information)</td>
<td>Report to every Council meeting – standing agenda item to include Dashboard Update and any major developments</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Risk register review by Audit Committee</td>
<td>Six monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPLY</td>
<td>VERIFY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(To ensure that the PCBU has, and implements, processes for complying with any duty or obligation of the PCBU under this Act)</td>
<td>(To verify the provision and use of the resources and processes)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Programme of H&amp;S internal work received by Audit Committee</td>
<td>• Receive ACC WSMP audit results and remedial actions (if any) reported to Audit Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Internal Audit reports to Audit Committee</td>
<td>• Worksafe audits, if undertaken</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Incident Investigations reported Audit Committee</td>
<td>• Self-assessment against Canterbury Safety Charter reported to the Audit Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Worksafe review of incidents/accidents reported to Audit Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Description</td>
<td>Rating (out of 20)</td>
<td>Current actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor Health and Safety Management</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>*Train all contract managers in H&amp;S processes/requirements at time of induction. *Develop comprehensive contract administration/contract management training package to deliver to all staff managing contractors. *Identify volunteer groups and shareholders that engage contractors on behalf of WDC and train in contract H&amp;S management processes. *Complete development of Safety in Design procedures and embed in design processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Use &amp; Driver Safety</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>*Deliver driver training as per training strategy (Driver Safety / 4WD). *Identify any drivers that require further progressive driver training on an as-needed basis and provide relevant training. *Provide information and training regarding use of safety equipment such as fire extinguishers in staff pool vehicles to all drivers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MINUTES OF THE DISTRICT PLANNING AND REGULATION COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD IN THE WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 215 HIGH STREET,
RANGIORA ON TUESDAY 22 NOVEMBER 2016 AT 1.01PM.

PRESENT
Councillor J Meyer (Chair), Mayor D Ayers (arrived at 1.03pm during item 3.1),
Councillors N Atkinson, P Allen, W Doody and D Gordon.

IN ATTENDANCE
Councillor P Williams and Rangiora-Ashley Community Board member G Miller
Messrs N Harrison (Manager Regulation), S Markham (Manager Strategy and
Engagement), M Johnson (Environmental Services Unit), G Meadows (Policy Manager),
T Ellis (Development Planning Unit), P Waiting (Team Leader – Resource Consents),
N Law (Resource Management Planner), J Tamaiparea (Duty Planner), L Hurley
(Planning Technician) and L Courtney (Governance Secretary).

Councillor Meyer commenced the meeting welcoming the new Committee members.

1 APOLOGIES
There were no apologies.

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
No conflicts of interest were noted.

3 RECEIPT OF MINUTES
3.1 Minutes of a meeting of the Resource Management and Regulation
Committee held on Tuesday 20 September 2016
Councillor Atkinson raised on page 4, paragraph 4, final sentence that ‘kiwis’
should be replaced by ‘people’ as he wanted to include all people not just
New Zealanders. Councillor Atkinson’s comments were noted but as the
minutes were only being received and from a Committee that no longer
existed, no changes could be made to them.

Moved Councillor Allen seconded Councillor Gordon

THAT the District Planning and Regulation Committee:
(a) Receives for information, the minutes of a meeting of the Resource
Management and Regulation Committee held on 20 September 2016.

CARRIED

4 MATTERS ARISING
Nil.

5 PRESENTATION/DEPUTATION
5.1 Mrs Davina McNickel (Team Leader Contaminated Sites, ECan) spoke to
the Committee in relation to the Ministry for the Environment’s Hazardous
Activities and Industries List.
Mrs McNickel spoke to a powerpoint (Trim No. 161125121688) outlining the project. She stated the project arose out of the 2010 Canterbury earthquakes to support rebuild work, so that, if required, land could be remediated before rebuild work commenced. She emphasised that her team investigates and identifies historic use, or at least probable use, of a particular site but does not identify whether that site is or is not contaminated. Possible contamination of a site requires a Detailed Site Investigation at the landowner's cost.

ECan intend to provide regular updates to the Council and will also hold drop in sessions for local communities. This method has proven to be a more effective way of communicating with the community and providing clarity to those who have queries about their own land. There is a public launch planned for June 2017 but more information will be provided closer to the date.

Councillor Atkinson queried how Council spraying was identified as opposed to private property owner spraying. Mrs McNickel acknowledged that it was an issue. Once historic land use had been identified, then the types of sprays that were probably used could be surmised. However, there were difficulties with organic operators as it was not as simple to identify the kinds of sprays they used but ECan staff were currently developing a guide to assist with this.

Councillor Atkinson asked how identified land use was notified, expressing concern that it could affect property equity. Mrs McNickel replied ECan have a Listed Land Use Register but it was up to each Council to decide how much information to provide. She stated the matter has been tested and there is a lot of case law available.

Councillor Atkinson questioned, once identified as a hazardous or contaminated site, how long the classification stays. Mrs McNickel replied that ECan relies on international classifications regarding the persistence of chemicals in water and soil, and adhere to the Stockholm Convention. Some sites that have had DDT used on the land, persist in the soil decades after it was first used.

Councillor Atkinson queried the difference between air and soil contaminants; one could argue the air contaminants are just as detrimental to people and the environment. Mrs McNickel acknowledged Councillor Atkinson’s query but air contamination was not an issue she could speak to. She explained the project was to assist those who may use land in later years, so they can be aware of what they could possibly be exposed to when conducting work that disturbs the soil.

Councillor Allen asked what property owners were expected do with the information being provided by the project. Mrs McNickel clarified that ECan were only investigating previous land use, not land condition. The effect on landowners would be dependent how the land was worked.

Regarding residential developments on land identified as hazardous: Councillor Williams expressed concern at the possible effect on property values. Mrs McNickel replied the same concerns were raised in Christchurch, commenting that possible historic land contamination combined with other factors, could have a negative effect on property values. The project was carried out in parts of Christchurch and did not have any negative effects on property values. Contamination needed to be investigated and confirmed first.

Mayor Ayers queried the feasibility of investigating historic land use. Mrs McNickel replied the current project would identify this.
Councillor Gordon sought clarification regarding the impetus for the project. Mrs McNickel responded the project was being carried out as requested by Central Government.

6 REPORTS

6.1 Appointment of District Licensing Committee – Malcolm Johnston (Environmental Services Manager)

Mr Johnston spoke to the report. He referred members to the 2012 changes in the Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act and advised the Council formed its own District Licensing Committee (DLC) in December 2013. The request is to re-establish a DLC. He highlighted the Council has the option to appoint an independent commissioner, however, there were advantages to having control of the licencing process within the Council. Mr Johnston commented that staff have recommend a commissioner be co-opted to the DLC from the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board; having a commissioner available gives greater stability and flexibility to the DLC.

Mayor Ayers sought confirmation that the Mayor was still an ex-officio for the DLC. Mr Johnston confirmed that the Mayor was.

Mayor Ayers queried cross accreditation with Hurunui. Mr Johnston replied there were advantages in having the cross accreditation and the staff recommendation was for it to continue.

Councillor Doody queried whether co-opting a commissioner from the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board would relieve pressure on the DLC due to a delay in training for new Committee members. Mr Johnston replied it would but training had been signalled for the earliest possible opportunity.

Moved Councillor Gordon seconded Councillor Allen

THAT the District Planning and Regulation Committee:

(a) Receives report 161104113935.

(b) Recommends to the Council that Councillors Peter Allen, Neville Atkinson, John Meyer and Wendy Doody be appointed to the District Licensing Committee.

(c) Recommends to the Council that Councillor P Allen, is appointed as Chairperson of the Waimakariri District Licensing Committee.

(d) Recommends to the Council that Councillor N Atkinson is appointed as the deputy chairperson of the Waimakariri District Licensing Committee

(e) Recommends to the Council that Rangiora-Ashley Community Board Chair J Gerard be appointed to the District Licensing Committee as a Commissioner until 31 January 2020.

(f) Notes that Mayor D Ayers is an ex-officio of the District Licensing Committee.

CARRIED

D Gordon commented he was part of original DLC but could not participate now due to work commitments. He believed it was a strong DLC and it was
7 PORTFOLIO UPDATES

7.1 District Planning Development – Councillor Neville Atkinson

Councillor Atkinson met with Council staff to discuss upcoming projects and plan meeting times. He commented on the progress of the District Development Strategy, noting its launch on 2 November 2016.

He commented on the Easterbrook Road development and the issue of commercial faculties in rural areas. A report will be before the Council in the near future and will be considered as part of the District Plan review process.

Regarding the Easterbrook Road development: Councillor Allen asked whether issues could be identified regarding the consent process. Councillor Atkinson responded that the original consent had been for the 11,000m² building. The plan then changed to a factory which required extra conditions under the Resource Management Act, which included a requirement for parking facilities. The next part of the process was to identify whether it should be notified or non-notified and it was deemed the effects were minor, and therefore non-notified. Councillor Atkinson has asked staff to investigate when governance should be notified if a similar situation occurs in the future, so elected members can be aware of issues earlier in the process. The development will progress although neighbouring residents are not happy with the decision. Conditions have been imposed which is hoped will alleviate some of the neighbouring residents’ concerns. He concluded the development is legal and permitted under the Council’s District Plan.

Councillor Allen sought clarification regarding Councillor Atkinson’s comment regarding governance. Councillor Atkinson replied his reference to governance meant the Waimakariri District Council.

Councillor Allen asked whether the conditions would be applied retrospectively. Mr Harrison clarified the consent has not been issued; only a decision made on whether it needed to be notified or non-notified.

Councillor Doody, to Mr Harrison, commended staff for providing the information.

Councillor Gordon asked whether a public meeting had been held regarding the development. Councillor Atkinson replied that a meeting had been requested by the local community and was held by key staff; Councillor Atkinson chaired the meeting but it was not a public meeting.

Mayor Ayers queried what legal recourse was open to those who were not happy with the proposed development. N Harrison replied that a judicial review through the High Court would be the next step. The review would look at the process the Council followed to arrive at its decision, not the decision itself. The High Court could then direct the matter back to the Council for review. Councillor Atkinson added that residents have been offered 2-3 hours of legal advice, at the Council’s cost, to assist with their concerns.

Councillor Doody asked whether construction had started. N Harrison replied that the building has a consent but Council staff have exercised Section 37 (of the Building Act) so the building cannot be used until Resource Consent has been issued; the building, as per the plan submitted for a building consent, can be built without a Resource Consent.
7.2 **Regulation and Civil Defence – Councillor John Meyer**

Councillor Meyer commented on the positives to come out of the Kaikoura earthquakes. He could see early on the effort put in by all, in particular the welfare centres and commended the efficiency of assistance being established. He acknowledged there was some initial confusion but advised if people were uncertain of what to do, to get themselves somewhere safe.

Mayor Ayers commented that he met with residents at the Rangiora Warehouse and New World car parks in the early morning of the 14 November 2016. He welcomed the acting Civil Defence Minister’s comments regarding tsunami warning technology. In relation to civil defence exercises, Mayor Ayers commented that some coastal residents cannot hear the sirens from inside their homes, while others could hear the sirens from Rangiora. He believed there may be a need to extend discussions on tsunami warnings to those neighbouring coastal properties. He noted that not all residents are comfortable in going to welfare centres and there were a number of issues that will require further discussion.

7.3 **Business, Promotion and Town Centres – Councillor Dan Gordon**

Councillor Gordon commented it had been a busy time. He met with the District Development LED group the previous night which is a well-represented group which will feed into the District Plan review. He noted the District Development Strategy launch was well attended and represented.

Councillor Gordon also held portfolio meetings with Council staff and intends to hold regular updates with them. He praised the leadership involved in the town centres. He believed there had been a common sense solution to car parking, noting a lot had gone on behind the scenes. He intends to get around all the town centres and wants to keep connected with those involved in their development. He commented on the goodwill among residents which he saw as been a result of good relationships built by staff involved.

8 **QUESTIONS**

There were no questions.

9 **URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS**

There was no urgent general business.

*Item 5.1 was taken at this time. Note the minutes have been recorded in accordance with the order of the agenda as circulated.*

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE MEETING WAS CLOSED AT 2.12PM.

CONFIRMED

________________
Chairperson
**BRIEFING**

At the conclusion of the meeting a briefing covered the following:

1. Parking update (Mr Johnston, Environment Services Manager)
2. District Plan Review – Recap and Next Steps (Mr Ellis, Development Planning Manager)
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE UTILITIES AND ROADING COMMITTEE HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA ON TUESDAY 22 NOVEMBER 2016 AT 4.00PM

PRESENT

Councillor R Brine (Chairperson), Mayor D Ayers, Councillors J Meyer, S Stewart and P Williams.

IN ATTENDANCE

Councillors N Atkinson, P Allen (to 6.00pm), D Gordon (to 6.05pm) and W Doody
Messrs G Cleary (Manager Utilities and Roading), K Simpson (3 Waters Manager), K Stevenson (Roading Manager), C Roxburgh (Water Asset Manager), R Barber (Development Manager, Project Delivery Unit), O Davies (Drainage Asset Manager), S Collin (Infrastructure Strategy Manager), S de Roo (Utilities Engineering Officer), Mrs K LaValley (Project Delivery Manager), Mrs J Fraser (Utilities Planner), Mrs A Smith (Committee Advisor)

1 APOLOGIES

Moved Councillor Meyer seconded Councillor Williams

THAT An apology be received and sustained from Deputy Mayor K Felstead.

CARRIED

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

No conflicts of interest were noted.

3 RECEIPT OF MINUTES

3.1 Minutes of a meeting of the Utilities and Roading Committee held on Tuesday 27 September 2016

Moved Councillor Stewart seconded Councillor Meyer

THAT the Utilities and Roading Committee:

(a) Receives, for information, the minutes of a meeting of the Utilities and Roading Committee held on Tuesday 27 September 2016.

CARRIED

4 MATTERS ARISING

There were no matters arising.
5 PRESENTATION

5.1 New Zealand Post

Mr John Roche, New Zealand Post, was present to speak on the proposal of NZ Post to introduce four wheel postal delivery vehicles metro areas around New Zealand over the next two years. This will include Rangiora and Kaiapoi. Prior to the meeting, members had been able to view one of the vehicles in the Council car park. Mr Roche advised that volumes of letter deliveries are declining at about 14% per year and this would probably halve within the next four years. On the other side of the scale, the market for smaller parcels, is growing at the rate of 30% a year – which is attributed mostly to on-line shopping, from both within New Zealand and internationally. The option for delivering these parcels is either having more vans on the roads or having the four wheel electric mid-range vehicle.

The vehicle is a Paxster four wheeler, classified by NZTA as a Light Goods Vehicles Mr Roche advised that this four wheel electric vehicle has been approved by NZTA for operation both on the road and on the footpath. Mr Roche advised that following successful testing of the Paxster in parts of Auckland in 2014, Waimakariri Council provided “in principle” approval to operate this vehicle on the footpath. New Zealand Post is now seeking final footpath exemption approval to operate the new vehicles on the footpath in residential areas of Rangiora and Kaiapoi from early 2017. The required training, plus any safety issues, have been identified and information is contained in the complete application pack that was tabled at the meeting. Copies of the executive summary were also circulated to all members (Trim 161202124487).

Questions

Mr Roche advised that this system will mean more posties and less courier drivers. There will be no loss of jobs and NZ Post will actually be looking for more staff – to be known as delivery agents. Though letter post is declining, Mr Roche confirmed that there has been an increase in parcels deliveries.

Councillor Doody queried the stability of the vehicles in windy conditions (i.e. a strong nor ‘wester) These electric delivery vehicles have been operating in Norway for several years and Mr Roche advised that there hasn’t been any instances of the vehicles blowing over or falling over in strong winds. In the hazard assessment this didn’t come up as an issue.

Mr Roche said it could be possible for these delivery vehicles to be used to deliver and collect mail from the west areas of Rangiora (where the postal collection boxes were recently removed from), or possibly from retirement villages/rest homes.

Mayor Ayers asked what is the future in relation to private parcel deliverers, who have offered to deliver same day. Mr Roche advised that NZ Post do deliver same day, including to Rangiora. It is a competitive market, there is Toll, Fastways and PBT couriers in addition to Freightways and NZ Couriers. It was suggested that any new private businesses may not be prepared to outlay for the infrastructure required for a delivery service and would therefore make use of an existing provider.

The delivery vehicles have a top speed of 45kph. Councillor Brine asked if there would be a maximum speed limit on the footpaths. Mr Roche explained that the training guidelines state that deliverers are not to travel on the footpath for any distance beyond 50 metres (between deliveries), otherwise they would travel on the streets.
Councillor Williams had concerns with some streets in Rangiora being quite narrow, and there is in some cases footpaths are only on one side. Mr Roche advised that drivers are being advised they are not to drive on residents front lawns, only on footpaths. The delivery agent will have to get off the vehicle and walk to complete a delivery in some cases. The vehicles can be locked and contents are safe anytime the driver is not on the vehicle. Mr Roche said it is a requirement of any delivery agent to give way, when there is any interaction with other footpath users. He noted that in trials with the vehicles in Auckland, the highest number of interactions with other footpath users in a day was eight.

Councillor Atkinson asked if there had been any accidents involving the vehicles, during the trials. Mr Roche advised that there had definitely been accidents on the roads, but nothing on the footpaths, and these were all attributed to driver error.

Following a question from Councillor Allen, Mr Roche confirmed the LTSA have approved these vehicles to travel on the footpaths, but there still needs to be approval granted from the Councils.

Councillor Brine thanked Mr Roche for his presentation and explained that a report will be presented to the Committee early in 2017 and a decision will be made at that time.

6 REPORTS

6.1 Barkers Road petition and Road Sealing – Ken Stevenson (Roading Manager)

Mr Stevenson presented this report to update the committee on the Barkers Road petition and to seek support for the proposed way forward. This follows the presentation of a petition to the Utilities and Roading Committee meeting in August, seeking the sealing of the unsealed section of Barkers Road.

Mr Stevenson explained that currently the financial contributions that the Council has for sealing this part of Barkers Road is short of the 30% amount required by the policy by approx. $42,000. This equates to $1800 per property. All the property owners on that section of the road who met with the Roading Manager, have verbally agreed to pay this amount. The next stage is to write to all the property owners seeking their feedback on the proposal. This sealing is only for the part of Barkers Road covered by the resource consent, not the whole of Barkers Road.

Councillor Allen noted this is not the first time a group of residents have come to Council because they have had expectations that their development contributions paid to developers, as part of the cost of the land they brought, would cover the cost of sealing the road. As there is still a short fall, Councillor Allen asks does this mean that the contributions are not sufficient and the policy is short of the requirement for sealing? Mr Stevenson said this is a problem and the issue is also that sometimes a developer proceeds with sealing just part of a road. Discussion took place on development contributions being refunded if after a period of time, it is not used towards sealing.

Mr Stevenson confirmed that there has been no financial contributions from property owners on the part of Barkers Road towards Fishers Road, which is not part of the planned sealed area. Mayor Ayers asked had the option been considered for sealing the entire length of Barkers Road? Mr Stevenson said
this had been looked at, but the cost would increase for each property owner up to $6,000 approx.

Councillor Doody has concerns with real estate agents promoting properties for sale, stating that the road would be sealed, when this is not confirmed at the time.

Councillor Williams has concerns with the possibility of any contracting firm buying one of the lifestyle properties and the damage from heavy trucks or machinery that would be done to the seal and where the seal and gravel sections of roads meet.

Moved Councillor Meyer seconded Mayor Ayers

THAT the Utilities and Roading Committee:

(a) **Receives** report N° 161104114039

(b) **Approves** the sealing of Barkers Road between Swamp Road and 530/534/538 Barkers Road, a length of 2.1km, under the Seal Extension Policy subject to the adjoining property owners agreeing to pay the difference between the current financial contributions and the amount required to reach 30% of the cost of the sealing.

(c) **Approves** in principle a targeted rate as an option for property owners to pay their contribution.

(d) **Supports** the proposed process of writing to all adjoining property owners seeking their agreement or not to pay the contribution and if there is majority support to report to Council to initiate the targeted rate process.

(e) **Notes** that the Council share will be funded from existing budgets which are loan funded.

(f) **Circulates** this report to the Rangiora Ashley Community Board.

**CARRIED**

Councillor Meyer in support of the motion, noted he had attended the meeting with the residents, and this is betterment for the families living on Barkers Road. Councillor Meyer doesn’t believe the road will become a speedway and this is a plus for the future.

Mayor Ayers noted it is good to see this resolution to this issue. It is important to have a distinction between development contributions and financial contributions. Mayor Ayers believes that refunding development contributions some years after the original development, can be fraught with challenges and suggests that it may become more frequent for people to be asking for roads to be sealed.

Councillor Gordon, though not part of this committee, supports this recommendation and appreciates the concerns of residents. This is a win/win situation. In time, it may be resolved with residents of the remaining part of Barkers Road for it to be sealed, if further development takes place there.

Councillor Doody supports this matter also and fully supports the Council going out to speak with the residents, finding out their issues and sourcing a resolution to the problem.
6.2 Establishment of Solid and Hazardous Waste Working Party 2016 – Kitty Waghorn (Solid Waste Asset Manager)

Mr Collins presented this report, seeking re-establishment of the Solid and Hazardous Waste Working Party. The upcoming matters that the Working Party would be working on will include the Draft Waste Assessment and Waste Management Plan Review, which is timed for completion in May 2017 and would then go out for consultation. Following that is the renewal of the Kerbside Services Contract and the Transfer Station Contract.

Moved Councillor Brine seconded Councillor Meyer

THAT the Utilities and Roading Committee:

- Receives report No. 161031111497.
- Establishes a Solid and Hazardous Waste Working Party.
- Approves the Terms of Reference for the Solid and Hazardous Waste Working Party as contained in document 131126109445, with an amendment to note that the Working Party is to comprise seven Councillors. (Terms of Reference updated to Trim document 161214128948)
- Notes that Mayor Ayers is an ex-officio member of the Solid and Hazardous Waste Working Party.

CARRIED

6.3 Alignment on Stage 2 of Central Rangiora Sewer Capacity Upgrade – Ric Barber (Development Manager, Project Delivery Unit)

Mr Barber presented this report, seeking approval for the alignment of Stage 2 of Central Rangiora Wastewater Capacity Upgrade Project. This project spans eight years, with Stage 1 out to Tender at the moment. This request is looking for confirmation of the alignment of Stage 2. Once confirmed staff can begin work on detailed design and work with any affected property owners and community engagement.

There were three options presented to the Committee, and Mr Barber pointed out the preferred Option 2. This is recommended for a few main reasons, firstly as it is the lowest priced option, there is an opportunity to have wastewater mains on Denches Lane that aren’t there presently, it ties in with the roading surfacing on Southbrook Road and has the lowest number of affected properties on that route. Mr Barber advised that once there is confirmation of the preferred option, staff will work with the contractor and both New Life School and Southbrook School to arrange the best time to carry out the work.

Moved Councillor Meyer seconded Councillor Williams

THAT the Utilities and Roading Committee:

- Receives report No. 161109115759.
(b) **Approves** the preferred alignment of the wastewater pipeline, Option 2 in this report, traversing King Street, South Belt, Pearson Lane, Denchs Road and Railway Road, to connect to the Stage 1 works which are being constructed from December 2016.

(c) **Notes** that a public consultation plan is being developed in conjunction with the design work that includes appropriate consultation with all properties directly affected by the pipe alignment and other parties affected such as other road users, schools and local businesses.

(d) **Notes** that this report approves a pipeline alignment route planned for construction in the 2017/18 financial year. The design work, consultation and tendering will be carried out in 2016/17.

(e) **Circulates** this report to the Rangiora Ashley Community Board for their information.

**CARRIED**

### 6.4 Reconvene Cam River Enhancement Subcommittee – Janet Fraser (Utilities Planner) and Owen Davies (Drainage Asset Manager)

Mr Davies presented this report seeking to appoint two new committee members to the Cam River Enhancement Subcommittee. The first appointment recommended is Councillor Stewart, who is also the portfolio holder of the Canterbury Water Management Strategy and Council representative of the Waimakariri Water Zone Committee. The report calls for one further appointment from this committee to this subcommittee. This report also requests approval to a new structure to the committee, with updated Terms of Reference.

Councillor Atkinson noting the focus on water, is concerned that there is no mention in this recommendation of tie in with the other water committees, so constituents can see that everyone is working together. Mr Cleary agreed that there are a number of committees working in this area and there is deliberate overlap, so work is coordinated. This subcommittee is specific to administer the Fund.

Moved Councillor Stewart seconded Mayor Ayers

**THAT** the Utilities and Roading Committee:

(a) **Receives** report No. 161103113640.

(b) **Appoints** Councillor Stewart, holding the Canterbury Water Management Strategy portfolio, and Councillor Meyer from the Utilities and Roading Committee to the Cam River Enhancement Subcommittee.

(c) **Approves** the proposed new structure of the subcommittee, and amends the subcommittee membership within the Terms of Reference as follows:

- 1 member from the Utilities and Roading Committee
- The Waimakariri District Council **Canterbury Water Management Strategy** portfolio holder
- 1 member from the Waimakariri Water Management Zone Committee (Lowland Streams Subcommittee)
• 1 representative from the Department of Conservation
• 1 representative from Environment Canterbury
• 1 representative from North Canterbury Fish and Game
• 1 representative from Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga Inc.

(d) **Notes** the proposed new subcommittee structure formalises existing committee arrangements, ensures recognition of key stakeholder organisations and replaces a superseded working party structure with the new relevant portfolio structure.

(e) **Notes** that this committee is to liaise with the Kaiapoi River Rehabilitation Working Party.

Councillor Stewart supports this new structure and the agreement to liaise with the Kaiapoi River Working Party, but added it is important that the fund for Cam River is used for work only on this river.

Mr Davies pointed out the new committee membership structure is to include a representative from the Waimakariri Zone Committee, suggesting that Grant Edge may be the member appointed.

6.5 **Request for Budget for Stormwater Diversion Townsend Road, Townsend Fields Development** – Kelly LaValley (Project Delivery Manager) and Owen Davies (Drainage Asset Manager)

Ms LaValley and Mr Davies presented this report which seeks approval for a new budget of $980,000 for a stormwater main that diverts stormwater from Pentecost Road to the Townsend Road extension for the 2016/17 financial year. Ms LaValley provided an overview of the proposed project, which will provide a better service to the existing ratepayers during 50 year large rainfall events, and provide better drainage along Johns Road. Cost for the project would be funded 75% through rates, with the primary driver being the benefit to existing ratepayers and 25% through growth. The cost estimate is based on an engineers estimate, once work is tendered and staff have actual costs, the recommendation would be taken to Council in February with the projected cost for this.

Councillor Meyer questioned if the Council was being fair to the community with the cost. Ms LaValley said the benefit to the ratepayer is the primary benefit, referred to the water flows during the high rainfall event of 2014. Having done this work will reduce the risks and there will be extra capacity available, for infill development. Mr Cleary added, the best thing that can be done for storm water in Rangiora, is to try to keep the storm water flow from rural area from getting into the town. Once it gets into the town, it is very difficult and expensive to manage. This is a cost effective way of remediating flooding problems from Johns Road southwards. Another future project is for a diversion along Lehmans Road to provide benefit to the residents of Rangiora. This fits in well with the Council’s overall strategy and Mr Cleary believes the Rangiora ratepayer is getting a fair deal out of this.

Following a question from Councillor Atkinson, Mr Cleary explained that the new stormwater pipe being proposed to go through the new subdivision is for stormwater already treated from existing residential area or is rural runoff. The intention is to keep this separate from the new subdivision stormwater as this will have a new stormwater system as this will still need to be treated.
Moved Councillor Brine seconded Councillor Meyer

THAT the Utilities and Roading Committee recommends:

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 161109115427.

(b) Notes that a request for a new capital budget and contract award of an estimated $980,000 for the Pentecost Road stormwater diversion will come to Council for approval in the current financial year (2016/17).

(c) Notes that this work will be 75% funded through rates and will have an effect of a 0.3% increase on the Rangiora Drainage rate.

(d) Notes that this work will be 25% funded through the Rangiora Drainage Development Contribution and will increase this development contribution by $112 per lot (excl GST) to $196 per lot (excl GST).

(e) Circulates this report to the Rangiora Ashley Community Board for their information.

CARRIED

Councillor Brine believes this report is very much about reducing risk for the urban area of Rangiora, as reiterated by the staff comments.

6.6 Renaming Maori Drain to Tuahiwi Stream – Kalley Simpson (3 Waters Manager)

Mr Simpson presented this report seeking endorsement of the committee for renaming of Maori Drain to Tuahiwi Stream. This name change has been proposed for some time, and this better reflects the name from the area, and acknowledging the environment that it is a stream and not a drain. The proposal is supported by the Runanga and the Central Rural Drainage Advisory Group at their most recent meeting.

Moved Councillor Meyer seconded Councillor Williams

THAT the Utilities and Roading Committee:

(a) Receives report No. 161107114616

(b) Endorses the renaming of Maori Drain to Tuahiwi Stream.

(c) Notes that the Central Rural Drainage Advisory Group has endorsed the renaming of Maori Drain to Tuahiwi Stream.

CARRIED

6.7 Expenditure due to Reactive Maintenance Work Carried Out on Rangiora, Kaiapoi and Pegasus Water Supply Wells - Sean de Roo (Utilities Engineering Officer)

Mr de Roo presented this report, along with Mr Colin Roxburgh, advising of additional maintenance work that was required to be undertaken on the Rangiora, Kaiapoi and Pegasus water supply wells. Mr de Roo provided an
overview of the work that was undertaken at the three different wells, and the maintenance work undertaken will be an overspend on each scheme’s budget.

Councillor Brine noted that this work was urgent work that needed to be undertaken. Mr Cleary advised that there is a budget set for maintenance work required for a year. This work was within the emergency delegation of the Utilities and Roading Manager, but it is required to be advised to the committee.

Councillor Atkinson questioned the lifespan of pumps for the wells, suggesting that the Rangiora well is not many years old. Mr Roxburgh said there was no definitive answer as to why this equipment failed. The pump was installed when the well was developed in 2010. Normally a pump would expect to have a life span of 10 to 20 years. The Warranty on a pump would not be covered, because the pump was pumping sand. Messrs Roxburgh and Cleary advised that the pump failed because it was pumping sand, and this would not be covered by warranty. The best and most cost effective thing to do is to fix it, otherwise it will cause damage by drawing sand through the pipeline and system as well. Councillor Gordon asked if there was insurance cover for a machinery replacement? Mr Cleary confirmed this will be followed up by staff and it will be worth pursuing.

Councillor Williams questioned if the option of changing the impellers and housing in the pumps had been considered, as this would be a cheaper option. Mr Roxburgh advised that for the Rangiora pump, the size of the pump was not the appropriate size for the well – a smaller pump will be installed. The Pegasus well pump was damaged beyond repair and required replacement.

Moved Mayor Ayers seconded Councillor Brine

THAT the Utilities and Roading Committee recommends:

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 161109115696.

(b) Notes that due to the urgent nature of the maintenance work and importance of the wells for the supply of water to Rangiora, Kaiapoi and Pegasus, it was necessary to undertake the maintenance without delay.

(c) Notes that the maintenance work to Rangiora Smith Street Wells 1, 2 and 3 is projected to cost approximately $74,970 and will be funded from the Rangiora Headworks maintenance budget. This over expenditure will be covered by the Rangiora Water Supply surplus account but may have an estimated $0.80 a year impact on rates per property.

(d) Notes that the maintenance work completed on Kaiapoi Davie Street well has cost $7,281.56 and that this has been funded from the Kaiapoi Headworks maintenance budget. This over expenditure will be covered by the Kaiapoi Water Supply surplus account but may have an estimated $0.12 a year impact on rates per property.

(e) Notes that the maintenance work to Pegasus Equestrian well 1 is projected to cost approximately $45,000 and that this will be funded from the Pegasus Headworks maintenance budget. Additional work to the fencing around the Equestrian wells has been completed to increase the security of the wells at an approximate cost of $40,000. Due to the amount of surplus within the Pegasus account it is envisaged that this should have no impact on rates.
Requests renewal capital budget of $25,000 on the Pegasus Water Supply Scheme to replace Equestrian well 1 pump. This capital expenditure will be depreciated funded.

Requests renewal capital budget of $25,000 on the Rangiora Water Supply Scheme to replace Smith Street well 3 pump. This capital expenditure will be depreciated funded.

Circulates this report to the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board, the Woodend-Sefton Community Board and the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board for their information.

CARRIED

Councillor Williams sought confirmation that the pump replaced was not discarded and Mr Roxburgh confirmed this.

6.8 Report on Expenditure to Protect Water Supply Sources from Contamination – Colin Roxburgh (Water Asset Manager)

Mr Roxburgh presented this report, along with Mr Simpson, which follows a previously presented report and follows the Havelock North events. An audit has been done of all water supply sites in terms of safety and tried to identify areas which could be improved. It was identified that the fencing at the Garrymere, Cust and Pegasus water schemes required to be upgraded to protect water supply sources from stock. This upgraded fencing has been completed at both Pegasus and Garrymere and there is still some work to be done regarding changes to the easements with the Cust supply. It is noted that this is the back-up water source at Cust. This work wasn’t programmed and not allowed for in existing budgets, but this was seen as work that staff didn’t want to delay and was approved by the Manager Utilities and Roading prior to coming before the committee.

Mayor Ayers asked and it was confirmed the maintenance contractor will keep the grass mowed around the water sources, within the slightly bigger fenced off areas.

Moved Councillor Brine seconded Councillor Meyer

THAT the Utilities and Roading Committee:

(a) Receives report No. 161108115158.

(b) Notes that improvements to the fencing at the Garrymere source are projected to have a total cost of $5,000, and that this will be funded from the source upgrade project budget.

(c) Notes that the improvements to the fencing at the Pegasus wells is projected to cost approximately $40,000, and that this will be funded from the Pegasus maintenance budget.

(d) Notes that the fencing at the Springbank 1 source on the Cust scheme is projected to cost approximately $8,000 and that this will be funded from the Cust maintenance budget.

(e) Circulates this report to the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board, the Woodend-Sefton Community Board and the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board for their information.

CARRIED
6.9 Request for increases to water source upgrade budgets for Waikuku Beach, Garrymere and Poyntzs Road water supply schemes – Colin Roxburgh (Water Asset Manager)

Mr Roxburgh presented this report, seeking to bring forward the upgrades to three of the Councils water schemes from 2023/24 financial year to the 2018/19 financial year, as part of the requirements to scheme compliance with the Drinking Water Standards for New Zealand. These three schemes are Waikuku Beach, Garrymere and Poyntzs Road water supply schemes. Mr Roxburgh advised that it is planned to have these recommended changes to the Council as part of the draft annual plan.

Councillor Brine questioned how much consultation will be undertaken with the residents advising of this proposed work, being included in the Councils Annual Plan. Mr Roxburgh advise said it is proposed to have fairly comprehensive consultation for the Poyntzs Road and Garrymere schemes with information letter drops to residents, drop in sessions, and public community meetings. For Waikuku Beach, the level of increase is not the same as the other two schemes, the method of treatment is already defined and it is planned that this consultation go through the draft Annual Plan.

Councillor Atkinson questioned the timing of work to be undertaken, and consultation with the community. If there are any further changes to the standards that Councils are to comply with for the drinking water standards, would it not be advisable to wait to seek more information from Local Government New Zealand and identify if any further changes to standards are required. Mr Cleary said this matter has been discussed at both Council and Utilities and Roading committee meetings over the last few years. Staff have undertaken a lot of work on this matter to identify areas where the Council may be at risk. In terms of the community and public health aspect he does not believe the Council should hold off upgrading these water supplies and waiting for a technical solution.

Councillor Gordon noted with these schemes, regarding rating modelling, said it is important for residents to know of the effects to their rates as part of the annual plan consultation process. Mr Cleary advised some of the options available and it was agreed that there will be a further report back to the committee on potential options in the near future. Mr Cleary also confirmed there will be considerable consultation with the community on this matter. There will be plenty of opportunities for the public to come and engage with staff directly.

Councillor Allen questioned Item 3.9 in the report, which states that “an ultra-violet (UV) disinfection system would likely provide adequate treatment for the Kings Avenue source to achieve full compliance with the Drinking Water Standards for New Zealand.” Mr Roxburgh explained that there have over the past years (over ten years approx.) been manual water turbidity testing undertaken approximately twice a week by staff. This is the main thing that UV relies on is the clarity of water. A turbidity meter was installed two or three months ago, which provides continuous testing, and the data collected so far has always been within the limits of what a UV system can treat. Each month that passes staff are more confident and before construction will be far more confident that it will work.

Moved Councillor Brine seconded Councillor Meyer

THAT the Utilities and Roading Committee:

(a) Receives report No. 161108115095.
(b) Recommends that the Council considers among other priorities an increase to the Waikuku Beach treatment upgrade budget from
$220,000 to $400,000 for consultation as part of the 2017/18 Draft Annual Plan.

(c) **Notes** that the rating impact of the increase in the capital expenditure for Waikuku Beach is calculated at $32 per connection per year.

(d) **Recommends** that the Council considers among other priorities an increase to the 2017/18 Garrymere source upgrade budget from $150,000 to $250,000 for consultation as part of the 2017/18 Draft Annual Plan.

(e) **Recommends** that the Council considers among other priorities a further $200,000 of funding be allocated for the Garrymere source upgrade budget in 2018/19 as part of the Long Term Plan process, giving a total construction budget of $450,000 for the upgrade.

(f) **Notes** that the rating impact of the increase in the capital expenditure for the Garrymere scheme is calculated at $643 per connection per year.

(g) **Recommends** that the Council considers among other priorities a budget of $50,000 for a Poyntzs Road source upgrade investigation project for consultation as part of the 2017/18 Draft Annual Plan.

(h) **Recommends** that the Council considers among other priorities that the Poyntzs Road source upgrade budget of $150,000 in 2023/24 be increased to $450,000 and brought forward to 2018/19 as part of the Long Term Plan process.

(i) **Notes** that the rating impact of the increase in the capital expenditure for the Poyntzs Road scheme is calculated at $389 per connection per year.

(j) **Circulates** this report to the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board, the Woodend-Sefton Community Board and the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board for their information.

CARRIED

Councillor Meyer noted his concern with the impact on the ratepayers.

Councillor Atkinson has concerns that even with these upgrades put in place, that there will still be further upgrades required over the coming years. Suggested that it is important to get the communications to the public right, and believes that there will be further changes required of Councils to meet water standards.

Councillor Allen has absolute confidence in the Council staff and how they handle the district water systems, there is quite a range of water schemes in the District. There has to be open communication with the public of the necessity for this work to be undertaken and the reasons why. Councillor Allen suggests that the guarantee that the public will want is that “the water they drink is going to keep them healthy”.

Mayor Ayers believes the Council is very close to the end of upgrading water schemes, including here in Rangiora, projects which have been quite challenging. All the Council can do is meet the standards required by the Government at this time, doubtless they will change in time. Information on
the rating possibilities either per scheme or if contributions were across the whole district is important information for the Council to consider.

Following a question from Councillor Stewart on the Poyntzs Road water source, Mr Roxburgh explained the process that is planned is that as part of the draft annual plan, there will be a budget of $50,000 requested to conduct an investigation project to consider options. Six months later there will be extensive consultation with the community on the options available - the consultation will include community meetings and drop-in sessions. Following this a preferred option will be identified which will be taken back to Council for consideration.

6.10 Ashley Rural Water Scheme WDC Representation – Simon Collin (Infrastructure Strategy Manager)

Mr Collin presented this report and provided some background update on the Ashley Water Scheme, which was considered by the previous term of Council. It was noted that the Hurunui District Council have restructured the governance of their water committees which is to now include an elected member appointed by the Waimakariri District Council on its Water Liaison Committee. Mr Collins said it seems appropriate for this person (Councillor Williams) to be on both the Ashley Rural Water Scheme Local Advisory Group and the Water Liaison Committee. It is the intention to brief the committee on the Ashley Rural Water Scheme Review, but after the effects of the earthquake on Hurunui, it was felt appropriate to postpone this. It is proposed that there will be a briefing to Council early in 2017 on this.

Moved Mayor Ayers seconded Councillor Williams

THAT the Utilities and Roading Committee recommends:

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 161102113044,

(b) Provides a letter of thanks to the Hurunui District Council for its recognition of the representation issues with respect to the Ashley Rural Water Scheme, and for the opportunity it has provided to Waimakariri District Council to be represented on the Water Liaison Committee.

(c) Nominates Cr Williams, as WDC Water Supply and Wastewater Portfolio Holder, to be the WDC representative on the Water Liaison Committee for the duration of the 10th term of Council.

(d) Requests staff to approach HDC to request that the WDC representative on the Water Liaison Committee also be granted membership to the Ashley Rural Water Scheme Local Water Advisory Group. (This would be in addition to the representative selected from the Rangiora Ashley Community Board).

CARRIED

Mayor Ayers suggested that there could be a representative from both the Rangiora-Ashley Board and the Woodend-Sefton Board. This would require some liaison between the Chairs of both these Boards. The member selected would represent both boards.
7 REPORTS FOR INFORMATION ONLY

7.1 Acceptance of Tender from OnGrade Drainage Ltd for Middle Brook Improvements CON2016/59 – Owen Davies, (Drainage Asset Manager) and Dan Lewis (Construction Management Engineer)
(refer to report no. 161027110427 to the Management Team meeting of 31 October 2016)

7.2 Request for Approval to Engage Opus International Consultants for Garrymere Water Supply Headworks Source Upgrade – Sean de Roo (Utilities Engineering Officer)
(refer to report no. 161107114449 to the Management Team meeting of 14 November 2016)

7.3 Approval to Install Cattle Stops in Moderates Road – Ken Stevenson (Roading Manager)
(refer to report no. 161019107953 to the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board meeting of 3 November 2016)

Moved Councillor Brine seconded Councillor Meyer

THAT the information in Items 7.1 and 7.3 be received.

CARRIED

8 PORTFOLIO UPDATES

8.1 Roading – Councillor John Meyer

Nothing to update.

8.2 Drainage and Stockwater – Councillor Sandra Stewart

Nothing to update.

8.3 Utilities (Water Supplies and Sewer) – Cr Paul Williams

Councillor Williams noted with the recent earthquakes there was only minor damage to one tank in the district.

8.4 Solid Waste – Cr Robbie Brine

Councillor Brine advised that the Southbrook transfer station was undamaged in the recent earthquake and opened at the usual time. Kate Valley opened and was able to take refuse from WDC but closed early to allow staff to go home. Transportation operations are independent of transfer station operations, so there was no disruption to this.
## 9 MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED WITH THE PUBLIC EXCLUDED

Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

Moved Councillor Brine seconded Councillor Meyer

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Minutes/Report of:</th>
<th>General subject of each matter to be considered</th>
<th>Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter</th>
<th>Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>Report of Ken Stevenson (Roading Manager and Joanne McBride (Civil Projects Team Leader))</td>
<td>West Kaiapoi New Arterial Road Update</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>Report of Ric Barber (Development Manager, Project Delivery Unit)</td>
<td>Contract 16/57 Wastewater renewals 2016/2019 tender award</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Reason for protection of interests</th>
<th>Ref NZS 9202:2003 Appendix A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.1 and 9.2</td>
<td>Protection of privacy of natural persons To carry out commercial activities without prejudice</td>
<td>A2(a) A2(b)ii</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CARRIED**

**CLOSED MEETING**

**Resolution to resume in Open Meeting**

Moved Councillor Brine seconded Mayor Ayers

**THAT** open meeting resumes and the business discussed with the public excluded remains public excluded, except for the resolution for Item 9.2 be made public.

**CARRIED**
9.2 **Contract 16/57 Wastewater renewals 2016/2019 tender award report – Ric Barber (Development Manager, Project Delivery Unit)**

Moved Councillor Meyer seconded Councillor Brine

THAT the Utilities and Roading Committee:

(a) **Receives** report No 161025109626

(b) **Accepts** the tender price of $74,863.96 from Interflow NZ Ltd. for the three year rates based Contract 16/57 Wastewater Renewals 2016-2019.

(c) **Notes** that this project is funded from the Eastern District Sewer Scheme pipeline replacement budgets and that there is remaining budget available of $430,000 in 2016/17 and then $635,000 for the two subsequent years of the three year contract.

(d) **Notes** that the quantity of renewal works undertaken within Contract 16/57 will be adjusted each year to fit within the budgeted sum of $635,000 per year for 2016/17, 2017/18, and 2018/19.

(e) **Notes** that this report is being considered as Public Excluded as it contains commercially sensitive information.

(f) **Notes** that in accordance with the Conditions of Tendering, all tenderers will be advised of the name and price of the successful tenderer, and the range and number of tenders received.

(g) **Circulates** this report to Council “in committee” for its information.

(h) **Resolves** that the recommendations in this report be made publically available but that the contents remain Public Excluded.

CARRIED

**OPEN MEETING**

10 **QUESTIONS**

There were no questions

11 **URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS**

There was no urgent general business.

Being no further business, the meeting closed at 6.15pm

CONFIRMED

________________________________________________________________________
Chairman

________________________________________________________________________
Date
STAFF BRIEFING

At the conclusion of the meeting there was a staff briefing to discuss:

- Drinking Water Standards, Chlorination and Source Upgrade Updates – Colin Roxburgh (Water Asset Manager)
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE COMMUNITY AND RECREATION COMMITTEE HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA, ON TUESDAY 13 DECEMBER 2016 AT 1.00PM

PRESENT

Councillor P Allen (Chairperson), Councillors A Blackie, R Brine, W Doody and D Gordon

IN ATTENDANCE

Councillor J Meyer, P Williams, S Stewart (from 1.20pm)
Messrs J Palmer (Chief Executive), C Sargison (Manager Community and Recreation), C Brown (Community Green Space Manager), Ms T Brough (Dudley Park Aquatic Centre Manager), Mrs P Ashbey (Libraries Manager), Mrs T Sturley (Community Team Leader) and Mrs A Smith (Committee Advisor).

1. APOLOGIES

An apology was received and sustained from Mayor D Ayers.

2. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Councillors Doody and Gordon noted as Trustees of the North Canterbury Sport and Recreation Trust.

3. RECEIPT OF MINUTES

3.1. Minutes of a meeting of the Community and Recreation Committee held on Tuesday 16 August 2016

Moved Councillor Brine seconded Councillor Gordon

THAT the Community and Recreation Committee:

(a) Receives for information the minutes of a meeting of the Community and Recreation Committee held on Tuesday 16 August 2016.

CARRIED

4. MATTERS ARISING

There were no matters arising.

5. PRESENTATION / DELEGATION

Mr Chris Prickett spoke to the Committee on the future of hockey in the district and region. An apology was tendered for the presentation from Mrs Batchelor from the Rangiora Hockey Club. Mr Prickett read a letter from Mrs Batchelor, expressing thanks to the Council for the hockey turf facility on Coldstream Road. This is due to be opened in February 2017. There is a great deal of excitement with local club members about the facility, and the prospect of teams coming from Christchurch to play and train on the turf. Mr Prickett noted that the ability of teams to get game and
training time on facilities in Christchurch has been very difficult with the popularity of the sport. It was advised that a hockey season is 20 weeks long, and there would be up to 200 players and supporters at the facility each of these weekends. It is envisaged that the popularity of hockey is set to increase in coming years. With this in mind, Mr Prickett suggested that the Council may want to keep a watch over the patronage of the new facility and to consider setting a threshold for having a second turf facility in the district in the future. Mr Prickett believes this turf will be well patronised and a second turf would need to be considered in the future.

The Chairperson thanked Mr Prickett for attending.

6. REPORTS

6.1. Coldstream Road Hockey Turf Operational Management – Chris Brown (Community Green Space Manager)

Mr Chris Brown presented this report, seeking approval of the operational management of the new Coldstream Road Hockey Turf facility. This is considered to be the best way to manage the turf facility and there have been discussions with both Canterbury Hockey and the local hockey clubs. Mr Brown highlighted the outcome of discussions between these organisations, Council Staff and the Sports Trust.

The artificial turf would need to be replaced every ten years and the safety surface underneath every 20 years. It is proposed the $33,000 per annum for user charges, would cover the cost of replacement of these over a ten year period.

The establishment of an advisory group is proposed with the groups terms of reference coming back to this committee for approval.

Councillor Allen asked with regard to user charges for facilities in Christchurch, Mr Brown advised that currently they are slightly more than is proposed for this facility.

With regard to the Advisory Group, Mr Brown said it is proposed that this group will be the best forum for discussion if Clubs wish to get more time of using the turf.

Councillor Doody asked if the pine needles falling on the field from the trees between the field and Manpower Oval would be an issue. Mr Brown noted that Delta will be clearing the fields of these. These trees have been inspected by arborists and are not considered a safety risk and provide a suitable barrier between this facility and the Mainpower Oval cricket facility.

Councillor Brine questioned the Council being responsible for cleaning the pavilion. Mr Brown said the cleaning would primarily be of the toilets, and users of the facilities will be expected to clean the facilities after they have used them.

Councillor Gordon asked regarding the naming rights of the ground. Mr Brown advised that it is expected that any proposals will come back to the Committee. Advertising hoardings facing the inside of the turf, would be granted, as they are at Kendall Park, Oxford Oval, Dudley Park and at Gladstone Park. These are all sources of funding.
Moved Councillor Brine seconded Councillor Doody

THAT the Community and Recreation Committee:

(a) **Receives** report No. 161201124094

(b) **Approves** the North Canterbury Sport and Recreation Trust managing the bookings for the Coldstream Road Hockey Turf including competition and training for clubs and schools.

(c) **Approves** the North Canterbury Sport and Recreation Trust setting the user charges for the turf noting that initial charges for competition and club training have already been discussed and agreed with Canterbury Hockey and the two local Hockey Clubs and that user charges cannot be in excess of charges levied in Christchurch for comparable facilities.

(d) **Approves** a total value of $33,000 plus GST per annum being recovered from the North Canterbury Sport and Recreation Trust which will cover the cost of turf and shock pad replacement over a ten year period.

(e) **Approves** any money over and above the initial $33,000 received through user charges being retained by the North Canterbury Sport and Recreation Trust.

(f) **Approves** the North Canterbury Sport and Recreation Trust, Hinemoa / Kaiapoi Hockey Club and Rangiora Hockey Club selling naming rights / signage boards to be located on the fence inside the turf. Naming rights to be subject to the Community and Recreation Committees confirmation.

(g) **Notes** that the proceeds from the any advertising will remain with the Club or Trust that has organised the advertising and that any advertising must first be approved by the Community Green Space Manager before it is erected.

(h) **Approves** the cost of power which will primarily be in the usage of field lights being split 50/50 between the Council and the North Canterbury Sport and Recreation Trust.

(i) **Notes** that a report will come to the February meeting of the Community and Recreation Committee recommending the establishment of an Advisory Group, including Terms of Reference, for the Coldstream Road Hockey Turf which will consist of user group representatives Council staff and the Council Green Space Portfolio holder.

CARRIED

Councillor Brine spoke on the process that Council had undertaken prior to the installation of the first artificial turf facility in the district at Kendall Park. There were options for locations that were considered during this process. The facility at Kendall Park is a multi-use turf. Councillor Brine suggested he would not be surprised if the local Hockey Clubs come back to speak to the Council in the future, seeking another field. The Coldstream Road Hockey facility will be a major benefit to the district. Councillor Brine noted the proposal for the Council and North Canterbury Sport Trust to have a 50/50 responsibility for the payment for the cost of power at this facility. It was suggested that Clubs who use lighting at other Council owned facilities,
may come to the Council seeking a similar arrangement. Councillor Brine congratulated the Hockey Clubs for advocating as strongly as they did and recalled his disappointment at the time the first turf was installed, that it had not been a hockey turf.

Community Facilities, Aquatic Centres, Libraries and Museums

6.2. Aquatic Facilities Update - Tina Brough (Dudley Park Aquatic Centre Manager)

Ms Brough presented this report with a summary of the aquatic facilities year to date, which included an updated summary of aquatic facilities attendances and budget results for the 2016/17 financial year.

All water testing undertaken at the aquatic facilities for the July to November period met or exceed the New Zealand and PoolSafe standards.

Ms Brough extended an invitation to any members who wished to have a tour of the aquatic facilities, noting that Councillor Williams had been for a tour of the Dudley Park facility yesterday.

There has been a change table installed for any users of the facility with physical disabilities. There was discussion on the new hoist proposed to be installed at Dudley Aquatic Centre, which has been discussed previously by the committee. It was advised that the initial quote received for a hoist was $11,000, but this was some time ago. Mr Sargison added that there are new designs available now, which are much more mobile and versatile than the hoist currently in place. A report will be brought to the February 2017 committee meeting to update on this.

Moved Councillor Doody seconded Councillor Gordon

THAT the Community and Recreation Committee:

(a) Receives report No. 161202124483

(b) Notes the Aquatic Facilities year to date achievement against key performance indicators

(c) Notes the 2016/17 financial year customer service initiatives/improvements implemented during the July to November period.

CARRIED

Councillor Allen took the opportunity to convey thanks from the Waimakariri Access Group for the service they receive from staff at the district aquatic centre. These comments will be passed on to the aquatic centres staff.

Councillor Doody supports the funding being available for the new hoist to be installed.

6.3. Library Update – Phillippa Ashbey (Libraries Manager)

Mrs Ashbey presented this report, which provides an overview of the partnerships that the Waimakariri Libraries participate in. These partnerships are both at a national level and also regional and local levels. Together they aid in providing an improved service to customers of the districts libraries.
Mrs Ashbey advised that there will be a function this evening to acknowledge and thank the volunteers who support the library staff during the year. There has also been a separate function held for the 12 volunteers who provide support at the Oxford Library. Elected members have been invited to this function to thank the volunteers for their work during the year.

Following a question from Councillor Doody on the Learning to Read Challenges. Mrs Ashbey advised that all of the challenges are done independently, for people to work through over the summer. With the supporting resources available through the Library website and the updated Reading Challenge cards, it is hoped that this will encourage children (and adults) to continue reading throughout the summer.

Mrs Ashbey advised that there is not specifically developed library resources for migrants but there is a new format in publishing available, which is called a “book shot”, a complete novel in 120 pages. These have just been released in the last six months and the library is buying these when they become available. This is more exciting than the old style reader that used to be for people approaching English for the first time. These books can be read in one session by people whose English is a second language. Library staff are available to liaise with customers on their different levels of their reading.

Moved Councillor Gordon seconded Councillor Doody

THAT the Community and Recreation Committee:

(a) Receives report No. 161202124415
(b) Notes the partnerships that the Waimakariri Libraries participate in.
(c) Notes the high level of customer service that is achieved through collaboration with other agencies.
(d) Circulates the report to the Boards for their information.

CARRIED

At the Woodend-Sefton Community Board meeting last night, members commented favourably about the computer facilities and relevant IT training available at the libraries in our district. These are well used and are a valuable service provided by the libraries, especially for the sections of the community who do not have computers at home.

6.4. Airfield Operations Update – Craig Sargison (Manager Community and Recreation)

Mr Sargison presented this report on airfield operations, noting that it is intended to have this as a regular item at future Community and Recreation committee agendas. Attached to the report is the review from Astral Consultants on a Safety Risk and CAA Compliance Review. This review looked at safety, risk and CAA Compliance. With regard to risk the report noted that the infrastructure provides for safe operations at the airfield and recommended implementation of a safety management plan to further reduce risk. Key actions have been agreed by the Airfield Advisory Group and staff and many of these already implemented. There are now two Councillors on the Rangiora Airfield Advisory Group and the improved reporting is designed to meet some of these requirements.
Moved Councillor Gordon seconded Councillor Blackie

**THAT** the Community and Recreation Committee:

(a) **Receives** report No. 161130123539.

(b) **Notes** the recommendations of the Astral report and the update on actions that have been taken towards implementation

(c) **Notes** that an update report on the Airfield will be prepared for each meeting of the Community and Recreation Committee

**CARRIED**

**Community Development**

6.5. **Community Team Annual Report 2015/2016 – Tessa Sturley (Community Team Leader)**

Mrs Sturley presented this report with an overview of the community team annual report for 2015/16. The Community Team facilitated over 30 groups for the community and it was noted that many of these groups now operate and function without input from the Council.

Mrs Sturley noted that one of the highlights for this year has been the increased engagement with the business community. This more closely aligns the business and the community, including youth development. There has also been support provided to the migrant community in the district, including welcoming newcomers and informing them about opportunities in the area.

Moved Councillor Brine seconded Councillor Doody

**THAT** the Community and Recreation Committee:

a) **Receives** report No 161130123833

**CARRIED**

6.6. **Community Team Update – Tessa Sturley (Community Team Leader)**

Mrs Sturley presented this report, providing an update on key community development, community safety and your development objectives and activities in October and November 2016. As in the recommendation, the intention of the Youth Council to apply for funding from Rata Foundation to fund WAIYouth initiatives was noted.

Mrs Sturley noted the successes in acquiring funding for various groups.

Following a question from Councillor Doody, Mrs Sturley advised that the attendances at the recent meetings held in the district, on family violence, that Lesley Elliot spoke at, totalled 280 people.

Moved Councillor Allen seconded Councillor Gordon

**THAT** the Community and Recreation Committee:
a) Receives report No 161124121223

b) Notes that Youth Council has approved the intention to apply to Rata Foundation for $19,091 to fund WAIYouth initiatives aimed at empowering and connecting young people across the District.

c) Notes that Rata Foundation has granted $25,000 for costs associated with the facilitation of a community-led approach to addressing local issues related to Community Safety.

CARRIED

Councillor Allen acknowledged the success of the funding applications that the community team have been involved in, noting the considerable work that is involved in preparing these funding applications. Councillor Allen also acknowledged the work that had been carried out in clarifying roles and leadership development in the Youth Council.

At this time, Mr Palmer acknowledged the work that Mrs Sturley had undertaken and the contribution of the whole team involved with supporting both Hurunui and Kaikoura Districts following the recent earthquakes. The work was a huge credit to all those involved, including the successful operation of the Welfare Centre at Woodend.

7. PORTFOLIO UPDATES

7.1. Greenspace (Parks Reserves and Sports Grounds) – Cr Robbie Brine

Councillor Brine had recently attended a briefing on Koura Reserve.

7.2. Community Facilities (including Aquatic Centres, Halls, Libraries and Museums) – Cr Wendy Doody

Councillor Doody advised that the Ashley Gorge caretakers house has been quite badly damaged and they have had to move into two caravans. The Council has been given a portacom to use as a shop. The house had asbestos and this caused some difficulties. The house is being repaired and they can now use the basement and hope to get back into the house in June or July. They have had a considerable loss of income but it is pleasing to note that the facility is fully booked for the upcoming holiday period.

There is a meeting this evening at the Mandeville Sports Club and Councillor Doody noted that there have been four break-ins there recently. There has been TVs stolen and the Club are considering approaching the Council to get the gates padlocked. Members are very concerned about what is happening.

The proprietors of the Waikuku Beach Holiday Park have invited Councillors to visit and view their facilities.

Following on from this, Councillor Gordon requested a briefing from staff on the current camping facilities in the district and also for members to go on site visits. Having recently visited Waikuku Beach Holiday Park, Councillor Gordon suggested that it needs some serious investment and the owners have challenges of investing into these facilities when they don’t own the facility. Mr Sargison and Mr Palmer responded that there has been a nominal sum put aside as part of the annual plan budget, which may lead to more conversation on the issues and concerns with regard to camping grounds.
7.3. **Community Development and Wellbeing – Crs Peter Allen and Wendy Doody**

Councillor Allen noted that it is still to be confirmed which areas he and Councillor Doody will each cover as part of this Portfolio.

8. **QUESTIONS**

There were no questions.

9. **URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS**

There was no urgent general business.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 2.35pm.

CONFIRMED

__________________________________________
Chairperson

__________________________________________
Date

---

**BRIEFING**

At the conclusion of the meeting, Craig Sargison conducted a briefing to discuss Indoor Court Facilities.
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE AUDIT AND RISK COMMITTEE HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA, ON TUESDAY 13 DECEMBER 2016 AT 4:00PM

PRESENT

Deputy Mayor K Felstead (Chairperson), Mayor D Ayers (to 5.30pm) Councillors N Atkinson, A Blackie, S Stewart and P Williams

IN ATTENDANCE

Councillors W Doody (to 5.20pm), P Allen (to 5.27pm) Messrs J Palmer (Chief Executive), J Millward (Manager Finance and Business Support), P Christensen (Finance Manager), Mrs L Ashton (Human Resources Manager), Ms C Brown (Health and Safety Coordinator), Mr G Meadows (Policy Manager), and Mrs A Smith (Committee Advisor).

1. APOLOGIES

Moved Councillor Blackie seconded Councillor Williams

THAT apologies for absence from Councillor Atkinson and for early departure from Mayor Ayers be received and sustained.

CARRIED

2. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

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

3. RECEIPT OF MINUTES

3.1 Minutes of a meeting of the Audit Committee held on Tuesday 20 September 2016

Moved Deputy Mayor Felstead seconded Councillor Blackie

THAT the Audit and Risk Committee

(a) Receives for information, the minutes of a meeting of the Audit Committee held on 20 September 2016.

CARRIED

4. MATTERS ARISING

There were no matters arising.

5. PRESENTATION/DEPUTATION

There were no presentations.
6. **REPORTS**

6.1 **Audit New Zealand Management Report for the year ended 30 June 2016 - Jeff Millward (Manager Finance and Business Support)**

Mr Millward presented this report, advising members that there are two audits conducted annually, an interim audit and the final audit report for the year ended. This provides a number of recommendations that the council staff should take on board and put in place in readiness for the next audit.

Mr John Mackey Director of Audit New Zealand was present and noted that an unmodified audit opinion was issued. The audit fee was noted and that this would need to be discussed at a later date.

Committee members were asked if they were aware of any actual fraud within the Council, and members all confirmed that they were not aware of any actual fraud within the Council.

Being the appointed Auditor of several Trusts associated with the Council, Mr Mackey suggested that any new Trusts that the Council may be considering establishing, could be amalgamated into a current trust (referring to the Art in Public Places). This would be the recommended option, rather than setting up another Trust which would need to be audited and administered. Mr Millward advised this new Trust is still in the early stages of formation and this is a possibility that could be discussed when this matter will be reported back to the committee at a future meeting.

Moved Deputy Mayor Felstead seconded Councillor Blackie

THAT the Audit and Risk Committee

(a) **Receives** report No 161125121595

(b) **Receives** Audit New Zealand’s Management Report for the year ending 30 June 2016;

(c) **Notes** there are no significant matters arising from the management letter. Audit New Zealand have made a number of recommendations where systems and reporting could be improved and these improvements have been made or programmed to be done.

CARRIED

6.2 **Promotion of Waimakariri District – 2015/16 Annual Report – Simon Markham (Manager Strategy and Engagement)**

Mr Markham introduced this report and advised for the information of new committee members, that each year the Council agrees a draft plan for district promotions and this is the annual report against that. There are two other elements of district promotion, being capacity grants and event grants to the three promotions associations for Oxford, Kaiapoi and Rangiora. The capacity grants allow the groups to operate and the event grants are a dedicated grant to allow the organisations to put on an annual Christmas event in the respective towns. Mrs Heather Warwick (Enterprise North Canterbury Chief Executive) and Mr Nick Harris (Enterprise North Canterbury Chair). Mrs Warwick spoke to a PowerPoint
presentation summarising an overview of the work streams of Enterprise North Canterbury in both Waimakariri and Hurunui Districts over the past 12 months. 50% of the budget for Enterprise North Canterbury is Council funded and 50% is private or project funded. Information on the sources of funding were provided showing an increase of 15% on the budget. The private funding portion is up considerably this year, due to the Business Awards function, which is a $100,000 event, there has been significant business attraction and visitor attraction promotion undertaken in Christchurch and also income from the Business and Information Centre.

The work of the Business Support face of the organisation was highlighted, with 120 free business capability assessments being undertaken, with funding of approximately 70% coming from NZ Trade and Enterprise and the rest from the Council Grants. The target was 55, so the figure was well over this. Free business resources are offered to start up businesses on the website.

The presentation included a video from Chris Bailey, of Rangiora Vets, who have engaged in many of the services offered by Enterprise North Canterbury, including entering the Business Awards (winning their category), received some funding for research and development and attend networking functions. Mr Bailey said that the support received from Enterprise North Canterbury has been a significant boost for their business and improved service to clients.

The North Canterbury Business Awards were held this year, and this was a very successful event, with 60 business’s entering and over 350 people attending the gala awards dinner at Ohoka School Hall. These awards are held every two years.

Mrs Warwick provided information on the training days that have been conducted throughout the year and the networking functions which are fully sponsored. The training calendar for the coming year has been set up.

ENC has this year employed some media and website assistance in the form of two part time staff and this is working well increasing the engagement with the public. There has been a 56% increase in the number of visits to the website, and there is good newsletters and media releases which are getting good feedback. Good information is getting out to the public on what ENC do. The Business Centre has now been open exactly a year in Kaiapoi, with good results in the use of the facilities at the Centre, with new and repeat business. It provides the community with a professional meeting place and quite a few external trainers are using it as well. The sponsors are to be thanked for this, providing $75,000 per year, which are signed up for the next three years. The I-site has a much higher profile now it is in the new building and has had an increase in commissions in the past 12 months.

Regarding events over the past year, these have been strong and contested, with 25 applications received requesting $62,000 and 17 successful for funding grants totalling $41,000. Through the Visit Waimakariri website, it was advised that there have been over 900 events promoted throughout the past 12 months.

Waimakariri District is above both Hurunui and Kaikoura Districts as far as visitor spend figures go. The district has been promoted through The Press full page advertising spreads, as well as leaflet drops in Christchurch. Social Media is being well utilised by Enterprise North
Canterbury. ENC also had a stand at the Canterbury A&P Show in November, with an estimated 5,000 visitors over the three days.

Mrs Warwick provided an update on current commercial space available around the district, specifically in Rangiora and Kaiapoi, noting the commercial/industrial lots for sale in Ravenswood are popular for owner/operators, as these are the only sites available to be purchased in the district. Any other sites are for lease only.

An update on the support being provided to the Hurunui District following the November earthquakes was provided.

Mrs Warwick concluded with thanking the Council for the continued foundation support for Enterprise North Canterbury.

Councillor Stewart asked if the information provided by ENC could be provided as base data, rather than percentages.

Councillor Williams questioned the spend to the Council of $600,000 and would like to know what businesses have established in the District as a direct result of the work of ENC. Mrs Warwick noted that ENC works in partnership with, and has both Ravenswood and Wai-Zone on its website and includes them in the newsletters. Councillor Williams said he would like to see what ENC have been doing for the community rather than mentioning what other people have been doing for other businesses. Mrs Warwick noted that ENC has a website and produces newsletters and sometimes a new business setting up in the district doesn’t come back directly through ENC. (noting that the PGG Wrightson is not a good example). Councillor Williams has concerns that businesses could be setting up in the district whether ENC were involved or not and he would like to see direct results on paper rather than assumptions. Mr Harris noted that the $600,000 is not used solely for the promotion of new business to the district. Councillor Williams would like to see what new businesses are in the district as a direct result of work of ENC and Mrs Warwick will provide this information via email.

Councillor Stewart suggested it would be advantageous for members to be able to view the two monthly reports that are presented at the meetings which the Council appointees attend (Mayor Ayers and Mr Palmer). Rather than having just a six monthly report or annual report, Councillor Stewart asked if it was possible to receive this information. Mr Palmer said the agenda and minutes from the Boards six board meetings per year could be made available, in addition to the annual report as presented here. It was agreed that this information would be made available to all members. Mr Harris noted the current reporting is on the timelines that have been set down, and suggested he considered that the information could be available through the two representatives from the Council. Mr Harris also noted that the $600,000 grant from the Council is not just about attracting business to the district, there are lot of other things that this money meets.

Following a question from Deputy Mayor Felstead regarding event funding, Mrs Warwick explained that sometimes grants are approved in the March round of funding but the events aren’t held until after July, and are still to be uplifted. With the contestable fund, sometimes an event is cancelled and the money then goes back into the fund, or there are times when a grant cannot be justified by the invoices showing for money spent. Mrs Warwick said this fund is well subscribed.
Moved Mayor Ayers seconded Deputy Mayor Felsted

THAT the Audit and Risk Committee

(a) **Receives** report No 161201124351

(b) **Notes** the report against goals in the adopted District Visitor Strategy set out in the 2015/16 District Promotions Business Plan report. (Doc. No. 161130123825)

(c) **Circulates** this report to all Community Boards

CARRIED

Mayor Ayers thanked Enterprise North Canterbury for the work they do in district promotion. This work supports the promotion of all of Canterbury. It was noted the current situation with Hurunui and Kaikoura Districts dealing with post-earthquake and the effects on their visitor numbers. Although Waimakaririr doesn’t have an iconic tourist attraction, the graph figures show that there has still been a significant number of visitors to the district.

6.3 **Annual Report for Enterprise North Canterbury for the year ended 30 June 2016 – Jeff Millward (Manager Finance and Business Support)**

Mr Millward spoke to this report which presents the Enterprise North Canterbury Annual Report for the year ended 30 June 2016, as noted in the Statement of Intent. This is an audited report which comes with the measures that a reported against by ENC. This shows that the Trust has made good progress in achieving the performance measures.

Moved Mayor Ayers seconded Deputy Mayor Felsted

THAT the Audit and Risk Committee

(a) **Receives** report No 161125121846.

(b) **Receives** the Annual Report of Enterprise North Canterbury for the year ended 30 June 2016;

(c) **Acknowledges** the work carried out by Enterprise North Canterbury over the year and thanks the Trustees and staff for their efforts;

(d) **Circulates** the report to the Boards.

CARRIED

In relation to business promotion, Mayor Ayers commented that one day several years ago, Rangiora lost the Farmers, and it was ENC that brought them back. Mrs Warwick added that ENC have also attracted Winnie Bagoes to Rangiora, noting that the role of ENC is as much about attracting business as landing new business.
6.4 **Annual Report of Te Kohaka o Tuhaitara Trust for the year ended 30 June 2016 – Jeff Millward (Manager Finance and Business Support)**

Mr Jeff Millward presented the report for the Te Kohaka o Tuhaitara Trust which is one of the Council controlled organisations. The Council appoints three of the six trustees to this Trust. Mr Greg Byrnes, the Trust General Manager was present and noted an apology from the Chairperson of the Trust Catherine McMillan.

The Trust continues to work with different groups in the community, and Mr Byrnes highlighted the successful planting day with members of the Canterbury University’s Student Volunteer Army.

Mr Byrnes noted there was a deficit of $15,000 but also was pleased to report for the first time in just over six years since he has worked for the Trust, that it was not necessary to use any of the investment funds during the year. This money is set aside for maintenance work at Tutaipatu Lagoon, and to fund a percentage of the depreciation.

There is a strong relationship with the Trust and the University of Canterbury. Have been working for two years on the possibility of having a field research station based at Tuhaitara. It has been confirmed that the Kaikoura Research station will not be rebuilt and a cost analysis has been undertaken on having a centre at Tuhaitara. This would be a huge benefit to have this relationship with a tertiary institution and would mean being nationally, and possibly internationally, recognised as a centre of excellence for the restoration and rehabilitation of coastal environment.

Mr Byrne provided an update on the project to relocate Canterbury mudfish into the Park and the success of this.

Councillors were extended an invitation to visit the Park to see first-hand the work that the Trust had been undertaking.

Regarding arson attacks, Mr Byrne advised that there has been the first arson attack of the summer, noting that over the past two summers there have been over 20 deliberately lit fires. These have been primarily at Pines Beach. There has been investment of trail cameras which are out all the time. Regarding vehicles on the track, Deputy Mayor Felstead asked if there had been any improvement since the review of the Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw this year Mr Byrnes thinks the situation has improved, with good relationships between the Council, Ecan and the Trust. There are volunteer rangers who are out and about which are very helpful. There will be a high presence of people on the trust land over the summer period including himself, volunteers and Ecan rangers making sure people are well educated.

Mayor Ayers asked if there had been any developments regarding the Trust taking over the management of the Kaiapoi Pa site. Mr Byrnes advised that there has been discussions on this matter. The Residential Red Zone Recovery Plan, which is signed off today, includes positive implications for the Te kohaka o Tuhaitara Trust, with the inclusion of land and Pines and Kairaki. The Trust has also been discussions with Todd Group of Pegasus and the Council around the ECMA (Eastern Conservation Management Area) and during these conversations the western area came up, including the Pa site. One of the holdups for this site has been the appointment of Trustees. These have now been appointed and signed off in the Maori Land Court. Mr Byrnes understands
that this has occurred or is occurring very soon. It is still his understanding that the Trust will be heavily involved with management and maintenance of the Kaiapoi site.

Moved Councillor Stewart seconded Councillor Blackie

THAT the Audit and Risk Committee

(a) Receives report No 161125121596
(b) Receives the Annual Report for Te Kōhaka o Tūhautara Trust for the year ended 30 June 2016;
(c) Acknowledges the work carried out by the Trust and thanks the Trustee’s and General Manager for their efforts;
(d) Circulates the report to the Boards.

CARRIED

Councillor Stewart believes the Trust is a great success story, and supports the continued financial and non-financial assistance to the Trust. Mr Byrnes extended thanks for the support he gets from a number of Council staff members he has regular contact with. The non-financial support is also very important in Mr Byrnes role.

Mayor Ayers suggested that the Council should be looking at the western conservation area along with the Kaiapoi Pa site due to the cultural significance of these areas. Mr Byrnes noted the acknowledgement of the cultural significance on these sites and suggests that this has to be recognised in both these sites.

6.5 Outcomes of the WDC Health and Safety Risk Register Review October 2016 – Charlotte Brown (Health and Safety Advisor)

Ms Charlotte Brown spoke to this report which presented the outcomes of the Council’s review of the Health and Safety Risk Register and the associated action plan for high-risk and/or high consequence activities. Background information was advised to the committee on the process undertaken to date. Ms Brown noted that there has been an increase in the control measures put in place which has meant some risks have been reclassified.

Moved Councillor Williams seconded Mayor Ayers

THAT the Audit and Risk Committee:

(a) Receives report No 161118118811,
(b) Reviews the outcomes of the WDC Health and Safety Risk Register Review October 2016,
(c) Notes the format for the associated action plan for high risk activities, and
(d) Notes next steps for implementation of actions.

CARRIED
6.6 Outcomes of Worksafe vs Ministry of Social Development Case and Implications for Waimakariri District Council – Liz Ashton (Human Resources Manager)

L Ashton and C Brown presented this report which looks at proposing security reviews of all Waimakariri District Council client-facing sites, following the Ministry of Social Development (MSD) shooting event at the Ashburton WINZ office.

Mayor Ayers noted there are a lot of places where Council staff are close to the public, and levels of predictability. Ms Ashton noted there is a property alert system which is now in place, with feedback from staff about places where there could potentially be a safety issue. More staff are using this system now.

Following a question from Councillor Blackie, on a zero tolerance policy. Ms Ashton noted some customer facing staff have been on specialised aggression de-escalation training, helping people to assess good judgement. It is hoped that the site security review assessments from the professionals will provide guidance on this matter.

Councillor Allen asked if there is any consideration given to the role of Councillors in relation to protection. Ms Ashton advised that at the moment it is a physical site security review that is being undertaken. Mr Palmer noted that elected members protection and wellbeing also needs to be considered and this may require some further discussion. There are times when elected members have to deal with aggressive and aggrieved residents. Ms Brown spoke on the de-escalation training that has been provided to staff, and the favourable feedback from participants who have attended this course. There is potential for the availability of this training to be extended.

Moved Councillor Blackie seconded Deputy Mayor Felstead

THAT the Audit and Risk Committee

a) Receives report No 161118118947,

b) Reviews the outcomes of the WorkSafe vs Ministry of Social Development case, and

c) Notes a security risk review of all Waimakariri District Council sites where employees are exposed to the hazard of client-initiated assault or aggression will be completed as outlined in this report.

d) Notes a review of other Ministry of Social Development recommendations will be considered once the security risk reviews have been completed.

CARRIED
6.7 **Local Government Act 2002 Section 17A Service Reviews – Geoff Meadows (Policy Manager)**

Mr Meadows presented to this report and the Section 17A Service Review, part of the Local Government Act. This Section looks at the cost effectiveness of services and the Council has a fairly detailed cost effectiveness review programme for 2016/17. There are three Section 17A reviews considered with this report. These are 3 Waters Information, Design and Delivery; 3 Waters System Maintenance and Development and Legal Services. These three reports are for this calendar year and there are number of reports still to be undertaken for the fiscal year.

Moved Deputy Mayor Felstead seconded Councillor Blackie

**THAT** the Audit and Risk Committee:

(a) **Receives** Report (TRIM No: 161128122136).

(b) **Receives** 2016/17 Section 17A Review Schedule (TRIM No: 160517045212).

(c) **Approves** the attached S17A Service Reviews for 3 Waters Information, Design and Delivery, 3 Waters System Maintenance and Development and Legal Services.

(d) **Confirms** no further S17A Service Review is required for up to six years for 3 Waters System Maintenance and Development, and Legal Services.

(e) **Agrees** that a further review of 3 Waters Information, Design and Delivery, be carried out in 2020.

CARRIED

6.8 **Non-Financial Performance Measures 1st Quarter result as at 30 September 2016 – Maria Edgar (Corporate Planner)**

Mr Meadows presented this report on behalf of Ms Edgar, noting that the Council is moving to a new system for non-financial performance quarterly reporting. This is the first quarter of the new system, but at this stage the reporting is still in some cases from the spreadsheet system. Mr Meadows advised that by the end of the second quarter, Council will be in a much better position to use the new system for non-financial quarterly performance reporting.

Moved Deputy Mayor Felstead seconded Councillor Williams

**THAT** the Audit and Risk Committee:

(a) **Receives** report no. EXC-08-03/161201123870 Non-Financial Performance Measures 1st Quarter Result as at 30 September 2016.

(b) **Notes** 65% of performance measures for the 1st Quarter were achieved and 32% have been almost met or it is too early to predict year end results at this stage of the financial year.
6.9 Capital Projects Report for the period ended 30 September 2016 – Paul Christensen (Finance Manager)

Mr Christensen presented this report on capital project expenditure to the end of September 2016. At the end of this quarter there were 218 projects that were considered on time, out of 260 projects that are undergoing. In monetary terms, there has been $21.7m spent on projects in progress, of which $7m has been spent this year, and $14m was carried forward from last year.

Moved Councillor Blackie seconded Councillor Williams

THAT the Audit and Risk Committee:

(a) Receives report No. 161114116589;
(b) Circulates report to the Boards

CARRIED

6.10 Financial Report for the period ended 30 September 2016 – Paul Christensen (Finance Manager)

Mr Christensen presented this report with the financial report for the period ended 30 September 2016. Three main points were noted:

- The surplus at the end of the quarter was $3.2m. The Council surplus is $1.8m better than the budget, which is a combination of revenue above budget and expenditure $500,000 under budget. Revenue included a special Transwaste dividend that the Council received which was not budgeted for.

- External loans are at $90m. At the same time last year this was $95m. There has not been any more debt raised this quarter.

- The Capital spent, as outlined in the previous report is $21.7m.

Mr Millward provided background information on the recommendation to Council on the Transwaste Canterbury dividend to be applied to the Earthquake Loan Rate account. An alternative to this option, is that any dividend would go to the general rates. This dividend comes from earthquake activity.

Moved Councillor Blackie seconded Councillor Williams

THAT the Audit and Risk Committee

(a) Receives report no. 161114116574

(b) Approves the special dividend received from Transwaste Canterbury to be applied to the Earthquake Loan Rate account, to be used to offset the Earthquake Loan.

CARRIED
7. **PORTFOLIO UPDATES**

7.1 **Audit, Risk, Long Term Plan and Excellence Programme – Deputy Mayor Kevin Felstead**

Deputy Mayor Felstead had nothing.

7.2 **Communications – Councillor Neville Atkinson**

Councillor Atkinson was not present.

8. **QUESTIONS**

There were no questions.

9. **URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS**

There was no urgent general business.

10. **MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED WITH THE PUBLIC EXCLUDED**

*Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987*

Moved Deputy Mayor Felstead Seconded Councillor Blackie

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Minutes/Report of:</th>
<th>General subject of each matter to be considered</th>
<th>Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter</th>
<th>Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>Minutes of the public excluded portion of a meeting of the Audit Committee of 20 September 2016</td>
<td>Receipt of minutes for information.</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Reason for protection of interests</th>
<th>Ref NZS 9202:2003 Appendix A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
10.1 Protection of privacy of natural persons
To carry out commercial activities without prejudice

A2(a)
A2(b)ii

CARRIED

CLOSED MEETING

Resolution to Resume in Open Meeting

Moved Deputy Mayor Felstead seconded Councillor Blackie

THAT the open meeting resumes and the business discussed with the public excluded remains public excluded.

CARRIED

OPEN MEETING

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 5.40pm.

CONFIRMED

______________________
Chairperson

______________________
Date
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE OXFORD-OHOKA COMMUNITY BOARD HELD IN THE WEST EYERTON HALL, CORNER NORTH EYRE ROAD AND EARLYS ROAD, WEST EYRETON ON THURSDAY 8 DECEMBER 2016 AT 7PM.

PRESENT

D Nicholl (Chair), M Brown (Deputy Chair), W Doody, J Ensor, S Farrell, K Felstead, J Lynn, and T Robson.

IN ATTENDANCE

S Markham (Manager, Strategy and Engagement), K Graham (Journey Planner/Road Safety Coordinator), D Lewis (Construction Management Engineer), S Morrow (Land Information Officer), M McIlraith (Communications and Engagement Manager), K Ward (Community Board Advocate) and E Stubbs (Minute Secretary).

The meeting adjourned at 7.40 and recommenced at 7.43pm to allow members of the public to depart.

The meeting adjourned at 8.14pm for a workshop, resuming at 8.30pm.

D Nicholl welcomed the large public gallery (approximately 75 members of the public).

1 APOLOGIES

Nil.

2 BOARD MEMBER DECLARATION

The Chair invited member elect, M Brown, to read and sign the declaration form so concluding the oath taken by all elected members.

3 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Nil.

4 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

4.1 Minutes of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board – 3 November 2016

Moved S Farrell seconded W Doody

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) Confirms the minutes of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board meeting held 3 November 2016, having been circulated, as a true and accurate record.

CARRIED
5 DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

5.1 Bud Caldwell and Shaun Ryan (local residents), spoke to the Board regarding Ready Mix Concrete Limited’s proposed Isaac’s Road Quarry on behalf of the deputation organised by Michael Ducray. Mr Caldwell thanked the members of the public attending and stressed that he was representing a community of residents from Isaacs Road. This community had major concerns related to the proximity of the proposed quarry to their homes. He noted the location had been chosen due to the quality of materials, but questioned if this particular 50 hectares had better material than others.

Mr Caldwell noted that the quarry was being presented as small-medium sized, however he believed it was a large quarry that would be active for some time. It had proposed extensive hours of operation – well beyond that typically expected in a rural zone considering the location of lifestyle blocks. Residents had concerns regarding noise, dust, vehicle movements and light pollution. They were also concerned it would set a precedent for the entire rural area of Waimakariri.

Mr Ryan read a tabled Statement (Trim 161213128533) on behalf of concerned residents of Isaac Road, and noted that many of the objections raised had been upheld in favour of the community in other quarry locations in Canterbury. He was firmly of the opinion that the siting of the quarry would have a direct impact on residents and as such should go through a notified resource consent process.

K Felstead noted that the quarry application was an unprecedented one for the Waimakariri District Council (WDC). Mr Caldwell commented that they believed the application would be lodged the following week with the Council and Environment Canterbury (ECan); it was understood that there was limited information at present due to no official application being lodged.

J Lynn asked about the nature of engagement residents had with ReadyMix Concrete. Mr Caldwell advised that some residents of Issac Road had received a letter and there had been some ‘one-on-one’ meetings with the company. J Lynn queried whether there was the intention of having a more open community group meeting. Mr Caldwell advised that they had not been given that opportunity. The community would also like to meet with the landowners who had approached ReadyMix with regard to establishing a quarry.

Mr Caldwell commented that they understood the need for a quarry and did not object from that point of view, rather they were concerned with regard to the proximity of lifestyle blocks considering the landowner had a large holding. There was an opportunity to shift the quarry away from homes, which would probably remove most of the objections.

S Markham outlined the current position of the Council which was that they had not yet received a resource consent application and as such the information that the residents had was more than that of the Council. With respect a notified resource consent, the Board would have the right to make a submission.

Mr Ryan acknowledged the advice of S Markham and commented the community was not trying to stop the process of democracy; rather they wanted to ensure Council was fully aware of the level of community interest. He referred to the recent plastic factory development and residents’ concerns the upcoming quarry application would not be ‘swept under the carpet’. He requested that the terms and conditions of recent similar consents granted elsewhere be compared to what was proposed.

S Markham advised that he would indicate to those colleagues meeting with ReadyMix of the public turnout this evening and extent of concern.
There was some discussion from the public around the granting of the building consent for the Wrights Road Storage Dam prior to granting of land use consent and there was a request for that not to happen in this case. S Markham advised that there was a procedure to follow when a building consent application was lodged, and an obligation to process that application within a specified time frame.

There was a suggestion from the floor that Waimakariri Irrigation Ltd (WIL) and ReadyMix should work together to create a water storage facility from quarrying, thereby eliminating the need for a dam. D Nicholl advised on some of the difficulties of that process.

Mr Edge was invited by the Chair to comment from the public gallery. Mr Edge believed there was a bigger issue: a greater level of protection for lifestyle blocks is required and a District Plan change is needed to reflect that.

The meeting adjourned at 7.40 and recommenced at 7.43pm to allow members of the public to depart.

5.2 Kathy Graham (Journey Planner/Road Safety Coordinator) and Dan Lewis (Construction Management Engineer) spoke to the Board regarding the Urban Cycleways project. K Graham advised there were two main routes in the project - Rangiora to Kaiapoi and Rangiora to Woodend; both routes had been approved funding. The purpose of the presentation was to provide an overview for the Board and an opportunity to provide feedback. Public feedback had emphasised residents were keen to see connections between towns. Strategy priorities were to get communities active, connected, and provide a choice of transport modes.

S Markham observed that in the past there had been reasonably active walking and cycling investment, however reduced government subsidy through the New Zealand Transport Agency had resulted in, until recently, less funding for cycleways and more had gone into roading. The Urban Cycleways project was a response to community concern about this by the Government.

Although the project was focused on two routes outside the boundaries of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board area, K Graham explained there was a district-wide vision being designed in relation to walking and cycling. It was about creating a network and a safe recreation facility to encourage more people to cycle. The cycleways had to be built to a high standard with strict criteria to receive government funding.

There was some discussion relating to the specific location of the routes.

D Nicholl commented that it was a huge cost and cyclists were not contributing to the cost through fuel levies. D Lewis commented that this was a common comment that staff involved had encountered, yet most cyclists also owned a car. Evidence analysed had also shown in an urban environment, cyclists frequented shops more often than car drivers.

D Lewis advised that $1.4 million of funding had been approved through the Urban Cycleways Project. Construction estimates were currently being looked at. Part of the process was to inform the Community Board of funding and level of cost; a report would be considered by the Council in early March.

J Lynn queried whether the shortfall of around $1 million would be contributed to by ratepayers. It was advised the shortfall would become part of the general rates and loan funded, so funded over a longer period of time.

S Farrell queried whether the route through Loburn and Oxford would be part of the National Cycleways Project and S Markham advised that it was unlikely to receive funding as the number of ‘great rides’ had been capped.
W Doody commented that the loop from Christchurch to Oxford needed to be looked at as a large proportion connected into the Oxford-Ohoka Ward. K Graham advised that there was continual monitoring.

6 ADJOURNED BUSINESS

There was no adjourned business.

7 REPORTS

7.1 Road Naming – Private Right of Way Oxford – S Morrow (Land Information Officer)

S Morrow advised he would take the report as read.

W Doody commented that it was timely that the Board seriously look at names they would like to use, as road naming invariably came up and there was no set criteria. K Felstead commented the previous Advisory Board had attempted the task but found to be too difficult.

Moved M Brown seconded S Farrell

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) Receives report No 161122120128.
(b) Approves a new road name for a Private Right of Way created off Cheapside Street, Oxford as Phillips Lane, DP393069.

CARRIED

The meeting adjourned at 8.14pm for a workshop, resuming at 8.30pm.

8 CORRESPONDENCE

8.1 Letter from Hazel Walker, Oxford Resident, regarding the well discovered under the Oxford Service Centre and Library. (Trim No. 161129122831)

Moved W Doody seconded J Lynn

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) Receives letter No.161129122733.

CARRIED

S Farrell advised that Hazel Walker had given her the letter and wished to see something made of the well so that it could be a tourist attraction.

K Felstead advised that he had spoken to C Sargison in relation to preserving the well. C Sargison had advised that the well was in a difficult location and would require re-planning of the whole site. He had been keen to keep it if possible but believed it was not feasible. The well had been filled with sand and a concrete lid placed on top which would preserve the well for the future.

J Lynn suggested that due to the public interest in the well there should be a good explanation provided to the public of the reason for its sealing through the Observer.
W Doody will speak to C Sargison in relation to replying to Hazel Walker, and drafting an item for the Observer.

8.2 A letter from Mr and Mrs C and H Taylor, Oxford Residents, regarding the intersection of Burnt Hill Road and Harewood Road was tabled, as was a Memo from the Roading Manager in response to this letter.

Moved W Doody seconded J Lynn

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) *Receives* letter No. 161201124193.
(b) *Notes* memo No. 161201124333.

CARRIED

9 CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT

9.1 Chairperson’s Report for November 2016

Moved M Brown seconded T Robson

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(c) *Receives* report No.161129122733.

CARRIED

10 MATTERS FOR INFORMATION

10.1 Rangiora-Ashley Community Board meeting minutes – 7 November 2016 (Trim No. 161104114041)

10.2 Woodend-Sefton Community Board meeting minutes – 15 November 2016 (Trim No. 161109115482)

10.3 Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board meeting minutes – 21 November 2016 (Trim No. 161118118922)

10.4 Visit to Belgium for Passchendaele Commemorations – J Palmer (Chief Executive) - Council, 1 November 2016 (Trim No. 161026109825)

10.5 Oxford Library/Service Centre Development – C Sargison (Manager Community and Recreation) – Council, 1 November 2016 (Trim No. 161020108313)

10.6 Contract Acceptance Report – 14/27 – Southbrook Road / South Belt Intersection Upgrade – K Stevenson (Roading Manager) and K Straw (Project Manager) – Public Excluded Council, 1 November 2016

10.7 Request for Increases to Water Source Upgrade Budgets for Waikuku Beach, Garrymere and Poyntzs Road Water Supply Schemes – C Roxburgh (Water Asset Manager) – Utilities and Roading Committee, 22 November 2016 (Trim No. 16108115095)

10.8 Report on expenditure due to reactive maintenance work carried out on Rangiora, Kaiapoi and Pegasus Water Supply Wells – S de Roo (Utilities Engineering Officer) – Utilities and Roading Committee, 22 November 2016 (Trim No. 16109115696)

10.9 West Kaiapoi New Arterial Road Update – K Stevenson (Roading Manager) and J McBride (Civil Projects Team Leader) – Public Excluded Utilities and Roading Committee, 22 November 2016
10.10 **Contract 15/66: Northbrook Road Urbanisation Tender Evaluation and Tender Acceptance Report – K Straw (PDU Project Manager) and K Stevenson (Roading Manager) – Management Team, 28 November 2016**

Moved J Ensor seconded T Robson

**THAT** the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board receives the information in items 10.1-10.10.

**CARRIED**

11 **MEMBERS’ INFORMATION EXCHANGE**

11.1 **S Farrell**
- Attended Pearson Park Advisory Group meeting. $100,000 would be spent on the Oval. There would be nominations for members in the New Year.
- Asked for information regarding the Jaycee Rooms; W Doody as Council portfolio holder for Community Spaces, to request information from C Sargison.

11.2 **J Lynn**
- Attended Neighbourhood Watch meeting.
- Would attend GreyPower meeting in January.
- Ohoka Residents Association meeting: concerns around the health and low flows of the Ohoka Stream were raised. Advised that the Residents Association had been offered the Ohoka Lodge Gatehouse Building (at no cost) which had a Historic Building Grade 2 listing. The Historic Places Trust had advised that is was a candidate for Earthquake restoration funding. S Markham advised that the Residents Association should write directly to J Palmer with regard to this project.

11.3 **K Felstead**
- Advised that the earthquake infrastructure recovery programme has 44 of 50 projects completed. The remaining six are on hold until the decision from the Minister regarding the regeneration zone is announced in the near future.
- Fernside/ Flaxton Road area has had a reduction in speed limit to 80km/hr.
- Implementation of a working party to progress the Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw.
- Recommencement of Kaiapoi River Rehabilitation Working Party.
- Extra funding for water main at Rangiora end of Oxford Road.
- New District Licensing Committee established.
- Councillor P Williams has been appointed to the Ashley River Water Supply Scheme.

11.4 **W Doody**
- Advised the old part of Oxford Town Hall has hairline cracks following the Kaikoura earthquake. Opus Consulting are monitoring.
- There has been a burglary at the Mandeville Sports Club for the fourth time.
- Commented on the new hockey turf at Coldstream Road
- Neighbourhood Support is planning a family picnic at Waikuku Beach for March.
11.5 **T Robson**
- Attended a recent Youth Council meeting. Raised the idea of creating a liaison role between the Youth Council and the Board. The Youth Council are keen to strengthen the relationship.
- Will be meeting with member of the public with regard to road surface issues.

11.6 **J Ensor**
- Attended WHAG meeting - concerns around underfunding of mental health and isolation of elderly.
- Advised a Fernside Federated Farmers group was being set up.
- Believes there had been an unsatisfactory response to local flooding issues. D Nicholl suggested it should be on the agenda for the Drainage Committee meeting.

11.7 **D Nicholl**
- Has met with Gavin Bennett with regard to his concerns around the Mandeville business zone application. Advised that an independent planning consultant had recommended the application proceed as non-notified. The process still had to go before a Hearings Commissioner.

12 **CONSULTATION PROJECTS**

Nil.

13 **REGENERATION PROJECTS**

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


14 **BOARD FUNDING UPDATE**

14.1 **Board Discretionary Grant**
Balance as at 1 December 2016: $2,360.

14.2 **General Landscaping Budget**
Balance as at 1 December 2016: $11,650.

The Board noted the balances.

15 **MEDIA ITEMS**

Large public turnout at the Board’s meeting with the Isaac Road residents’ delegation.

Information regarding the decision-making process around the historic well found on the Oxford Service Centre site.
16 QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS
There were no questions under Standing Orders.

17 URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDERS
There was no urgent general business under Standing Orders.

NEXT MEETING
The next meeting of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board is scheduled for 7pm, Thursday 9 February 2016 in a location in Ohoka yet to be advised.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE MEETING WAS CLOSED AT 9.07PM.
CONFIRMED

________________
Chairperson
________________
Date
Workshop (9.11-10.05pm)

1. **Members’ Forum**  
   Members had a general discussion around a number of items of interest.

2. **Media and Communication.** M McIlraith (Communications & Engagement Manager)  
   Spoke to modern media communications and options for the Board to consider utilising.

3. **Our District, Our Future Waimakariri 2048: Waimakariri District Development Strategy.** S Markham (Manager Strategy and Engagement)  
   Interactive discussion regarding this Strategy and the aspects that particularly relate to the Board’s community area.

4. **Community Board Plan and Community Interaction Plan.** K Ward (Community Board Advocate)  
   Deferred until 2017.
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE WOODEND-SEFTON COMMUNITY BOARD
HELD IN THE WOODEND COMMUNITY CENTRE, SCHOOL ROAD, WOODEND ON
MONDAY 12 DECEMBER 2016 COMMENCING AT 7.00PM

PRESENT

J Meyer (Chairperson), J Archer, A Blackie, R Mather, S Powell, and A Thompson.

IN ATTENDANCE

C Sargison (Manager, Community and Recreation), K Stevenson (Roading Manager),
K Graham (Journey Planner/Road Safety Coordinator), D Lewis (Construction
Management Engineer), H Downie (Principal Planning Analyst), M McIlraith
(Communications and Engagement Manager), K Ward (Community Board Advocate) and
A Smith (Committee Advisor).

1 APOLOGIES

There were no apologies.

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

There were no conflicts of interest.

3 CONFIRMATION MINUTES

3.1 Minutes of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board – 15 November 2016

Moved J Archer seconded A Thompson

THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:
(a) Confirms, as a true and accurate record, the circulated minutes of the
Woodend-Ashley Community Board meeting held 15 November 2016,
with the following amendments:

Item 6.2: first paragraph, second line to read “He highlighted that the
current toilet…..”

Item 6.2: second paragraph remove sentence “C Sargison replied the
new facility would be built around the current toilet, so there would be
no loss of facilities”.

Item 6.3: fourth paragraph, last sentence to read: “R Mather
commented that the some of the rumble strips were removed due to
complaints regarding noise and jarring to vehicles. The strips have
been replaced with asphalt strips that have been reduced in height to
mitigate the noise and jarring. There is more of this work to be done
as budget allows.”

Item 6.5: Recommendation to include (i) Approves the appointment of
Board member S Powell as a Board representative and liaison person
to Grey Power North Canterbury”.

CARRIED
4 DEPUTATIONS FROM THE COMMUNITY

4.1 Kathy Graham (Journey Planner/Road Safety Coordinator) and Dan Lewis (Construction Management Engineer) were present to speak on the Urban Cycleways project. (this item was duly considered as part of the Workshop following the meeting).

5 ADJOURNED BUSINESS

There was no adjourned business.

6 REPORTS

There were no reports.

7 CORRESPONDENCE

There was no correspondence.

8 CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT

The Chairperson apologised for not having a report, but advised there would be one provided at future meetings.

9 MATTERS FOR INFORMATION

9.1 Oxford-Ohoka Community Board meeting minutes – 3 November 2016 (Trim No. 161028111115)
9.2 Rangiora-Ashley Community Board meeting minutes – 9 November 2016 (Trim No. 161018107108)
9.3 Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board meeting minutes – 21 November 2016 (Trim No. 161118118922)
9.4 Request for Increases to Water Source Upgrade Budgets for Waikuku Beach, Garrymere and Poyntz’s Road Water Supply Schemes – C Roxburgh (Water Asset Manager) – Utilities and Roading Committee, 22 November 2016 (Trim No. 161108115095)
9.5 Report on expenditure due to reactive maintenance work carried out on Rangiora, Kaiapoi and Pegasus Water Supply Wells – S de Roo (Utilities Engineering Officer) – Utilities and Roading Committee,
9.6 West Kaiapoi New Arterial Road Update – K Stevenson (Roading Manager) and J McBride (Civil Projects Team Leader) – Public Excluded Utilities and Roading Committee, 22 November 2016

Moved R Mather seconded A Blackie

THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board receives the information in items 9.1-9.6

CARRIED

S Powell noted concern at the Pegasus water supply well failing (Item 9.5).
10 MEMBERS’ INFORMATION EXCHANGE

10.1 J Archer
- The Woodend Community Association held its final meeting for the year on 6 December. The Association has $39,000 in the funds for the walkway connecting Woodend and Woodend Beach, with another $30,000 pending. This will enable further progress for the walkway to get around the S-bend and towards the beach end. The contractor can start on this work after January.

10.2 R Mather
- As a fundraiser, the Pegasus Residents Group recently distributed nearly 4,000 promotional scratch cards in Christchurch, for the Pegasus Golf and Sports Club.
- ‘Christmas on the Lake’ event was held on Saturday afternoon, with about 650 people attending; there has been good feedback from the event. The last gathering of the Residents Group for the year is to be held tomorrow evening at Flat White Café.
- Discussions have been held with the Council’s Community Greenspace Manager about enabling access for cyclists to the track at Gladstone Park and at the ends of various Pegasus Streets. This will mean cyclists no longer need to lift their bikes over the barriers.
- Pegasus community members have been observed picking up rubbish along the streets and parks in the town whilst out walking. This is to be congratulated.

10.3 S Powell
- Also commented on the successful Pegasus ‘Christmas on the Lake’, which was a fun event.
- The Woodend Lions’ current project is to have a War Memorial established in Woodend, as there is currently not one in the town. C Sargison noted this project is gaining public interest and it is understood the group will be approaching the Council for assistance.

11 CONSULTATION PROJECTS
Nil

12 FOSTERING COMMUNITIES
C Sargison noted that the Woodend Toy Library has dissolved, but the operating of it has been taken over by the Rangiora Toy Library Group. It is unlikely that members will notice any change, though there could be the benefit of having more toys available.
13  REGENERATION PROJECTS

Regular updates on the Woodend-Pegasus area projects are emailed to Board members. These updates can be located at the link below:


C Sargison advised there has been progress in securing a venue for a community facility in Pegasus. There had been discussions held with Todd Property Group. The Council has made an offer to lease what was the original pharmacy, beside the Flat White Café. The alternative option that had been considered was to relocate the Council Green Space staff portacom from Rangiora, which would have a cost of around $50,000. Rental for the former pharmacy space would be approximately $12,12,500 per annum, with the initial proposed term of lease being two years. There is good outside lighting at the site. C Sargison sought the approval of the Board to take this proposal direct to the Council. The facility is bigger than the portacom, at approximately 250m², and includes toilet facilities, tea making facilities and a storage area at the back. The budget would include signage. The Board members agreed with the proposal of this matter going to Council in February 2017.

Moved R Mather  seconded S Powell

THAT the Board supports Council staff progressing the proposal to lease the former pharmacy facility at Pegasus as a Community facility.  CARRIED

14  BOARD FUNDING UPDATE

14.1  Board Discretionary Grant

Balance as at 6 December 2016: $1,620

14.2  General Landscaping Budget

Balance as at 6 December 2016: $15,278.71

15  MEDIA ITEMS

Nil

16  QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS

Members asked if staff could provide information to the Board on drinking water sources and whether they meet the current New Zealand Drinking Water Standards. C Sargison agreed to arrange a staff member to come to speak to the Board to provide this information at a subsequent meeting.

It was confirmed that a card and flowers had been sent to former Board member Karen Eastwood, to acknowledge her contribution as a member of the Board.
17 URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDERS

There was no urgent general business under Standing Orders.

NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board is scheduled for 7pm, Monday 13 February 2017 at the Woodend Community Centre.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE MEETING CLOSED AT 7.26PM.

CONFIRMED

__________________________
Chairperson

__________________________
Date
Workshop - 7.30pm-9.15pm (Item 2: 6.30-6.58pm)

1. **Members’ Forum.**
   Opportunity for members to share potential new ideas and initiatives.

2. **Media and Community Board Communications.**
   Matt McIlraith (Communications and Engagement Manager)
   Spoke to modern communication media and how the Board could consider utilising it.

3. **Out District, Our Future Waimakariri 2048: Waimakariri District Development Strategy.**
   H Downie (Principal Planning Analyst).
   Presented the Strategy with particular reference to the Board’s community area.

4. **Woodend-Sefton Roading Matters.** K Stevenson (Roading Manager)
   The purpose of this workshop was to update the Board and discuss the following roading projects/issues:
   - Woodend Beach speed issues
   - Woodend Beach Road cycle/walkway
   - Waikuku to Pegasus walking and cycling connections
   - Pegasus road connection to Gladstone Road
   - Gladstone Road walkway/cycleway
   - State Highway 1/NZTA business case
   - Map showing current and possible future walking, cycling and mobility scooter connections.

5. **Community Board Plan.** K Ward (Community Board Advocate).
   Deferred until January 2017.
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE RANGIORA-ASHLEY COMMUNITY BOARD
HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS, RANGIORA SERVICE CENTRE, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA ON WEDNESDAY 14 DECEMBER 2016 AT 7PM:

PRESENT

J Gerard QSO (Chair), D Lundy (Deputy Chair), P Allen, R Brine, J Hoult, C Prickett (arrived 7.33pm during item 5.2), K Galloway, D Gordon, S Lewis, G Miller and P Williams.

IN ATTENDANCE

J Millward (Manager Finance and Business Support), K Stevenson (Roading Manager), K Graham (Journey Planner/Road Safety Coordinator), D Lewis (Construction Management Engineer), S Collin (Infrastructure Strategy Manager), K Ward (Community Board Advocate) and L Courtney (Governance Secretary).

1 APOLOGIES

Moved J Gerard seconded D Lundy

Apologies were received and sustained from M Clarke for absence and C Prickett for lateness.

CARRIED

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Nil.

3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

3.1 Minutes of the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board – 9 November 2016

Moved D Gordon seconded G Miller

THAT the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board:

(a) Confirms the circulated minutes of the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board meeting, held 9 November 2016, as a true and accurate record.

CARRIED

4 DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

4.1 Neil Price (Trustee, Waimakariri Passchendaele Trust) and David Ayers (Chair, Waimakariri Passchendaele Trust) spoke to the Board with a proposal that the Rangiora-Kaiapoi cycle/walkway be made a centennial memorial to the Battle of Passchendaele. D Ayers advised that they would also raise their proposal with the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board.

2017 would mark the 100 year anniversary of the Battle of Passchendaele, which is located in the municipality of Ypres, Belgium. The Waimakariri District has a twinning relationship with Zonnebeke, a district within Ypres that acknowledges this shared history.
The Trust proposed the cycle/walkway be a permanent memorial to those who died during the battle and that the off-road cycleway along Paisley Road be called the ‘Passchendaele Way’ or similar. It was suggested that memorial elements including information boards be erected at points along the pathway, explaining the history of the battle and how it links to the Rangiora and Kaiapoi communities. D Ayers added that a report would come to the Board.

N Price, as President of the Kaiapoi RSA, advised the RSA supported the proposal to honour and recognise the sacrifice made by those from the Waimakariri District. He commented that 10% of the men in the district at the time left to fight in wars with few returning.

D Lundy asked whether consideration had been given to renaming Paisley Road. D Ayers replied it would be up to the Board to decide but the proposal had only been to name the off-road cycle/walkway.

G Miller queried whether it would be appropriate for information boards to be erected along the track. D Ayers replied the current proposal was for information boards at either end of the track but believed it would be possible for other information boards along the track.

Regarding the memorial: J Hoult asked whether it would be possible to list the names of those who died during the battles. N Price commented that names are listed on memorials in Rangiora, Kaiapoi and Coutts Island. J Hoult clarified whether names could be listed just for the Battle of Passchendaele. D Ayers replied the names were known and the Rangiora and Kaiapoi RSAs were working together on the project.

J Gerard thanked them for their presentation.

4.2 Kathy Graham (Journey Planner/Road Safety Coordinator) and Dan Lewis (Construction Management Engineer) updated the Board on the Urban Cycleways project.

D Lewis spoke to a Powerpoint outlining how the proposed tracks would link with current walking/cycling tracks in the three communities, being Rangiora, Woodend and Kaiapoi, and outlined detailed diagrams of the proposed tracks.

Regarding the Rangiora to Kaiapoi track: D Lewis commented on anecdotal evidence that Paisley Road was being used as a race track: concerns had been raised regarding safety for walkers and cyclists along that part of the track. Staff consulted with local residents from the four properties along Paisley Road. These residents supported closing the road to through traffic at the Fernside Road end.

P Williams commented on the speed of cyclists along the track, in relation to the safety of walkers, and queried whether there would be a speed limit put in place. D Lewis replied that speed limits for cyclists had not been considered but the design of the track would allow room for all to use the track safely. K Graham added that cyclists who do speed usually work in peloton groups, and are less likely to use the proposed track as the design does not allow them to travel at fast speeds. Part of the programme will be to educate the public regarding etiquette of the track for shared use. This may also discourage use by cyclists who do speed.

Regarding the Rangiora to Woodend track: D Lewis showed members a picture of cycleway in Selwyn which best portrayed how the proposed Rangiora-Woodend track would look. He highlighted the intersection of
Rangiora-Woodend, Boys, Tuahiwi and Harris Roads, locally known as five cross roads. On the approach to this intersection, the proposed track would veer south from Rangiora-Woodend Road. Users of the walk/cycleway will cross Boys and Tuahiwi Roads back from the intersection. This will mean track users will have to cross each road separately before the track returns to parallel Rangiora-Woodend Road. Staff are working with landowners to access land where the proposed track will cross onto private property.

Regarding five cross roads: D Gordon questioned whether the proposal was the best plan in relation to users’ safety. D Lewis commented the Roading team is currently looking at future options for the intersection, so the proposed track takes those options into account. It may not be an ideal path for cyclists but makes navigating that particular intersection safer for all users.

D Gordon queried signage that informed users of how to approach the intersection. D Lewis replied that signage was part of the plan.

K Galloway asked whether connections between Waikuku, Pegasus and Woodend had been considered. D Lewis showed members how the proposed track connected to Woodend, and to Pegasus through Ravenswood.

D Lundy questioned whether the walk/cycleway linked to the Highgate subdivision. D Lewis replied there currently were footpaths along Kippenberger Avenue, clarifying the Urban Cycleways project is to create connections between urban centres. The cycleway would cease being off-road and become an on-road cycleway just north of Devlin Avenue. K Graham added that part of the project is also to consider all walking and cycling connections within the urban centres.

Regarding the Rangiora to Woodend track: G Miller queried whether planting would be carried out between the track and the road. D Lewis replied the berm would still be required by vehicles from time to time, so planting the berm was not planned.

Regarding the five cross roads intersection: R Brine expressed concern at the visibility of cyclists. D Lewis replied that the track has been moved away from the main road intersection to alleviate the issue of track users having to navigate the difficult intersection.

R Brine sought clarification that a report would come back to the Board regarding any possible land purchases. D Lewis confirmed that staff would come back to the Board regarding any required land purchases.

D Gordon asked about the construction timeframe for both projects. D Lewis replied the scheme design is currently underway for the two routes, with a report to Council in February/March 2017 to finalise the design and costing options. Construction is expected to commence in September 2017 as work has to be completed by June 2018 under the requirements of the Urban Cycleways funding.

D Gordon asked if the timeframe was achievable. D Lewis replied that currently the process was working as planned and the timeframe was achievable and realistic.

Regarding five cross roads: K Graham added there would be an opportunity to re-consider the speed limit along Rangiora-Woodend Road.

J Gerard thanked staff for their presentation.
5 ADJOURNED BUSINESS
Nil.

6 REPORTS

6.1 Ashley Rural Water Advisory Group – S Collin (Infrastructure Strategy Manager)
J Gerard raised a few corrections to the report. S Collin noted the corrections and spoke to the report highlighting the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board representative would also be the representative for the Woodend-Sefton Community Board. A report will go to the Woodend-Sefton Community Board’s February 2017 meeting to seek their support for the appointment.

D Gordon expressed an interest in being part of the Advisory Group. It was noted that C Prickett is a current member of the Advisory Group and was willing to act as the Board’s representative. S Collin clarified the Ashley Rural Water Advisory Group report to the Water Liaison Committee; P Williams is the Waimakariri District Council representative on the Committee.

Moved D Gordon seconded G Miller

THAT the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board:
(a) Receives report No. 161121119429.

AND

Recommends that the Council:
(b) Appoints Rangiora-Ashley Community Board Member C Prickett as its representative on the Ashley Rural Water Advisory Group, to represent the interests of water supply customers in the both the Rangiora-Ashley, and Woodend-Sefton Communities, subject to ratification by the Woodend-Sefton Community Board.

CARRIED

D Gordon believed it was appropriate that C Prickett continue to be the Board’s representative with the added strength of being a resident from that part of the Ward.

6.2 Road Naming – Private Right of Way, Rangiora – S Morrow (Land Information Officer)
The report was taken as read and a correction of “Pippen” to “Pippin” was made.

J Hoult queried whether the proposed name was on the Board’s pre-approved name list. It was clarified that the name was submitted by the developer.

Moved P Williams seconded C Prickett

THAT the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board:
(a) Receives report No 161122120206.
(b) Approves Pippin Lane as the new name for the Private Right of Way created off Ballarat Road, Rangiora, being Lot 100, DP 502562.

CARRIED
C Prickett was pleased to see continuity of theme in the naming of local roads.

7 CORRESPONDENCE

Nil.

8 CHAIRPERSON'S REPORT

8.1 Chair's Diary for October-November 2016

Moved J Gerard  seconded K Galloway

THAT Rangiora-Ashley Community Board:

(a) Receives report No.161202124410.

CARRIED

9 MATTERS FOR INFORMATION

9.1 Oxford-Ohoka Community Board meeting minutes – 3 November 2016 (Trim No. 161028111115)

9.2 Woodend-Sefton Community Board meeting minutes – 15 November 2016 (Trim No. 161109115482)

9.3 Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board meeting minutes – 21 November 2016 (Trim No. 161118118922)

9.4 Visit to Belgium for Passchendaele Commemorations – J Palmer (Chief Executive) - Council, 1 November 2016 (Trim No. 161026109825)

9.5 Contract Acceptance Report – 14/27 – Southbrook Road / South Belt Intersection Upgrade – K Stevenson (Roading Manager) and K Straw (Project Manager) – Public Excluded Council, 1 November 2016

9.6 Request for Increases to Water Source Upgrade Budgets for Waikuku Beach, Garrymere and Poyntz's Road Water Supply Schemes – C Roxburgh (Water Asset Manager) – Utilities and Roading Committee, 22 November 2016 (Trim No. 161108115095)

9.7 Report on expenditure due to reactive maintenance work carried out on Rangiora, Kaiapoi and Pegasus Water Supply Wells – S de Roo (Utilities Engineering Officer) – Utilities and Roading Committee, 22 November 2016 (Trim No. 161109115696)

9.8 Barkers Road petition and road sealing – K Stevenson (Roading Manager) – Utilities and Roading Committee, 22 November 2016 (Trim No. 161104114039)

9.9 Request for budget for Stormwater Diversion Townsend Road, Townsend Fields Development – K Stevenson (Roading Manager) – Utilities and Roading Committee, 22 November 2016 (Trim No. 161109115427)

9.10 Preferred Alignment of Stage 2 Rangiora Wastewater Capacity Upgrade – R Barber (Development Manager) – Utilities and Roading Committee, 22 November 2016 (Trim No. 161109115759)

9.11 West Kaiapoi New Arterial Road Update – K Stevenson (Roading Manager) and J McBride (Civil Projects Team Leader) – Public Excluded Utilities and Roading Committee, 22 November 2016
9.12 **Earthquake Infrastructure Recovery Programme – December 2016 Update – G Boot (Senior Engineering Advisor)** - Council, 6 December 2016 (Trim No. 161124121388)

9.13 **Changes to Fernside Road, Flaxton Road and Todds Road Speed Limits – K Stevenson (Roading Manager) and H Davies (Roading Projects Engineer)** - Council, 6 December 2016 (Trim No. 161116117803)

9.14 **Bringing Forward Budget for Extra Over Oxford Road Water Main – C Roxburgh (Water Asset Manager)** - Council, 6 December 2016 (Trim No. 161128122682)

9.15 **Contract CON201547 - Central Rangiora Sewer Capacity Upgrade Stage 1 Tender Award Report – R Barber (Development Manager)** – Public Excluded Council, 6 December 2016

Moved D Gordon seconded C Prickett

**THAT** the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board receives the information in items 9.1-9.15.

**CARIED**

10 **MEMBERS’ INFORMATION EXCHANGE**

10.1 **P Williams**

- New Zealand Post (NZPost) office boxes. P Williams sought support from the Board for a letter to NZPost on the issue. He commented that at a public meeting NZPost had stated that it was not economical for post boxes to remain. C Prickett queried whether it was worth asking what the current patronage numbers were. The Board was in agreement for a letter to be sent. Staff to follow up.

10.2 **G Miller**

- Easterbrook Road: a community meeting was held to discuss residents’ concerns.
- Attended a meeting at West Eyreton Hall regarding a proposed shingle quarry in Isaac Road, Eyrewell; likely to be a future issue for local residents.
- Keep Rangiora Beautiful: working bee along railway to clean up mess left by vandals and now waiting to have graffiti removed.

J Gerard commented that some of the issues raised in G Miller’s first two items could be addressed by a submission through the District Plan change process.

10.3 **J Hoult**

- Attended a community meeting regarding Local Water Management for the Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan at Waikuku Beach Hall. Believes the Board should be kept up to date on these issues.
- Attended Landmarks meeting. Discussed a district strategy plan.
- North Canterbury Neighbourhood Support: working on a Memorandum of Understanding with Civil Defence, for better communications during major disasters. Comments were made that local groups need to be able to operate for at least three days before contacting national representatives. Added that the Old Fashioned Family Picnic is planned for March 2017.
10.4 **P Allen**
- Announcement of decision on Waimakariri Residential Red Zone Recovery Plan.
- Attended Easterbrook Road community meeting.
- Kippenberger Ave: residents raised issues regarding walkways.
- Oakwood Reserve plantings: local residents have volunteered to help with watering.
- Approached by community members to have the Board’s historic photos along Conway Lane wall.
- Lobbied about proposed Cones Road walkway.
- Received concerns regarding recent Rangiora Health Hub community meeting.

10.5 **R Brine**
- Artificial Hockey turf: referred members to Community and Recreation Committee meeting agenda for more details.
- Graffiti: confession received by Police regarding a number of acts of vandalism. Police working through matters.

10.6 **K Galloway**
- Millton Memorial Dog Park: the park is this month one year old. Working with staff on suggested enhancements to the park and to establish a ‘Friends of the Park’ group. A ‘Dog’s Day Out’ fundraiser planned for autumn 2017.
- Rangiora Museum: compiling a video of citizens of Rangiora.
- Attended Rangiora Health Hub community meeting.
- Met with Watson Place residents to get resealing work completed.

10.7 **D Lundy**
- Civil Defence: spent time working at the Woodend Community Centre after the 14 November Kaikoura earthquakes. Practices carried out have proved to be effective.

10.8 **D Gordon**
- Invited G Miller, as Board appointed liaison, to attend meeting at Fernside Hall regarding hall usage. A number of items were requested like heating and a ramp at the entrance. Some items may come to the Board as a report in the future.
- Attended meeting with Ward Place residents and Council staff regarding maintenance of a drain.
- Entrances to District Town Centres: spoke with the Roading Manager and proposed 1 February 2017 to scope the areas concerned. All Board members invited to attend.
- Attended Easterbrook Road community meeting. Some councillors met with senior Council staff to reflect on concerns raised. May need to look at submitting on Plan Change 41 to help towards a solution.
- Rangiora Promotions: to be commended on the Christmas Gala and fireworks display, 24 November and recent Christmas Parade. Met with Muscle Car Madness (MCM) promoters to discuss a small scale event in High Street, Rangiora to highlight the MCM event and promote the township.
- Requested a briefing for the Board regarding development of the corner of High Street and Ashley Road, where BNZ was situated.
- Attended Rangiora Health Hub community meeting. Commented that discussion was regarding the need for an after-hours service in the town.

11 CONSULTATION PROJECTS

Nil.

12 REGENERATION PROJECTS

Regular updates on the Rangiora Town Centre projects are emailed regularly to Board members. These updates can be located at the link below:


13 BOARD FUNDING UPDATE

13.1 Board Discretionary Grant

Balance as at 9 December 2016: $6,353.79

At its November meeting, the Board granted a total of $1,956.21 to four community groups/organisations: Presbyterian Support Upper South Island, the Ashley Playcentre, the Cust-West Eyreton Playcentre and the Rangiora Playcentre.

13.2 General Landscaping Budget

Balance as at 9 December 2016: $35,619

14 MEDIA ITEMS

Community Board’s Christmas message in local media.

15 QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS

There were no questions under Standing Orders.

16 URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDERS

There was no urgent general business under Standing Orders.

NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board is scheduled for 7pm, Wednesday 8 February 2017 in the Council Chambers at the Rangiora Service Centre.
THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE MEETING WAS CLOSED AT 8.11PM.

CONFIRMED

__________________  ____________________
Chairperson          Date

Workshop – 8.14pm – 9.48pm (including staff briefing)

1. Members’ Forum
   Nil.

2. Christmas Lights. Representative from Phillips J McBride (Civil Projects Team Leader) and K Stevenson (Roading Manager). S Hart (Business and Centres Manager) was an apology as helping with Hurunui Recovery.
   The Board were advised of changes in technology and options for lighting designs. A presentation of various lighting was provided by Mike Little, a representative of Philips.

3. Our District, Our Future Waimakariri 2048: Waimakariri District Development Strategy. T Ellis (Development Planning Manager)
   The Strategy was presented to the Board with particular reference to their community area.

4. Proposed Cones Road walkway. D Cameron (Green Space Community Engagement Officer)
   Full update on background of project and consultation taken place to date, due to the project moving to a new Board with revised ward boundaries.

   Deferred to January 2017.

Staff Briefing (Public Excluded)

6. Town Centre Budgets. S Markham (Manager Strategy and Engagement).
   An update on town centre developments.
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE KAIAPOI-TUAHIWI COMMUNITY BOARD HELD
MEETING ROOM 1 (UPSTAIRS), RUATANWHA KAIAPOI CIVIC CENTRE,
176 WILLIAMS STREET, KAIAPoi ON MONDAY 19 DECEMBER 2016 AT 4PM.

PRESENT

J Watson (Chair), C Greengrass (Deputy Chair), N Atkinson, R Blair, P Redmond,
M Pinkham and S Stewart.

IN ATTENDANCE

Councillor A Blackie, C Sargison (Manager Community and Recreation), K Stevenson
(Roading Manager), M McIlraith (Communications and Engagement Manager), D Lewis
(Construction Management Engineer), K Graham (Journey Planner/Road Safety
Coordinator), G Barnard (Parks Community Assets Officer), S Morrow (Rates Officer
Land Information), J Fraser (Principal Planning Analyst), O Davis (Drainage Asset
Manager), J McBride (Civil Projects Team Leader), K Ward (Community Board Advocate)
and L Courtney (Governance Secretary).

The meeting adjourned for a photography session at 6.01pm and resumed at 6.18pm.

At the commencement of the meeting, the Chair acknowledged the recent passing of
Woodend-Sefton Community Board member Karen Eastwood. The Board held a
minute’s silence.

1 APOLOGIES

Nil.

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Nil.

3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

3.1 Minutes of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board – 21 November 2016

P Redmond raised an error in item 3.1 (a), line 4, where the reference to
M Pinkham should be P Redmond.

Moved M Pinkham seconded C Greengrass

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:

(a) Amends item 3.1 (a), line 4 of the minutes changing M Pinkham to
P Redmond.

(b) Confirms, as a true and accurate record, the circulated minutes of the
Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board meeting held 21 November 2016.

CARRIED

4 DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

4.1 Neil Price and Ian Thompson (Trustees, Waimakariri Passchendaele Trust)
and David Ayers (Chair, Waimakariri Passchendaele Trust) spoke to the
Board with a proposal that the Rangiora-Kaiapoi cycle/walkway be made a
centennial memorial to the Battle of Passchendaele. D Ayers advised they
had already raised their proposal with the Rangiora-Ashley Community
Board.
2017 would mark the 100 year anniversary of the Battle of Passchendaele, which is located in the municipality of Zonnebeke, West Flanders. The battle had the greatest loss of life in a single battle for New Zealand troops. The Waimakariri District has a twinning relationship with Zonnebeke, which acknowledges this shared history.

Most of the proposed walk/cycleway is a paper road except one part along a formed metal road, Paisley Road. The proposal from the Trust is that Passchendaele is used in the naming of the off-road part of the walk/cycleway. It was suggested that memorial elements including information boards be erected at points along the pathway, explaining the history of the battle and how it links to the Rangiora and Kaiapoi communities. D Ayers added that a report would come to the Board.

N Price, as President of the Kaiapoi RSA, added the RSA supported the Trust's proposal and that it would be a unique element in the District.

I Thompson, as President of the Rangiora RSA, supported previous comments. He added the Rangiora RSA would be involved in the upcoming commemorations, as well as local high school students; the RSA would be sponsoring one student to attend the commemorations in Passchendaele, Belgium in October 2017.

N Atkinson queried whether the Trust wanted to name the entire proposed urban cycleways network. D Ayers replied the Trust was only proposing the Passchendaele name for the Rangiora-Kaiapoi section as the off road section works better for naming. N Atkinson commented that in the future the walk/cycleway may cross all the major towns in the District which would make it an appropriate name/memorial.

P Redmond asked whether a sculptural memorial had been considered by the Trust. D Ayers replied the Trust have had discussions with an iron sculpture artist regarding a possible memorial/memorial elements.

The Chair thanked the representatives for their presentation.

4.2 Adrian Bell, resident of Busby Place, spoke to the Board about the Crab Apple tree outside his property being considered for removal.

A Bell spoke to a prepared speech (Trim No. 161220131139). He commented that his request for the tree to be removed has been ongoing over a number of months. He disagreed with the timeframe of the fruit fall outlined in clause 3.1 of the report, as fruit fall was evident when staff inspected the area this month. He estimated that fruit fall occurred over approximately six months of the year and believed that 2017 would be worse due to the tree being older and larger. A Bell commented that Council staff offered to provide a service to remove the fallen fruit which would be at a cost of $500 per annum. He believed removing the tree would save the Council having to provide such a service. A Bell outlined some of the issues caused to himself and his neighbours, and raised Health and Safety concerns from people slipping on the fallen fruit. He concluded that he would like the Crab Apple tree replaced with a Cherry tree.

P Redmond queried what species the other trees in the neighbourhood were. It was stated that they were of the Malus variety. Most of the trees in the neighbourhood were of the Malus variety but the tree outside A Bell's property was the largest.
M Pinkham asked if Crab Apple trees were currently a planting option in the Council’s street trees policy. G Barnard replied that they were not.

R Blair asked if A Bell was aware of the issues cherry blossom trees can pose. A Bell was aware that roots could be an issue.

The Chair invited A Bell to stay and listen to the discussion and decision on the report being considered later in meeting.

4.3 Bev Hansen, resident of Fairweather Crescent, spoke to the Board regarding tree removal in Fairweather Crescent.

B Hansen commented the Cherry tree outside her property had been assessed for root pruning but could not be carried out as it would cause the tree to become unstable, therefore a health and safety hazard. The roots of the tree have also been covered with soil, to try to mitigate the damage to the lawn but the roots only pushed through the soil. She had been advised that the root pruning should have been carried out when the tree was younger and smaller. B Hansen has struggled to mow her lawn and maintain her berm to the same high standard of her neighbourhood. She is happy for the current Cherry tree to be replaced with another Cherry tree.

P Redmond asked if all trees in the neighbourhood were planted at the same time. B Hansen believed they were. P Redmond noted the other Cherry trees in the neighbourhood did not seem to cause the same issues as the tree outside B Hansen’s property. B Hansen was not certain why the tree outside her property was such an issue, but suggested that maybe the other trees had been planted deeper.

S Stewart asked whether B Hansen supported the street garden option as noted in report of item 6.2 of the agenda. B Hansen replied she was happy with this with option as long as it made the current lawn area flat and attractive.

The Chair invited B Hansen to stay and listen to the Board’s discussion and decision regarding the tree removal later in the meeting.

4.4 Kathy Graham (Journey Planner/Road Safety Coordinator) and Dan Lewis (Construction Management Engineer) spoke to the Board regarding the Urban Cycleways project.

D Lewis spoke to a PowerPoint presentation outlining the proposed plans for the Rangiora-Kaiapoi walk/cycling path, and sought the Board’s support/comments. He also outlined how the proposed paths linked to current pathways in the Woodend, Pegasus and Ravenswood areas as well as the Tuhaitara Coastal Track and Ashley River stop bank.

He commented that Paisley Road, which is currently a metal road, is proposed to be sealed for a shared pathway and for the Fernside Road end to be blocked to through traffic. The proposal has the support of local residents.

D Lewis showed a photograph of a pathway in Selwyn which best represents the pathway proposed for the Rangiora-Woodend track. He explained the proposed track for the intersection of Rangiora-Woodend, Boys, Tuahiwi and Harris Roads, locally known as five cross roads. Staff are working with property owners for access to privately owned land the track is proposed to cross. Having ownership of the land will allow for the approach to the intersection to be clearer and to have better lines of sight, making it safer for those approaching the difficult intersection.
S Stewart commented the trees on the north side of Kippenberger Avenue were planted as part of a Year 2000 project and are often trimmed because of the powerlines. She asked if staff would consider recommending that Mainpower bury the lines along the north side of the avenue, which would allow the trees to mature better, and reinstate trees on the south side. K Graham commented this was beyond the scope of the Urban Cycleways project.

Regarding Fernside and Flaxton Roads: N Atkinson asked whether the path should be ‘future proofed’ as the intersection is a main access to the Southbrook Resource Recovery Park (Transfer Station). D Lewis replied that had been considered with the proposal to close Mulcocks Road to through traffic and to make the walk/cycleway crossing of Fernside Road away from the railway crossing which would also allow for better visibility. He added that once more detailed designs were completed, a safety audit would be carried out to identify areas that required improvement.

N Atkinson requested costings for the crossing to be underground, acknowledging it would be a more costly option. However, he believed it would be a safer option. There was a lot to consider especially with the many different kinds of traffic at that intersection including heavy vehicles, cars with trailers, as well as trains.

P Redmond asked if the path could be moved to the west. D Lewis replied that it was possible. K Graham added that a balance needed to be reached regarding the usability of the path and users’ safety. The wider aim of project is to increase the general use of cycles in the district.

C Greengrass asked if bars at the crossing sites were in the plans. K Graham replied they were.

M Pinkham asked if staff had considered extending the project north. D Lewis replied it had been considered, acknowledging it was not ideal for a cycleway to become on-road after being off-road but the project is currently limited by its budget. More walk/cycleways would be planned for the future. K Graham added that the more cyclists were on the road, the greater awareness there would be among drivers in the district, which would encourage the extension of the current walk/cycleways.

There was discussion regarding various options for a walk/cycleway along Flaxton Road.

5 ADJOURNED BUSINESS

Nil.

6 REPORTS

Items 6.2 to 6.4 were taken at this time. Note the minutes have been recorded in accordance with the order of the agenda as circulated.

6.1 Kaiapoi Regeneration Steering Group – C Sargison (Manager Community and Recreation)

C Sargison spoke to the report. He highlighted that the executive management including Crown involvement of the Draft Project Structure was yet to be determined, and noted an error with clause 3.10 as the
appointment of Chair is in the recommendation. He distributed, for the Board’s information, material that would be posted on the Council’s website including Frequently Asked Questions.

N Atkinson queried the involvement of the Regional Council Environment Canterbury (ECan). C Sargison replied that the Waimakariri Residential Red Zone Recovery Plan (Recovery Plan) affects a lot of riverbanks. He noted it has been beneficial having ECan as part of the Kaiapoi Riverbanks Steering Group but acknowledged it was the Board’s discretion regarding membership.

Moved R Blair seconded C Greengrass

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:

(a) Receives report No.161129123237.

(b) Approves the establishment of a Regeneration Steering Group.

(c) Approves the Terms of Reference for the Regeneration Steering Group (161129123269).

(d) Approves the appointment of the following to the Regeneration Steering Group:

- Mayor
- Council Portfolio Holder (Chair)
- Kaiapoi - Tuahiwi Community Board (full Board)
- Kaiapoi-Woodend Ward Councillors
- Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga (representative/s)
- Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust (representative)
- Environment Canterbury (representative)
- Chief Executive (Waimakariri District Council)
- Manager, Community & Recreation
- Implementation Programme Manager, District Regeneration

(e) Notes the Draft Project Structure.

CARRIED

R Blair was pleased that A Blackie would Chair the group being the Council regeneration portfolio holder. The establishment of this Steering Group was further good progress in post-earthquake recovery of the area.

C Greengrass agreed with R Blair’s comments.

A Blackie was pleased the whole Board was included in the membership and would therefore be privy to all information regarding the Recovery Plan.

N Atkinson commented the large group may seem cumbersome but it was better being open to a comprehensive membership of all interested parties rather than omitting any, and then those invited could decide on attendance as appropriate to their respective interests. The group would be important for the town and would receive close local attention; and would require a significant budget. He again questioned the involvement of ECan but acknowledged it was better to open the invitation and let them decide on their level of involvement.
6.2 Proposed Street Tree removal 86 Fairweather Crescent, Kaiapoi –
G Barnard (Parks Community Assets Officer)

G Barnard spoke to the report acknowledging the issues being caused by
the large root system of the Cherry tree. He referred members to the 2015
consultation carried out in the Mansfield subdivision regarding the retention
or removal of the neighbourhood's Cherry trees. The Board had decided to
retain the trees. G Barnard spoke to the street garden option. He
commented the Cherry tree outside 86 Fairweather Crescent was one of the
larger trees in the neighbourhood with prolific flowering.

N Atkinson commented that issues with the Cherry trees have been raised
with the Board a number of times over the last few years and suggested that
budgeting be allocated to stage a replacement programme for the trees
causing issues, so trees are not replaced all at once and the effect of the
trees is maintained. He requested a report with recommendations on how to
stage the replacement of trees with a variety that will cause fewer issues.
J Watson concurred with N Atkinson’s request.

C Sargison stated that a report could be brought to the Board with costings
in relation to a street garden and a staged replacement tree programme. He
commented there was an on-going cost with street gardens and this option
would potentially set a precedent for other residents’ tree issues.

P Redmond commented that he only saw a few other trees with the same
issue, and was not convinced that creating a street garden would set a
precedent. He requested an immediate, short term solution for the residents
of 86 Fairweather Crescent. G Barnard replied that covering the roots with
soil would only be effective for 12-18 months, but suggested a small scale
garden would last longer until a more permanent solution can be planned
and organised.

M Pinkham believed the tree was the largest in the street and did not
support the development of a street garden as a solution, as it would deviate
from the initial plan of the subdivision.

N Atkinson queried the timeframe for replacing trees without affecting the
aesthetics of the street. G Barnard replied that trees have been replaced in
the neighbourhood in the last 18 months and this had not affected the
aesthetics of the street. As long as trees are replaced in a staged
programme, over a long period of time, the overall effect of the trees would
not be affected.

R Blair supported the request for a report regarding the gradual replacement
of trees over a period of time.

S Stewart queried the colour of blossoms. G Barnard replied that a
replacement tree would be chosen to blend in well with the existing trees.

Moved M Pinkham seconded P Redmond

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:
(a) Receives report No. 161208127142.
(b) Approves the removal of the Cherry tree situated in the berm
adjacent to 86 Fairweather Crescent and replace with another cherry
tree with suitable characteristics.
(c) Requests staff prepare a report to the Board on a staged tree
replacement programme for the Mansfield Park subdivision.
6.3 **Proposed Street Tree removal Kaiapoi Anglican Cemetery, Isaac Wilson Road, Kaiapoi – G Barnard (Parks Community Assets Officer)**

G Barnard spoke to the report, highlighting issues raised regarding leaf drop. The Magnolia trees are twenty metres from the property but do create minor shading issues. It was noted anecdotally that the trees had been planted as a memorial to a young local woman but this could not be confirmed, as no Council records existed regarding the history of these particular trees.

C Greengrass asked if the resident could be asked to return the fallen leaves to under the tree. G Barnard replied that they could be asked.

Moved N Atkinson seconded S Stewart

**THAT** the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:

(a) **Receives** report No.161207126109.
(b) **Approves** the retention of the two Council owned Southern Magnolia trees situated on the south east boundary of 2 Parnham Lane, (known as the Kaiapoi Anglican Cemetery) Kaiapoi.
(c) **Notes** that the retention of the Magnolia trees are consistent with section 3.3 of the Council’s standard operating procedure for the removal of trees.

CARRIED

N Atkinson accepted it was unknown who planted the Magnolia trees, highlighting he did not support removing trees just because they were a nuisance. He supported C Greengrass’ suggestion.

S Stewart agreed with N Atkinson’s comments. She believed the hedge around the cemetery was funded by the family of the deceased young person and retaining the trees retained the continuity of the avenue affect.

A Blackie commented on discussions regarding trees over the last number of years, noting the same kinds of issues being raised.

6.4 **Proposed Street Tree removal 5a Busby Place, Kaiapoi – G Barnard (Parks Community Assets Officer)**

The report was taken as read.

N Atkinson queried the level of maintenance for the issues raised by local resident Adrian Bell. G Barnard would investigate immediate measures, for example pruning the tree, until the report was ready for the Board.

P Redmond asked how the tree in question compared to the other the trees in the street. G Barnard replied that although it was similar to the other trees, it was the largest tree in the street. He commented that it was sheltered from the North West winds which may have attributed to its larger size.

Moved J Watson seconded C Greengrass

**THAT** the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:
(a) **Lies** report No. 161207126109 on the table until the Board receives a further report on a staged tree replacement programme for the Mansfield Park subdivision

CARRIED

6.5 **Road Naming - Sovereign Lakes, Kaiapoi – S Morrow (Rates Officer Land Information)**

S Morrow took the report as read.

J Watson queried why the names were chosen. S Morrow replied the developer selected them from the Board's preapproved road naming list.

R Blair asked how many houses were in the lane. S Morrow replied 11-12 new houses.

Moved C Greengrass seconded M Pinkham

**THAT** the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:

(a) **Receives** report No 161129123209.

(b) **Approves** McKee Lane as the name for a road to be created on Lot 602 DP 500061.

CARRIED

6.6 **Appointments to Advisory Groups and Outside Organisations – K Ward (Community Board Advocate)**

K Ward spoke to the report.

R Blair asked if any of the groups were based in Tuahiwi. K Ward replied there were none currently, but this did not preclude such appointments being made in the future if Tuahiwi-based groups made this request.

Moved J Watson seconded P Redmond

**THAT** the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:

(a) **Receives** Report No. 161025109369.

(b) **Approves** the appointment of Board Member C Greengrass as a Board representative and liaison person, to the Pines-Kairaki Beach Association.

(c) **Approves** the appointment of Board Member R Blair as a Board representative and liaison person, to the Darnley Club.

(d) **Approves** the appointment of Board Member J Watson as a Board representative and liaison person, to the Silverstream Advisory Group.

(e) **Approves** the appointment of Board Member M Pinkham as a Board representative and liaison person, to the Cam River Rehabilitation Subcommittee.

(f) **Approves** the appointment of Board Member P Redmond as a Board representative and liaison person, to Kaiapoi Beautiful Towns Group.

(g) **Approves** the appointment of Board Member C Greengrass as a Board representative and liaison person, to Kaiapoi and Districts Historical Society.

(h) **Approves** the appointment of Board Member C Greengrass as a Board representative and liaison person, to the Kaiapoi Landmarks Team.
(i) Approves the appointment of Board Member R Blair as a Board representative and liaison person, to the North Canterbury Neighbourhood Support.

(j) Approves the appointment of Board Member N Atkinson as a Board representative and liaison person, to the Northern Bulldogs Rugby League Club.

(k) Approves the appointment of Board Member J Watson as a Board representative and liaison person, to the Waimakariri Arts Trust.

(l) Approves the appointment of Board Member P Redmond as a Board representative and liaison person, to the Waimakariri Health Advisory Group.

(m) Approves the appointment of Board Members N Atkinson and S Stewart as Board representatives and liaisons, to the Kaiapoi River Rehabilitation Working Party.

(n) Approves the appointment of Board Member R Blair as a Board representative and liaison person, to Grey Power, North Canterbury.

(o) Approves the appointment of Board Member M Pinkham as a Board representative and liaison person, to the Kaiapoi Promotion Association.

(p) Approves the appointment of Board Member N Atkinson as a Board representative and liaison person, to the Christchurch International Airport Community Liaison Group.

CARRIED

Moved J Watson seconded C Greengrass

THAT the meeting adjourned for a photography session at 6.01pm. The meeting recommenced at 6.18pm.

7 MATTERS REFERRED FROM COUNCIL

7.1 Reconvene Kaiapoi River Rehabilitation Working Party – J Fraser (Utilities Planner) and O Davies (Drainage Asset Manager)

(referred to copy of report no. 161115117130 to the Council meeting of 5 December 2016)

O Davies spoke to the report, highlighting the planting trials in the tidal zones. He stated this was an opportunity to get the community onside with regard to river rehabilitation and projects which enhance/support the environment.

J Fraser stated that planting was planned for 12-14 January 2017 and would be up-river of the St Margaret’s rowing pontoon. An agreement had been reached with Environment Canterbury (ECan) that funding included covering costs of cleaning the river and riverbed, and debris around the Courtenay confluence. She advised that public consultation material was almost ready and would be presented to the working party for discussion at its first meeting in January 2017.

Regarding clause 1.5 of the report: S Stewart requested the river water be tested before any trial work began. She noted that no monitoring of the lower reaches of the Kaiapoi River had occurred and believed the most important aspect of the project was improving the water quality of the river/rivers. For that to happen, baseline data was required. This would
mean that ECan’s monitoring units need to be in place on the piles of the Mafeking Bridge before the trial began. The units would measure the salt content in the water, to better understand when salt wedge occurs.

N Atkinson commented that the Waimakariri Water Zone Committee had identified low flows in the Waimakariri River attributed to salt wedge. He questioned what alternative plans were in place in case ECan raised the minimum Waimakariri River cubic metres per second (cumecs) flow level, including alternative timing of the trial and other plantings that could be carried out. O Davies replied, as he understood from Dr Adrian Meredith, that salt wedge is prevalent during low flows and high tides. He acknowledged N Atkinson’s comments of the risk that the trials would be a wasted effort if the conditions of the planting experiments changed mid-trial.

M Pinkham queried the methodology of removal and disposal of spoil. O Davies outlined a few of the options.

Regarding the proposed consultation material: S Stewart questioned the purpose “to improve water clarity” and would like to see it changed from “clarity” to “quality”, as a river can be clear but full of nitrates. C Sargison commented that the brochure would be fully discussed by the working party.

8 CORRESPONDENCE
Nil.

9 CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT

9.1 Chair’s Diary for November-December 2016

Moved J Watson seconded P Redmond

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:

(a) Receives report No.1612128105.

CARRIED

10 MATTERS REFERRED FOR INFORMATION

10.1 Oxford-Ohoka Community Board meeting minutes – 3 November 2016 (Trim No. 161028111115)

10.2 Rangiora-Ashley Community Board meeting minutes – 9 November 2016 (Trim No. 161018107108)

10.3 Woodend-Sefton Community Board meeting minutes – 15 November 2016 (Trim No. 161109115482)

10.4 Report on expenditure due to reactive maintenance work carried out on Rangiora, Kaiapoi and Pegasus Water Supply Wells – S de Roo (Utilities Engineering Officer) – Utilities and Roading Committee, 22 November 2016 (Trim No. 161109115696)

10.5 West Kaiapoi New Arterial Road Update – K Stevenson (Roading Manager) and J McBride (Civil Projects Team Leader) – Public Excluded Utilities and Roading Committee, 22 November 2016
10.6 Earthquake Infrastructure Recovery Programme – December 2016
Update – G Boot (Senior Engineering Advisor) - Council, 6 December 2016  (Trim No. 161124121388)

10.7 Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016 Implementation – V Spittal (Senior Policy Analyst) - Council, 6 December 2016  (Trim No. 161116117879)

10.8 Contract 16/47 Parnham Lane Pump Station Rising Main Renewal Tender Report – G Stevenson (Utilities Projects Team Leader) – Public Excluded Council, 6 December 2016

Moved J Watson  seconded C Greengrass

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board receives the information in items 10.1-10.8.

CARRIED

11 MEMBERS’ INFORMATION EXCHANGE

Nil.

12 CONSULTATION PROJECTS

Nil.

13 REGENERATION PROJECTS

The Department of the Prime Minster and Cabinet released its decision on the Waimakariri Residential Red Zone Recovery Plan. Refer to the link for more information: [http://www.dpmc.govt.nz/future-use](http://www.dpmc.govt.nz/future-use)

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


14 BOARD FUNDING UPDATE

14.1 Board Discretionary Grant

Balance as at 14 December 2016: $2,934

At its November meeting the Board allocated $500 to You Me We Us towards the cost of paying for a performer and advertising for a Waitangi Day celebration.

14.2 General Landscaping Budget

Balance as at 14 December 2016: $73,240.99

The Board noted the balances.

15 MEDIA ITEMS

- Report coming to a future Board meeting regarding a replacement tree plan for Mansfield Park.
• It was noted that a workshop regarding a Communications Plan for the Board was scheduled for February 2017.

16 QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS
There were no questions under Standing Orders.

17 URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDERS
There was no urgent general business under Standing Orders.

NEXT MEETING
The next meeting of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board is scheduled for 4pm, Monday 20 February 2017 at the Ruataniwha Kaiapoi Civic Centre.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE MEETING WAS CLOSED AT 6.39PM.
CONFIRMED

__________________________
Chairperson

________________________________
Date
Workshop (items 2 and 3 6.40-6.54pm)

1. **Photography session for the Communications and Engagement Department.**
   Photographs were taken at 6.01-6.18pm after item 6.6.

2. **Members’ Forum.**
   Nil.

3. **Christmas Lights.** A representative from Philips, J McBride (Civil Projects Team Leader) and K Stevenson (Roading Manager).
   Modern LED technology was demonstrated by Morgann Le Bars, a representative of Philips, and urban lighting design options for Kaiapoi were discussed.

4. **Community Board Plan.** K Ward (Community Board Advocate).
   Deferred to January 2017.

Briefing – Public Excluded

5. **Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan Review.** S Markham (Manager Strategy and Engagement).
   Deferred to January 2017.

6. **Kaiapoi River Project Update.** J Fraser (Principal Planning Analyst).
   Incorporated into item 7.1; public exclusion was not required.
### SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 29 November</td>
<td>Interview with Compass FM Radio Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apprentices Prize giving, Aurora Centre, Burnside High School – with Mayor Lianne Dalziel, Mayor Winton Dalley and Deputy Mayor Malcolm Lyall. (Mayors’ Taskforce for Jobs function)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 30 November</td>
<td>Enterprise North Canterbury Board meeting, Kaiapoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Most of ENC’s work had been supporting businesses in the northern areas of Hurunui following the earthquake in Hanmer, Cheviot, etc, and much of the meeting was taken up by this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The ENC centre in Kaiapoi is going well – 127% above budget for venue hire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Social media is directing more to the website. A new website is on track.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Health and safety reported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 5000 had visited the Waimakariri District stand at the Canterbury A&amp;P Show.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Insurances had been renewed on better terms than previously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 1 December</td>
<td>Karanga Mai Young Parents College Prize giving, Kaiapoi High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enterprise North Canterbury Networking Function, Pegasus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attended Induction of Rev Stephanie Wells, Kaiapoi Co-operating Church.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 2 December</td>
<td>Interview with David Hill, North Canterbury News</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 December Saturday</td>
<td>Visited Kaiapoi Carnival, Murphy Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rangiora High School Y13 Graduation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 December Sunday</td>
<td>Ashgrove School Santa’s Grotto Opening, Rangiora A&amp;P Showgrounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kaiapoi Carnival Parade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 December Monday</td>
<td>Visited Mandeville Craft Festival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attended informal meeting of Woodend-Sefton Community Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health Hub Review, Rangiora Town Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 December Tuesday</td>
<td>Compass FM Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kaiapoi High School Senior Prize giving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 December Wednesday</td>
<td>Te Kohaka o Tuhaitara Trust End of Year Function, Woodend Beach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                      | Canterbury Local Hero Presentation, New Zealander of the Year, Addington Raceway.  
|                      | *Deputy Mayor Kevin Felstead and I submitted three names from this year’s Community Awards: Robyn Wallace (Kaiapoi), Ian Ford (formerly of Mt Grey Downs) and Margaret Buckley (Rangiora) and all received awards. In addition, John Thompson (Kaiapoi) and Judy “Tussock” Rendell (Oxford) received awards.* |
| 8 December Thursday  | Mayoral Morning Tea, Council Chambers                                |
|                      | Attended funeral of Peter McMorran, the last Chair of Oxford County Council and also a Waimakariri District Councillor (1989-1992) at Oxford. |
|                      | Citizenship Ceremony                                                 |
|                      | Oxford-Ohoka Community Board meeting                                 |
| 9 December Friday    | Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy Implementation Committee  
|                      | *Key points from the meeting were:  
|                      | - New members were welcomed to this first meeting of the Committee following the local body elections in October. New members included Mayor Sam Broughton (Selwyn); Cllr Sara Templeton (Christchurch); Deputy Mayor Kevin Felstead (Waimakariri); Chair David Bedford and Cllr Cynthia Roberts* |
Mayor David Ayers was re-appointed as Deputy Chair of the Committee.

Recommendations from the previous Committee were received and a timetable was agreed to address these matters over coming meetings. The recommendations cover enhancing local leadership; how the Partnership operates and connects with related initiatives and organisations; and progressing strategic initiatives (see below).

At its next meeting renaming of the Committee will be considered, to better reflect a wider partnership role in addressing the challenges and opportunities facing Greater Christchurch.

The Committee stressed the urgency of discussions to consider a strategic approach to the application of the Greater Christchurch Regeneration Act 2016, and the scope and timing for a comprehensive strategy review.

Canterbury Civil Defence Group meeting
The new chair is Mayor Lianne Dalziel.

Participated in the opening of the Charles Upham Village by Sir Charles Upham’s three daughters.

Saturday 10 December
Popped into Council staff Family Christmas Fun Day at Waikuku Beach before going to the Pegasus Christmas by the Lake

Sunday 11 December
Rangiora Christmas Party and Parade

Kaiapoi RSA Christmas Party

Monday 12 December
Interview with David Hill from the North Canterbury News

Canterbury Museum Trust Board meeting
- The Air New Zealand 75 exhibition is proving to be very successful.
- Annual visitor numbers heading towards a record level.
- There is a health and safety report at every meeting.

Oxford Area School Year 7-10 Prize giving

Cr Dan Gordon attended th Rangiora High School Junior Prizegiving on my behalf

Tuesday 13 December
Community / Migrant Morning Tea, Council Chambers

Compass FM Radio Station Interview
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 14 December</td>
<td>Morning tea with Selwyn District Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting with McAlpines re Plan Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rangiora-Ashley Community Board meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 15 December</td>
<td>ATC No 88 Squadron, End-of-Year Parade and Prizegiving, Rangiora Airfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 16 December</td>
<td>View Hill School Prize giving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting with MP Matt Doocey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northern A&amp;P Book Launch and Dinner, Rangiora Showgrounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday 18 December</td>
<td>Naval Memorial Service, HMNZS Pegasus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oxford Christmas Parade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attended charity cricket match at the Willows Cricket ground, Loburn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Christmas at the Races, Rangiora Racecourse, attended on my behalf by Deputy Mayor Kevin Felstead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 19 December</td>
<td>Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sefton Community Carol-singing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 20 December</td>
<td>Interview with Compass FM Radio Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Christmas Event, Mandeville Domain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 22 December</td>
<td>Attended funeral for Karen Eastwood of Woodend-Sefton Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 23 December</td>
<td>Rangiora Carol-singing, Victoria Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday 24 December</td>
<td>Attended funeral for staff member Richard Cocker, Rangiora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday 25 December</td>
<td>Assisted at Community Christmas Day Lunch, Kaiapoi Rugby Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 16 January</td>
<td>Chinese Spring Festival attended on my behalf by Deputy Mayor Kevin Felstead, Christchurch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 19 January</td>
<td>Remuneration Authority Advisory Group – all-day conference call after flight cancelled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 20 January</td>
<td>Interview with David Hill from the North Canterbury News</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 23 January</td>
<td>Attended funeral of former Waimakariri Water Zone Committee member Bill Wilson at his Waikuku home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 24 January</td>
<td>Interview with Compass FM Radio Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 25 January</td>
<td>Meeting with John Henderson from Ministry Social Development, Kaiapoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NZ-China Trade Association Function, Christchurch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 26 January</td>
<td>Crown Fibre Holdings Announcement (Prime Minister Rt Hon Bill English and Hon Simon Bridges), Amberley – UFB phase two. Four areas of Waimakariri to receive fibre in this phase and although it is due to start in 2019, all ours come later. • “Rangiora Fringe” (appears to be Ashley village) 2021. • “Woodend Fringe” (appears to be Woodend Beach) 2012 • Waikuku Beach 2022 • Oxford 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canterbury Employers’ Chamber of Commerce, Reserve Bank Lunch, Air Force Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finale Library Summer Reading Programme Teens, Kaiapoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Art on the Quay Opening, Kaiapoi – a very brief visit!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 27 January</td>
<td>Canterbury Mayoral Forum Dinner, Commodore Hotel, Christchurch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canterbury Mayoral Forum meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attended opening of the Kip McGrath Centre by Matt Doocey MP, Rangiora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday 28 January</td>
<td>Civil Defence Volunteers Thank-you Function, Kaiapoi Golf Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday 28 January</td>
<td>Finale Library Summer Reading, Rangiora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday 29 January</td>
<td>One Day Cricket – Canterbury vs Auckland, MainPower Oval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday 29 January</td>
<td>Visited Muscle Car Madness, Rangiora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 30 January</td>
<td>Interview with David Hill from the North Canterbury News</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RECOMMENDATION:**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report N° 170125006748.

David Ayers
MAYOR