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WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

A meeting of the WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL will be held in the COUNCIL CHAMBER, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA on TUESDAY 4 SEPTEMBER 2018 at 1.00PM.

Sarah Nichols
GOVERNANCE MANAGER

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

BUSINESS

1. APOLOGIES

2. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

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

3. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

4. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

4.1 Minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on 7 August 2018

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Confirms as a true and correct record the circulated minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on 7 August 2018.

4.2 Minutes of the public excluded portion of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on 7 August 2018

(refer to Blue agenda papers)

MATTERS ARISING

5. DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

6. ADJOURNED BUSINESS

Nil.
7. REPORTS

7.1. Cones Road Safety Improvements—Gerard Cleary (Manager Utilities and Roading), Bill Rice (Senior Transport Engineer), and Chris Brown (Community Greenspace Manager)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180823095984.

(b) Notes that the walkway is supported by the Rangiora Ashley Community Board

(c) Approves a speed limit of 40km/h on Cones Road, north of Carrs Road, along with the following safety improvements:
   - Speed advisory and pedestrian warning signage.
   - Improvements to the timber site rails at the beginning of the unsealed portion of Cones Road.
   - Localised shaping of the vertical curve north of 352 Cones Road and minor widening of the road.
   - Outdoor convex mirror opposite the driveway at 352 Cones Road.
   - Clearing of vegetation adjacent to the road and including the berm areas in the Council’s maintained mowing list.
   - Letter drops to residents, who are the predominant users of this road, leading up to the installation of the new walking track. These will outline the protocols to enable safe operation of this section of road.

(d) Notes that the Register of Speed Limits will be updated to include the changed speed limit.

(e) 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.

(f) Approves the budget proposed for Cones Rd Upgrade of $20,000 which is included in the Minor Safety Improvements budget.

(g) Notes that the Council, during the LTP deliberations, approved $11,800 towards the cost of the track construction in the 2018/19 financial year.

(h) Circulates this report to the Rangiora Ashley Community Board.
7.2. **Ashley Gorge Road Trunk Main – Colin Roxburgh (Water Asset Manager)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180717079353.

(b) **Approves** $35,000 of the $218,000 capital budget in 2024/25 to be brought forward to the 2018/19 financial year to allow a section of this project to be constructed early.

(c) **Notes** that this work is ultimately required to accommodate growth on the scheme, but by constructing this portion early it will allow Council to resolve an ongoing dispute by providing a point of supply at the property frontage to 101 Ashley Gorge Road, rather than their point of supply requiring pipework through a neighbouring property.

7.3 **Adoption of the Alcohol Control Bylaw 2018 Recommendation of the Hearing Panel – Councillors N Atkinson (Chair), W Doody and J Meyer**

**RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180815091951.

(b) **Adopts** the draft Alcohol Control Bylaw 2018 (TRIM: 180409037733), incorporating the changes made by the Hearing Panel as attached, to take effect from 1 October 2018.

(c) **Notes** the extension of the alcohol control area to Murphy Park during the rugby/rugby league season (1 April to 1 September).

(d) **Revokes** the Liquor Ban Bylaw 2007 on 1 October 2018.

(e) **Notes** an audit of all signage will be undertaken by staff.

(f) **Notes** a copy of this report will be sent to the Community Boards for their information.

7.4 **Draft Business Zone 1 and 2 Public Spaces Policy – Mike O'Connell (Senior Policy Analyst)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180803087217.

(b) **Adopts** the Business Zones 1 & 2 Public Spaces Policy following minor amendments noted in officer recommendations with the Policy to come into effect from Wednesday 5 September 2018.

(c) **Notes** that public consultation took place from 25 June to 30 July 2018 with a total of fifteen submissions received in support of the policy.

(d) **Notes** that feedback received through consultation was considered by a staff Working Group and, where appropriate has been reflected in the final policy.

(e) **Notes** that the final policy will be circulated for information to all Community Board members and to Advisory Group members who provided input into policy development.
7.5. **Amended Appointments to two Hearing Panels – Sarah Nichols**  
(Governance Manager)  

**RECOMMENDATION**  
THAT the Council:  
(a) **Receives** report No. 180822095200.  
(b) **Appoints** Councillor Meyer to the Unreinforced Masonry Building Hearing Panel, in the place of Councillor Gordon.  
(c) **Appoints** Mayor Ayers to the Kaiapoi Town Centre Hearing Panel, in the place of Councillor Barnett.

8. **HEALTH AND SAFETY**  


**RECOMMENDATION**  
THAT the Council:  
(a) **Receives** report No.180821094715,

9. **MATTERS REFERRED FROM COMMITTEES AND COMMUNITY BOARDS**  

9.1. **Increase in Transwaste Disposal Charges for Expanded Polystyrene – Kitty Waghorn (Solid Waste Asset Manager)**  
(refer attached report no. 180802086601 to the Solid and Hazardous Waste Working Party meeting of 15 August 2018)  

**RECOMMENDATION**  
THAT the Council:  
(a) **Receives** report No. 180802086601.  
(b) **Approves** limiting acceptance at Southbrook resource recovery park of low density materials such as expanded polystyrene to a “domestic load” which is equivalent to a standard trailer holding up to a volume of 1.7m³ or up to a maximum weight of 40kg as from 8 September 2018.  
(c) **Notes** that changing a gate fee after the fee has been adopted through the Long Term Plan process would require Council to undertake some form of consultation which would delay the implementation of such an increase.  
(d) **Notes** that expanded polystyrene is not accepted separately at Oxford transfer station and that general waste is charged by volume at this site.  
(e) **Notes** that staff will bring a report to Council in October to request approval of changes to the Terms and Conditions of the Solid Waste and Waste Handling Licensing Bylaw 2016, and that maximum limits on acceptance of low density materials will be included in those proposed changes.
9.2. **Annual Dog Control Report for 2017/18** – Malcolm Johnston (Environmental Services Manager)
(refer attached report no. 180704074535 to the District Planning and Regulation Committee meeting of 21 August 2018)

**RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180704074535.

(b) **Approves** the attached 2017/2018 Annual Report on Dog Control to the Department of Internal Affairs.

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

9.3. **Management of Nitrate Levels for WDC Community Water Supplies** – Sophie Allen (Water Environment Advisor) and Colin Roxburgh (Water Asset Manager)
(refer attached report no. 180719080422 to the Utilities and Roading Committee meeting of 21 August 2018)

**RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180719080422

(b) **Acknowledges** that 3 Waters staff, who are responsible for providing safe high quality drinking water, will advocate for the management of nitrate leaching to groundwater in the Waimakariri Water Zone to limit groundwater nitrate levels to not exceed more than 50% of the Maximum Allowable Value (MAV), as defined in the Drinking-Water Standards New Zealand, for community drinking water supplies.

(c) **Notes** that a groundwater nitrate limit will be proposed by the Waimakariri Water Zone Committee in the draft Zone Implementation Plan Addendum, to be presented to the Council on the 11th September 2018.

(d) **Notes** staff are integrating management and monitoring of nitrate levels into current WDC management practices i.e. Activity Management Plans, and Water Safety Plans under the Drinking-Water Standards New Zealand.

(e) **Notes** that staff are working with Environment Canterbury for increased data input into the nitrate groundwater model from WDC water supply wells, to reduce modelled uncertainty and allow for more informed management.

(f) **Notes** that water treatment for nitrate removal is not considered a preferred option with current technology, however options such as catchment management, and blending of water supplies are viable options.

10. **COMMITTEE/WORKING PARTY/JOINT COMMITTEE MINUTES FOR INFORMATION**

10.1 **Minutes of a meeting of the Community and Recreation Committee held on 24 July 2018**

10.2 **Minutes of a meeting of the Audit and Risk Committee held on 24 July 2018**
10.3 Minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri Youth Council held on 31 July 2018

10.4 Minutes of a meeting of the Regeneration Steering Group held on 6 August 2018

10.5 Minutes of a meeting of the Solid and Hazardous Waste Working Party held on 15 August 2018

10.6 Minutes of a meeting of the District Planning and Regulation Committee held on 21 August 2018

RECOMMENDATION
THAT the information in items 10.1-10.6 be received.

11. COMMUNITY BOARD MINUTES FOR INFORMATION

11.1 Minutes of a meeting of the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board held on 8 August 2018

11.2 Minutes of a meeting of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board held on 9 August 2018

11.3 Minutes of a meeting of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board held on 13 August 2018

11.4 Minutes of a meeting of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board held on 20 August 2018

RECOMMENDATION
THAT the information in items 11.1 to 11.4 be received.
12. REPORTS REFERRED TO COUNCIL FOR INFORMATION FROM THE UTILITIES AND ROADING COMMITTEE MEETING OF 21 AUGUST 2018 (refer to committee agenda to view)

12.1 Avian Botulism at the Kaiapoi Wastewater Treatment Plant – Sophie Allen (Water Environment Advisor) and Rob Frizzell (Wastewater Engineer)

12.2 20 February 2018 Storm Event – Update on Service Requests – Kalley Simpson (3 Waters Manager)

12.3 Seal Extensions and Roading Subdivision Contribution Budget – Joanne McBride (Roading and Transport Manager)

12.4 Approval of new Footpaths Programme – Joanne McBride (Roading and Transport Manager)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the information in items 12.1 to 12.4 be received.

13. CORRESPONDENCE

14. MAYOR’S DIARY

14.1 Mayor’s Diary 31 July – 27 August 2018

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report no. 180827096666.

15. COUNCIL PORTFOLIO UPDATES

15.1 Iwi Relationships
15.2 Canterbury Water Management Strategy
15.3 International Relationships
15.4 Regeneration (Kaiapoi)

16. QUESTIONS
(under Standing Orders)

17. URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS
(under Standing Orders)
18. MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED WITH THE PUBLIC EXCLUDED

Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

RECOMMENDATION

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Minutes/Report of:</th>
<th>General subject of each matter to be considered</th>
<th>Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter</th>
<th>Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>Minutes of the public excluded portion of Council meeting of 6 August 2018</td>
<td>Confirmation of minutes</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>Report of Joanne McBride (Roading and Transport Manager) and Dan Lewis (Engineer)</td>
<td>New Link Road Land Purchase</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 Joanne McBride (Roading and Transport Manager) and Kieran Straw (Civil Project Team Leader)</td>
<td>Gladstone Road Cycleway – Purchase of property</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>Report of Greg Barnard (Parks Community Assets Officer), Grant Reburn (Parks and Recreation Operations Team Leader) and Paul Reed, (Engineer, Beca)</td>
<td>Contract 17/22 – Street, Reserve and Cemetery Tree Maintenance Contract Tender Report</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 Rob Hawthorne (Property Manager)</td>
<td>Contract 17/06 – Logging Contract 17/19 – variation to Harvest Contract</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>Report of Rob Hawthorne (Property Manager)</td>
<td>Purchase of Southbrook Property</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>Report of Mayor Ayers</td>
<td>Chief Executive</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This resolution is made in reliance on section 48(1)(a) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987, and the particular interest or interests protected by section 6 or section 7 of that Act which would be prejudiced by the holding of the whole or relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public are as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Reason for protection of interests</th>
<th>Ref NZS 9202:2003 Appendix A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18.1 – 18.7</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>

**CLOSED MEETING**

See Public Excluded Agenda (blue papers)

**OPEN MEETING**

19. **NEXT MEETING**

The next scheduled meeting of the Council is on Tuesday 2 October 2018 commencing at 1pm.
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA, ON TUESDAY 7 AUGUST 2018, COMMENCING AT 1PM.

PRESENT:

IN ATTENDANCE:
J Palmer (Chief Executive), G Cleary (Manager Utilities & Roading), C Sargison (Manager Community & Recreation), G Wilson (Building Inspector), L Beckingsale (Policy Analyst), B Rice (Senior Transport Engineer), K Waghorn (Solid Waste Asset Manager), C Roxburgh (Water Asset Manager), and S Nichols (Governance Manager).

The meeting adjourned at 2.58pm and recommenced at 3.16pm.

1. APOLOGIES
Nil.

2. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
Nil.

3. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS
Nil.

4. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

4.1 Minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on 29 – 31 May 2018

Moved: Councillor Gordon  Seconded: Councillor Felstead

THAT the Council:

(a) Confirms as a true and correct record the circulated minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on 29 – 31 May 2018.

CARRIED

4.2 Minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on 3 July 2018

Moved: Councillor Gordon  Seconded: Councillor Felstead

THAT the Council:

(a) Confirms as a true and correct record the circulated minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on 3 July 2018.

CARRIED

4.3 Minutes of the public excluded portion of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on 3 July 2018

Matters were dealt with in the public excluded section of the meeting.

MATTERS ARISING
Nil.
5. DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS
Nil.

6. ADJOURNED BUSINESS
Nil.

7. REGENERATION REPORTS

7.1. Earthquake Infrastructure Recovery Programme – August 2018 Update –
G Boot (Senior Engineering Advisor)

K Simpson spoke to the report, providing a summary for the key aspects of the projects. He outlined the outstanding projects related to three waters and timeframes for completion, highlighting the Charles Street pump station.

It was clarified that the demolition referred to in recommendation (f) would not necessarily cost $100,000 however that was the overall remaining budget.

Moved: Councillor Atkinson  Seconded: Councillor Blackie

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180723081893

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

(c) Notes that 48 of the 52 projects on the Earthquake Infrastructure Recovery Programme have been completed, one will be completed in August 2018 and another in September 2018. The remainder are integral with the Kaiapoi East Regeneration Area.

(d) Notes that the current estimate for the capital component of the recovery works is $38,219,000, which is approximately $400,000 less than is budgeted.

(e) Notes that a proposal is being considered to convert the redundant Charles Street wastewater pump station into a public viewing platform adjacent to the Kaiapoi River, rather than demolish the structure.

(f) Authorises staff to utilise the remaining budget of $100,000 allocated for demolishing the Charles Street wastewater pump station for investigating the feasibility of establishing the public viewing platform, and report back to the Council.

(g) Forwards this report to the Utilities and Roading Committee and Regeneration Steering Group for their information.

CARRIED

Councillor Blackie commented on the connection with the Kaiapoi Regeneration development projects timeframes, with any issues coming back to the Council.

Councillor Stewart congratulated staff on six years of project management that is under budget and very close to the original timeframes. She stated that this has been a huge project and well done.

Mayor Ayers endorsed comments made, acknowledging the projects underway and the few remaining projects are some of the largest projects overall.
Building (Earthquake Prone Buildings) Amendment Act 2016 – G Wilson (Building Inspector) and L Beckingsale (Policy Analyst)

L Beckingsale spoke to the report, outlining the reasoning behind the legislation, the requirements going forward and the effects on community safety.

Councillor Blackie commented on building owners dealing with councils, building regulations and deterrents for improving building safety, enquiring if this was the case in Waimakariri. G Wilson commented on MBIE guidance and Building Act requirements. He explained discussions already held with building owners and the balanced approach being taken. The Waimakariri does not have many remaining buildings that are affected by this legislation, compared to some North Island authorities. Staff have identified those buildings and are working with the owners on compliance.

Staff confirmed the hearing timetable could be amended, pending the confirmation of the panel members and their availability.

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

(a) Receives report No: 180710076763.
(c) Notes that the period of public consultation will be from 20 August to 20 September 2018, following which a hearing is proposed for later in October.
(d) Notes consultation with affected property owners is being undertaken.
(e) Appoints Councillors Doody, Blackie and Gordon to the Hearing Panel.

CARRIED

Councillor Gordon thanked G Wilson for the work he has done to date, acknowledging there are only a few dozen buildings to continue working through matters with property owners. Councillor Gordon appreciated the consultation and discussions with affected building owners, acknowledging the difficulties of absentee landlords and insurance companies.

Councillor Felstead stated this was a sensible approach that was being taken, and he thought the consultation document was easy to understand.

Mayor Ayers reflected on a Council submission against this legislation because it believed the time frames were too long and the rules were not tough enough. Mayor Ayers believed this legislation was about saving lives and this Council understands the economic implications for property and business owners post-earthquake. He spoke of the fortitude of business owners and operators, working from temporary premises and the disruption experienced. Mayor Ayers believed many other Councils do not understand the economic impacts until they have experienced such an event like us, remarking on the importance of town centres and the impacts. Mayor Ayers reflected on the recent LGNZ conference and a remit proposing a softening of the regulations. This Council was seen as opposed to the remit. Mayor Ayers reflected on various buildings in the town centres of Rangiora, Kaiapoi and Oxford.

8. REPORTS

8.1. Rangiora-Woodend Road, Gressons Road, Boys Road and Northbrook Road Speed Limit Review– B Rice (Senior Transport Engineer)
B Rice reflected on the reasoning for the report and informal feedback received from the Community Boards and the public. The information received was not as conclusive as anticipated. Feedback indicated those that live on a road are supportive of speed reductions, whilst those that drive the roads would prefer current speed limits to remain.

Evidence related to the number of vehicle crashes on Gressons Road support a speed reduction. B Rice commented on the urban section of Rangiora Woodend Road from the proposed Ravenswood roundabout to Chinnerys Road.

Councillor Gordon referred to para 1.2, enquiring why the Community Board views were not sought first. Staff advised it was related to timing, however Board feedback could occur during the consultation period. In a supplementary question Councillor Gordon enquired what the driver was related to the timeframes. Staff commented that it related to the construction timetable of the Rangiora Woodend Road and cycleway and development in the North Woodend (Ravenswood) area.

Councillor Gordon enquired if it would be critical to the programme if consultation was delayed a month. Staff advised any decisions would be moved back to November as a result and potentially impact construction in Ravenswood, however the additional consultation could occur and staff could come to each of the community boards for discussion and feedback.

Councillor Brine reflected on crashes on the roads outlined in the report. Staff advised there had been a non-fatal crash this morning.

Councillor Barnett reflected on the Long Term Plan discussions which spoke of a comprehensive speed review of whole district, enquiring what the reasoning was for this consultation being singled out. B Rice commented on the cycleway, Ravenswood and adjacent roads to the Rangiora Woodend Road being inconsistent with speed limits. It was advised that the comprehensive review is programmed to be undertaken over a period of time and proposes to look at a number of areas, particularly in eastern wards. Staff would prefer to stage the review area by area rather than the district as a whole at a single time as it would take significant resourcing and time to complete. Staff were also concerned that by undertaking a whole of district review individual communities could get lost in the wider area.

Councillor Barnett questioned the Survey Monkey data, as to how many Rangiora residents responded. Staff were unable to advise as that data was not collected.

Councillor Barnett queried the targeted consultation, particularly as anyone in the District uses these roads. Staff explained consultation was targeted to persons living adjacent to the roads being consulted on. In addition consultation was available for everyone in the District and the mechanisms used to inform included social media, the Council website and newspaper advertisements.

Councillor Barnett referred to accidents and fatalities, enquiring if staff take into account the reasons behind the accident ie where the road is not at fault. B Rice commented that such consequences are often dependent on speed at the time.

Councillor Barnett queried the timing of data collection in May, which was a time period when speed restrictions were in place during the construction of the cycleway. Staff recollection was that the data capture was undertaken outside of the cycleway construction works. Data capture was August the previous year for the Rangiora Woodend Road. The May data capture was for other roads with no speed restrictions impairment.

Councillor Barnett queried that by having a separated cycle lane it makes the road safer. Staff agreed but a cycleway also encourages more cyclists ie intersections and connecting areas.

J Palmer commented on the district speed review, acknowledging LTP discussions. It was noted under the GPS that the government has identified road safety, within speed limits as something they will focus on. It was advised a report will come to the Council outlining a proposed plan, timeframes, the scope of the programme, and priorities. The
work will require being broken into more manageable portions of work phases as intense conversations occur, citing several approaches that could be considered to be taken.

Councillor Doody queried mailboxes facing inwards along the Rangiora Woodend Road cycleway and impacts for the postal service delivery, particularly in relation to safety. Staff advised the matter had been considered and discussed however currently a solution has yet to be found. Feedback from property owners is that they are not comfortable at putting mailboxes on the other side of road, as this would involve owners crossing a busy road. The postal delivery service has high awareness of the issues.

Councillor Meyers sought staff thoughts, based on the feedback received to date, indications were that for the Ravenswood to Woodend School area, the consultation should go out at 50kph. B Rice advised compliance would be low at 50kph without other complimentary engineering works and changes to the layout of the road. It is not appropriate to do the engineering works first before we understand what else may need to happen, particularly on the State Highway, as that potentially changes the best way/place to access the State Highway and cycleways. When staff consider all the factors, they believe 60kph is appropriate for the consultation.

Councillor Atkinson queried the consultation and its targeted nature, as everyone in the district is a potential user of the roads. In acknowledging district wide consultation for a topic such as speed limits which is a large project of work, Councillor Atkinson asked if full district consultation could be discussed further. J Palmer indicated a further discussion with Councillors would occur prior to a report outlining the issues, scope and various approaches to be undertaken.

Councillor Barnett sought clarification on rules for not implementing 70kph speed limits. Staff commented on NZTA guidelines and the special dispensation required for 70kph which can usually be used as a temporary measure. NZTA guidelines are 60kph or 80kph.

In a supplementary question Councillor Barnett sought clarity if that means all current 70kph roads will need to be changed. Staff advised that there is no requirement to change the existing 70kph limits until the review is undertaken.

Councillor Meyer asked if public meetings had occurred in Woodend, and if community board members attended. Staff confirmed public meetings had been held and that community board members had attended, hearing local feedback.

Councillor Blackie reflected on Woodend School who have been lobbying for a 50kph speed limit and low compliance factors. Staff commented on anecdotal information on other similar areas in the district.

Moved: Councillor Barnett Seconded: Councillor Williams

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180706075194.

(b) Refers this report to all Community Boards to seek feedback, and report back to the Council, prior to consultation on proposed speed limits.

(c) Staff to prepare a briefing to the Council on the subject of a district wide review of speed limits.

CARRIED

Division called by Councillor Barnett
For: Councillors Felstead, Atkinson, Barnett, Brine, Gordon and Williams.
Against: Mayor Ayers, Councillors Blackie, Doody, Meyer and Stewart.
Carried 6:5
Councillor Barnett reflected on past consultation experiences related to the Rangiora Woodend Road to Chinnerys Road area, the high response rate and speed limit decisions at that time. Councillor Barnett agreed that this area needs a review again as it is becoming an increasingly important aerial road for the district, however she would like to see evidence of what treatment is proposed first. Councillor Barnett does not believe the data is conclusive enough to form a clear preference. She commented on arterial roads, the importance of consulting with everyone and there not being a need to go outside normal practice of seeking community board views from a local knowledge perspective. Councillor Barnett stated she was not convinced that an area by area approach to speed limits is the most appropriate approach, remarking on inconsistency and a desire to see a communication plan prior to such consultation.

Councillor Williams concurred with Councillor Barnett’s comments.

Councillor Brine supported the motion but cautioned on the need to be reasonable on how the consultation is undertaken with the community then work through the information. He stated this motion makes it more specific on seeking community board views, although the staff recommendation would have enabled such an opportunity to occur.

Councillor Felstead remarked he understood community board frustrations on decisions before their input is received, hence he would support the motion, although cautioned that he did not wish to see unnecessary delay of a speed limit review for some areas of the district.

Mayor Ayers appreciated talking to the community boards, however they may lack the big picture as this is not just speed limits. The speed limit information coming from the government is due to be released in late September and he feels it is appropriate to wait until that information becomes available. Mayor Ayers expressed concern about the consultation with all four community boards, as the specific area covers three ward areas and they would have the opportunity to submit through normal processes. Mayor Ayers remarked that the Council should be careful about turning community boards into district councils as their role is consult on individual community areas.

Mayor Ayers spoke of views on process may change once the government report is released, remarked on the logistics of reviewing the whole district at once, believing that an area by area approach made sense, and discussions with planners was also needed. Mayor Ayers spoke of the speed management guidelines already in place.

Mayor Ayers also spoke of speed and the different elements for reasoning/contributors to a collision.

Councillor Atkinson disagreed with Mayoral comments on a district wide review, believing a comprehensive review was necessary for all users. Councillor Atkinson stated that staff already undertake large consultation projects such as the LTP so it can be done. Councillor Atkinson held some reservation with statistics reflecting how several interpretations can come from data.

Councillor Gordon stated his principal concern is consultation with the community boards and that a short extension of time for improved feedback is important to the overall outcome.

Councillor Meyer acknowledged it is a challenging task however the community boards had already been involved, so now was the time to move onto the next phase.

In her right of reply Councillor Barnett believed it was evident from the debate that the Council needs a bigger conversation first and by involving the community boards that local knowledge input will assist with future decision making. Everyone in the district is a potential user of the roads, and lowering speed limits is not the only answer, hence the call for further discussions which in turn will assist with consistency across the district.
8.2 Request for Budget for Completion of Oxford Rural No. 1 Source Upgrade Project – C Roxburgh (Water Asset Manager)

C Roxburgh spoke to the report, highlighting key aspects of the proposal.

Councillor Barnett sought clarification on the complications that occurred during the consenting process. Staff explained two aspects, being the ability to demonstrate impacts on other wells within a two kilometre radius and the community protection zone required for drinking water standards. Initial discussions with Ecan indicated some impact on other wells but as the purpose was a public drinking water well then the criteria alters and further discussions indicated matters were not clear cut.

Councillor Felstead understood the additional cost of $120,000, for resource consent for the well and enquired what other additional costs due to objections and appeal process could be involved. Staff advised the majority of costs were associated with the objection process and would be influenced by the Ecan interpretation of information.

Councillor Doody enquired if the consumers are being kept up to date with progress. Staff advised some feedback was being received and staff were preparing a letter to send to consumers in the near future.

Moved: Councillor Doody Seconded: Councillor Brine
THAT the Council:
(a) Receives report No. 180724082339.
(b) Notes that the consent to take water from the new well has been granted by Environment Canterbury and that there were no appeals against this decision.
(c) Approves an additional capital budget of $200,000 for the Oxford Rural No.1 Source Upgrade budget for the 2018/19 financial year ($130,000 level of service budget, $70,000 renewal budget) to make a total combined capital budget of $2.6M.
(d) Notes that this budget will compensate for additional expenditure required to gain the resource consent to take water from the new well, as well as to allow sufficient contingency for the completion of the project.
(e) Notes that this additional budget will increase the Oxford Rural No.1 water rate by approximately $11 per unit per year, which is a 2% increase over next year’s projected water rate for the scheme.
(f) Circulates this report to the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board for their information.
(g) Circulates the report to consumers with a letter updating the situation.

CARRIED

Councillor Doody remarked that this had been a long process with public meetings and discussions with the neighbouring property owner. She was pleased to see this project underway as it was important for the community.

8.3 Southwest Rangiora Supply Main – Request for Additional Budget – C Roxburgh (Water Asset Manager)

C Roxburgh spoke to the report highlighting reasons for the proposal.

There were no questions from the members.

Moved: Councillor Brine Seconded: Councillor Gordon
THAT the Council:
(a) Receives report No. 180726083675.
(b) Approves an additional capital budget of $40,000 to the Southwest Rangiora Supply Main – Stage 1 project for the 2018/19 financial year to give a total budget figure of $314,000.
(c) Approves staff to engage the Council’s Water Unit to complete these works for the quoted price of 147,776.36 without seeking alternative prices.
(d) Notes that the reason for not publicly tendering the work is because the Water Unit have the capability and capacity to complete the work at a competitive price.
(e) Notes that the costs associated with this project will be recovered through the West Rangiora Water development contribution, and that the increase in budget will increase this development contribution by $49 per new connection from the 2019/20 financial year onwards.

CARRIED

Councillor Brine stated this was a common sense approach to a project that has to be undertaken.

Rangiora Airfield Plan Change and Designation – C Sargison (Manager Community and Recreation)

C Sargison spoke briefly to the report, outlining the next steps in the process. Staff continue to monitor all take off and landings at the airfield.

There were no questions from members.

Moved: Councillor Gordon Seconded: Councillor Williams

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives report No.180730084697.
(b) Approves staff lodging the Proposed plan change and notice of requirement for Rangiora Airfield (Trim 180730084763 and 180730084766).
(c) Circulates this report to the Community Boards for information.

CARRIED

Councillor Gordon fully supported the report, direction and the process, having attended the public meetings as he believed it was a robust process. Feedback from the airfield committee had been positive. Councillor Gordon commented that the communications plan will be worked through enabling people to feedback. He advised that the airfield would be having an open day in the near future which will assist with public knowledge of the varied airfield operations.

Councillor Williams concurred with comments of colleagues.

Mayor Ayers stated this is another important step forward, reflecting on some feedback about the airfield; some related to delegation and some general feedback about having an airfield in the district.

8.4 Councillor Appointments to Rangiora Airfield Advisory Group – S Nichols (Governance Manager)
Moved: Councillor Atkinson  Seconded: Councillor Blackie

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180725083462.
(b) **Retrospectively ratifies** Councillor Gordon to replace Councillor Atkinson as the Council representative on the Rangiora Airfield Advisory Group.
(c) **Notes** that Councillor Williams will continue to also be the Council representative on the Rangiora Airfield Advisory Group.

CARRIED

Councillor Atkinson explained the meetings unfortunately clashed with his responsibilities to the Te Kohoka o Tuhaitura Trust and was supportive of Councillor Gordon’s appointment.

9. **HEALTH AND SAFETY**

9.1 **Health and Safety Report for July 2018 – J Palmer (Chief Executive)**

Moved: Councillor Atkinson  Seconded: Councillor Felstead

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180723081898.

CARRIED

Councillor Atkinson stated it was a good report which was self-explanatory.

10. **MATTERS REFERRED FROM COMMITTEES AND COMMUNITY BOARDS**

10.1 **Parking Restrictions at Oxford Road/ Charles Upham Drive /Acacia Avenue Intersection and on Charles Upham Drive – B Rice (Senior Transport Engineer)**

(referred to report no. 180628071686 from the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board meeting of 11 July 2018)

Moved: Councillor Gordon  Seconded: Councillor Williams

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180628071686.
(b) **Adopts** the attached Amended Second Schedule – Parking Restrictions to the Parking Bylaw 2007 (TRIM No 180629072243).
(c) **Notes** that other safety concerns at the Oxford Road, Acacia Avenue, Charles Upham Drive intersection are to be addressed in the Oxford Road urbanisation project.
(d) **Notes** that further parking restrictions may be required on Oxford Road to accommodate right turn bays at the intersection.
(e) **Notes** that further parking restrictions may be required on the roading network north of the Charles Upham village vehicle entrance. These will be added to the parking bylaw second schedule when this section of road is vested in Council.

CARRIED

Councillor Gordon reflected on a residents’ meeting on site and feedback in which he believed staff were flexible and an easy solution was found. He noted the residents were an active group.
Councillor Doody reflected on anecdotal feedback being that parking was hard for visitors and queried if the Charles Upham Retirement Village was going to provide more parking in the future.

Councillor Gordon stated this report enabled a tidying of a particular situation and was not removing any parking.

10.2 **Final Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018 – K Waghorn (Solid Waste Asset Manager)**

(referred to report no. 180710076344 from the Solid and Hazardous Waste Working Party meeting of 19 July 2018)

S Collin spoke briefly to the report reflecting on the process to date, and was seeking final adoption of the plan.

Councillor Barnett referred to 300 tonnes of waste from bins transported to Kate Valley rather than kerbside recycling, enquiring if there was any further update on the investigation. S Collin advised the matter was not being investigated further at this stage, but that aspect of the project is still proposed. J Palmer clarified several aspects related to the 300 tonnes of waste.

Moved: Councillor Barnett   Seconded: Councillor Brine

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180710076344.

(b) **Adopts** the final Waste Management & Minimisation Plan 2018 (180710076343).

(c) **Circulates** a copy of this report to all Community Boards for their information.

CARRIED

Councillor Barnett stated that good work had occurred to date. In explaining her reasoning for questioning Councillor Barnett stated the aim of the plan is to stop the waste in the first instance, commenting on packaging at the beginning of the process.

Councillor Brine acknowledged it had been a long process to this stage and thanked staff for their work.

Councillor Williams stated he was supportive of the motion, but cautioned on the importance of getting the weight/ size proportions right alongside balancing costs.

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

11.1 **Minutes of a meeting of the District Planning and Regulation Committee held on 19 June 2018**

11.2 **Minutes of a meeting of the Utilities and Roading Committee held on 19 June 2018**

11.3 **Minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri Youth Council held on 26 June 2018**

11.4 **Minutes of a meeting of the Regeneration Steering Group held on 2 July 2018**

11.4 **Minutes of a meeting of the Solid and Hazardous Waste Working Party held on 19 July 2018**

Moved: Councillor Atkinson   Seconded: Councillor Doody

**THAT** the information in items 11.1-11.4 be received.

CARRIED
12. COMMUNITY BOARD MINUTES FOR INFORMATION

12.1 Minutes of a meeting of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board held on 5 July 2018
12.2 Minutes of a meeting of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board held on 9 July 2018
12.3 Minutes of a meeting of the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board held on 11 July 2018
12.4 Minutes of a meeting of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board held on 16 July 2018

Moved: Councillor Meyer Seconded: Councillor Atkinson

THAT the information in items 12.1 to 12.4 be received.

CARRIED

Councillor Felstead updated the Council on the Canterbury Landscape Supplies situation, including what stage consents were currently at, and reflected on residents attending the last meeting.

13. CORRESPONDENCE

Nil.

14. MAYOR’S DIARY

14.1 Mayor’s Diary 25 June to 30 July 2018

Moved: Councillor Felstead Seconded: Councillor Atkinson

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report no. 180720081108.

CARRIED

15. COUNCIL PORTFOLIO UPDATES

15.1 Iwi Relationships

Mayor Ayers acknowledged recent Runanga meeting and reflected on a speech to the LGNZ Conference from Te Maire Tau. Mayor Ayers commented on recent discussions with leaders and views of the future direction of the Tuahiwi hapu.

15.2 Canterbury Water Management Strategy

Councillor Stewart reflected on processes and feedback from recent community meetings. Both Ecan and Water Zone Committee had enquired what nitrate level would the Council be comfortable with via a policy. However the Council does not have a policy and further discussion will occur on 18 August.

Councillor Stewart outlined the current work programme of the Water Zone Committee and spoke of upcoming Zone stakeholder discussions.

It was advised that in early September a further update on the ZIPA would be discussed with the Council, prior to public consultation.

15.3 International Relationships

Mayor Ayers provided a presentation to the Council on the recent Waimakariri delegation to China.
15.4  **Regeneration (Kaiapoi)**

Councillor Blackie mentioned the upcoming opening of Feldwick Drive, which was another important step forward for Kaiapoi.

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 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>18.1</td>
<td>Minutes of public excluded portion of Council meeting of 3 July 2018</td>
<td>Confirmation of minutes.</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>Minutes of public excluded portion of Rangiora-Ashley Community Board meeting of 11 July 2018</td>
<td>Minutes to be received for information.</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>Report of Raymond Qu (Property Assets Advisor) and Rob Hawthorne (Property Manager)</td>
<td>Proposed Sale process for 70 and 74 High Street, Rangiora</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MATTER REFERRED FROM THE RANGIORA-ASHLEY COMMUNITY BOARD 11 JULY 2018**

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 as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Reason for protection of interests</th>
<th>Ref NZS 9202:2003 Appendix A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18.1 – 18.3</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>
Closed meeting

Resolution to resume in Open Meeting

Moved: Mayor Ayers Seconded: Councillor Gordon

THAT open meeting resumes and that the resolution(s) made with the public excluded be made public on report 19, however any discussion remains public excluded.

CARRIED

19 MATTER REFERRED FROM THE RANGIORA-ASHLEY COMMUNITY BOARD
MEETING OF 11 JULY 2018

Proposed Sale Process for 70 and 74 High Street, Rangiora – R Qu (Property Assets Advisor) and R Hawthorne (Property Manager)

Moved: Councillor Stewart Seconded: Councillor Atkinson

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180601061463.
(b) Supports the proposed sale process;
(c) Notes the importance of this land and future development of it with regard to its location and connection to the Rangiora town centre, adjoining developments and the current Rangiora Town Centre Strategy;
(d) Notes that investigations are underway into the original acquisition of the various sites to ensure no impediment exists to the sale of the land as proposed;
(e) Notes the tender process has two stages, being an EOI and tender price offer as mentioned in 1.2. After reviewing the Selected Tender submissions, the preferred designs will be presented to the Council and the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board for comments;
(f) Notes the staff propose that Council nominates the following people to be part of the tender selection panel.
   i. Mayor David Ayers, (ex officio), and Councillors Dan Gordon and Kevin Felstead as portfolio holders
   ii. Rob Hawthorne, the Property Manager and Raymond Qu, the Property Assets Advisor, and Simon Hart, the Business & Centres Manager.

CARRIED

The public excluded section of the meeting occurred from 3.47pm to 4.15pm.
Open meeting

19. NEXT MEETING
The next scheduled meeting of the Council is on Tuesday 4 September 2018 commencing at 1pm.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE MEETING WAS CLOSED AT 4.17PM.

CONFIRMED

________________
Chairperson

________________
Date
1. SUMMARY

1.1. This report seeks Council approval of a speed limit of 40km/h on Cones Road which along with the implementation of safety features recommended by Ableys will allow the construction of a walkway linking Cones Road to Boundary Road.

1.2. The proposed walkway and associated roading works have been the subject of several reports and deliberations by the Rangiora Ashley Community Board, the Utilities and Roading Committee and the Council.

1.3. The Rangiora Ashley Community Board were approached by Mr Harris at the July 2015 meeting with his proposal for the development of a walkway in Loburn between the existing northern terminus of Cones Road and following the unformed portion of legal road to its connection with Boundary Road. The proposed walkway would provide a worthwhile and safe pedestrian link between Rangiora and the Ashley Forest area as well as providing additional options as part of local walking circuits for Loburn residents.

1.4. At the March 2017 Rangiora – Ashley Community Board Meeting the following resolution was passed:

THAT the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board:

(a) Receives report No.161202124440.

(b) Supports a walking track between Cones Road and Boundary Road being developed by the community in order to create a direct walking link between Rangiora and the Ashley Forest provided that:

(c) no work commences on the walkway until staff ensure a legal posted speed limit of 30km/h on the unsealed portion of Cones Road, can be implemented. Such signage to be in place prior to the walkway being opened.
(d) pedestrian warning signage be installed at appropriate locations along the road.

(e) an outdoor convex mirror be installed for the driveway of 352 Cones Road.

(f) the area next to the road be widened or cleared to give users more space to avoid conflicts, if the scope of the project allows.

(g) Requests that staff investigate the intersection access and area of Carrs and Cones Road in order to:
   • provide greater safety,
   • provide adequate parking.

1.5. In order to progress the resolution passed by the Board Council staff consulted with the community regarding the reduction of the speed limit on Cones Road to 30km per hour. Following the consultation it was recommended by the Board in August 2017 (based on a staff report) that it instead be changed to 40km per hour, provided other road safety works were completed. The Board’s recommendation was then presented to Council which decided to leave the report lying on the table until it received further information regarding the walkway’s viability. The Council requested a community action plan which needed to identify who was going to complete the track, maintain the track and how much money was required from Council.

1.6. This information was provided to Council in a report as part of the January 2018 draft Long Term Plan budget meetings. The Council resolved to allocate $11,800 towards the track project. However, this was still reliant on the implementation of the Cones Road safety improvements, including the lowering of the speed limit. Not until the Long Term Plan process was completed in June of this year was that funding confirmed.

1.7. Funding for the safety improvements to Cones Road, which was identified by Abley Transportation Consultants, included localised shaping of the vertical curve at no. 352, installation of signage, upgrading timber sight rails and clearing of vegetation to open up the lines of sight. This funding has been allocated from the Roading Unit’s Minor Safety Improvements budget. The estimated cost of the roading improvements is $20,000 and a report requesting that this funding be allocated was considered at the 21st August Utilities and Roading Committee meeting.

1.8. The following is an extract from the unconfirmed minutes of that meeting:

   Notes that budget proposed for Cones Rd Upgrade which is included in the Minor Safety Improvements will be subject to project approval by Council and a separate report will be taken to Council on this matter;

1.9. The Council now needs to consider the recommendation to reduce the speed limit and approve the funding for the proposed road safety improvements, and a copy of that report is attached.

1.10. In regards to the walkway construction it is proposed that this will be undertaken by volunteers under the guidance and management of Council Greenspace staff. The track will be constructed to the “Walking Track” category as specified in the “Tracks and Outdoor Visitor Structures” standard (SNZ HB 8630:2004). This document specifies design standards such as track construction including slope, width and track surface as well as associated structures. Due to the scale and type of track that is being proposed, and the additional native vegetation planting that will occur alongside the track development, Council staff do not consider that a geotechnical engineer is required to assess the road reserve land prior to the track development.
1.11. A question has been raised regarding the availability or location for car parking. This issue was identified during early consultation and was presented to the Rangiora Ashley Community Board in a report in March 2017. The track is not being built as a destination track and is likely to be used more by locals as a link track and therefore it is unlikely car parking demand will be high. The improvements at the Carrs Road / Cones Road intersection have not included any provision for car parking associated with the walkway. However, car parking can occur on the reserve adjacent to the Cones / Dixons Road intersection.

1.12. Alongside the process to implement safety improvements to Cones Road the Roading Unit has also undertaken safety improvements to the Cones Road / Carrs Road intersection. A new road layout has been implemented which provides improvements to sight distances and associated levels of safety. Some minor repairs are still to be completed and are scheduled subject to appropriate weather conditions.

Attachments:

i. Report to Rangiora Ashley Community Board August 2017 Changes to Cones Road Speed Limit (Trim 170713072881)

ii. Plan showing proposed speed limits (Trim 170713072824)

iii. Report to Council January 2018 Cones Road Proposed Walkway Link to Boundary Road (Trim 180104000506)

iv. Cones Road Safety Assessment Abley Report (TRIM 161202124829)

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180823095984.

(b) Notes that the walkway is supported by the Rangiora Ashley Community Board

(c) Approves a speed limit of 40km/h on Cones Road, north of Carrs Road, along with the following safety improvements:
   • Speed advisory and pedestrian warning signage.
   • Improvements to the timber site rails at the beginning of the unsealed portion of Cones Road.
   • Localised shaping of the vertical curve north of 352 Cones Road and minor widening of the road.
   • Outdoor convex mirror opposite the driveway at 352 Cones Road.
   • Clearing of vegetation adjacent to the road and including the berm areas in the Council’s maintained mowing list.
   • Letter drops to residents, who are the predominant users of this road, leading up to the installation of the new walking track. These will outline the protocols to enable safe operation of this section of road.

(d) Notes that the Register of Speed Limits will be updated to include the changed speed limit.

(e) 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.

(f) Approves the budget proposed for Cones Rd Upgrade of $20,000 which is included in the Minor Safety Improvements budget.
3. BACKGROUND

3.1 A walking track from the end of Cones Road to Boundary Road, through the unformed road reserve, is proposed. In March 2017, the Rangiora – Ashley Community Board approved the walking track subject to the implementation of a 30km/h speed limit, installation of pedestrian warning signage, installation of an outdoor convex mirror at 352 cones Road and clearing of the area adjacent to the road.

3.2 The 30km/h speed limit was recommended in an independent safety review because the vertical curve on Cones Road limited inter-visibility between vehicles and pedestrians, accessing the walkway, on Cones Road.

3.3 Consultation on the speed limit change indicated strong opposition to the proposed 30km/h limit. A total of 32 submissions were received. Ten of these fully supported the proposed change. Eighteen thought the speed limit should remain as it is. Two suggested reducing the speed limit and widening the road. Two suggested reducing the speed limit, but to more than 30km/h.

3.4 A speed survey on Cones Road, 200m north of Carrs Road recorded a mean speed of 50km/h. The speed management guide recommends that, once a speed limit is in place, mean speeds should not exceed 10% more than the posted speed limit. Reducing the existing 50km/h mean speed to 33km/h is unlikely in this environment. Following consultation and the speed survey, a revised speed limit of 40km/h was recommended, along with measures to improve visibility over the vertical curve.

3.5 At its meeting of 9th August 2017, the Rangiora–Ashley Community Board resolved:

THAT the Rangiora–Ashley Community Board:

(a) Receives report No 170713072881

THAT the Rangiora – Ashley Community Board recommends to Council that it:

(b) Approves a speed limit of 40km/h on Cones Road, north of Carrs Road, along with the following safety improvements:

- Speed advisory and pedestrian warning signage.
- Improvements to the timber site rails at the beginning of the unsealed portion of Cones Road.
- Localised shaping of the vertical curve north of 352 Cones Road and minor widening of the road.
- Outdoor convex mirror opposite the driveway at 352 Cones Road.
- Clearing of vegetation adjacent to the road and including the berm areas in the Council’s maintained mowing list.
- Letter drops to residents, who are the predominant users of this road, leading up to the installation of the new walking track. These will outline the protocols to enable safe operation of this section of road.
(c) **Notes** that the Register of Speed Limits will be updated to include the changed speed limit.

(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.

(e) **Requests** that staff continue to investigate the intersection access and area of Carrs and Cones Roads in order to:
   - Provide greater safety
   - Provide adequate parking

(f) **Requests** that within six months of the vertical curve being reshaped, a speed survey will be carried out in this location, and an assessment made to ensure that the appropriate stopping sight distances are provided.

3.6 At its meeting on 5th September 2017, Council resolved to:

   *Lay* the report on the table on the proposed Cones Road Walkway pending further information including costs, a community action plan for the walkway construction and maintenance matters and to report back to the Council through the Long Term Plan.

3.7 A report including an action plan was provided to Council at its Draft Long Term Plan meetings in January 2018. That meeting resolved:

   **THAT** the Council

   (a) **Receives** report No.180104000506

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

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

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

   (e) **Notes** that the Roading report Trim # 170822090365 regarding the reduction of the speed limit on Cones Road and other safety related changes to Cones Road is still lying on the table and will be considered when the Long Term Plan is finalised.

3.8 The Utilities and Roading Committee approved the Roading Programme at their meeting on 21st August 2018 and noted that the budget proposed for the Cones Rd Upgrade, which is included in the Minor Safety Improvements, will be subject to project approval by Council and a separate report will be taken to Council on this matter – which is this report.

4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1. This report seeks Council’s approval of the recommendations relating to the change in speed limit to 40km/h speed limit on Cones Road which was as recommended in the August 2017 report, copy attached, (TRIM Number 170713072881) which was left on the table in 2017.

4.2. The report was left “on the table” pending further information including costs, a community action plan for the walkway construction and maintenance matters and to report back to the Council through the Long Term Plan.
4.3. Council has received information regarding costs to construct the walkway and an action plan for walkway construction and maintenance. Council has approved $11,800 in the LTP for the walkway construction.

4.4. The Utilities and Roading Committee considered the Roading Programme budget report which included a $20,000 provision for the safety works to facilitate the construction of the walkway.

4.5. This report is seeking approval from the Council to proceed with the changes to the speed limit, the proposed safety measures and to proceed with the community on the detailed plans for the construction of the walkway.

4.6. The options available to the Council are:

- Approve the speed limit and roading improvements, which will then enable the track to be built (recommended option).
- Not approve the recommendations contained in this report, which would effectively prevent the track from being built because of safety considerations.
- Defer the matter, seeking further information or reports on aspects that are unclear. Staff, at this time, consider there is sufficient information to enable the Council to make a decision.

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

5. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

5.1. **Groups and Organisations** Consultation has been carried out regarding the speed limit change. The results of this consultation were included in the speed limit report (attached).

5.2. **Wider Community** These were canvassed as part of the Speed Consultation and as summarised in the attached report.

5.3. The project has been subject to a high level of community awareness over the past three years. Community members have presented their views to the Community Board, and it is fair to say there are some strongly held views for and against the construction of the walkway.

5.4. No submissions were received on the budget allocation for the walkway as part of the LTP process.

6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**

6.2. The total cost of the new speed limit and other signage and road improvements can be met from existing budgets.

6.3. The following is a summary of the Council funding proposed to be applied to this project.

| Roading Minor Safety budget (will be eligible for NZTA subsidy) | $20,000 |
| Track construction costs | $11,800 |
6.4. Note that the actual construction will be undertaken by volunteers working to a plan approved by the Council Greenspace Team. Part of that plan will include a health and safety plan.

6.5. **Community Implications**

6.6. The speed limit reduction and associated safety improvements on Cones Road will facilitate the construction of the walkway. While the walkway was suggested by members of the local community there are other members who would prefer not to see the walkway constructed.

6.7. The proposed walkway would provide a worthwhile and safe pedestrian link between Rangiora and the Ashley Forest area as well as providing additional options as part of local walking circuits for Loburn residents and is supported by the Rangiora Ashley Community Board.

6.8. Ultimately, the assessment of the benefit to the Community, is a decision to be made by Council.

6.9. **Risk Management**

6.10. These measures mitigate risks associated with walkers and cyclists walking on the narrow section of Cones Road, which has limited visibility.

6.11. **Health and Safety**

6.12. Track construction health and safety will be managed by the Greenspace Team

6.13. Implementing the proposed safety improvements outlined in the Abley’s report, along with the speed limit change, are considered sufficient to provide a safe environment and enable construction of the walkway to proceed.

7. **CONTEXT**

7.1. **Policy**

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

7.2. **Community Outcomes**

   **c. There is a safe environment for all**
   - Harm to people from natural and man-made hazards is minimised. ¹,²,³,⁴
   - Crime, injury and harm from road crashes, gambling, and alcohol abuse are minimised. ¹,³,⁴

   **j. Transport is accessible, convenient, reliable and sustainable**
   - The standard of our District’s roads is keeping pace with increasing traffic numbers. ¹,³,⁴

7.3. **Delegations**

The Council is responsible for approving speed limit changes
1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to seek Boards approval to change the speed limit on Cones Road, north of Carrs Road.

1.2. A speed limit of 40km/h is recommended on Cones Road, north of Carrs Road, along with the following safety improvements:
   - Speed advisory and pedestrian warning signage.
   - Improvements to the timber site rails at the beginning of the unsealed portion of Cones Road.
   - Localised shaping of the vertical curve north of 352 Cones Road and minor widening of the road.
   - Outdoor convex mirror opposite the driveway at 352 Cones Road.
   - Clearing of vegetation adjacent to the road and including the berm areas in the Council’s maintained mowing list.
   - Letter drops to residents, who are the predominant users of this road, leading up to the installation of the new walking track. These will outline the protocols to enable safe operation of this section of road.

1.3. In March, a speed limit of 30km/h was proposed on Cones Road, along the unsealed portion north of Carrs Road. The Board supported the proposal for consultation and feedback was sought between 16 June and 14 July 2017.

1.4. A total of 32 submissions were received on the proposal. Ten submissions fully supported the proposal.

1.5. Two submissions thought a combination of lowering the speed limit and widening the road was needed. Two more submissions agreed with decreasing the speed limit on Cones Road, however thought a speed limit of 30km/h was too low.

1.6. Eighteen submissions were fully opposed to the change and thought the speed limit should stay at 100km/h. It is noted that five of the eighteen submissions stated they opposed the proposed walking track, and ten of the eighteen submissions thought other safety measures were required, including improvements to the Cones Road / Carrs Road intersection. Options for improvements
to the Cones Road / Carrs Road intersection are being developed. Feedback on these options will be sought from the Community Board and local residents shortly.

1.7. Based on the feedback received, the mean operating speed of the road and a re-evaluation of the road environment and possible safety improvements it is recommended a 40km/h speed limit be approved. A 40km/h speed limit is likely to have a higher level of compliance than a 30km/h speed limit and the additional safety measures will ensure pedestrians using the road are safe.

Attachments:

i. Plan showing proposed speed limits (TRIM 170713072824)

ii. Submission Details (TRIM 170713072801)

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Rangiora – Ashley Community Board recommends to Council that it:

(a) Receives report No 170713072881

(b) Approves a speed limit of 40km/h on Cones Road, north of Carrs Road, along with the following safety improvements:

- Speed advisory and pedestrian warning signage.
- Improvements to the timber site rails at the beginning of the unsealed portion of Cones Road.
- Localised shaping of the vertical curve north of 352 Cones Road and minor widening of the road.
- Outdoor convex mirror opposite the driveway at 352 Cones Road.
- Clearing of vegetation adjacent to the road and including the berm areas in the Council's maintained mowing list.
- Letter drops to residents, who are the predominant users of this road, leading up to the installation of the new walking track. These will outline the protocols to enable safe operation of this section of road.

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

(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.

3. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

3.1. Cones Road, north of Carrs Road, is a low volume unsealed road with a 100km/h speed limit, which provides access to a small number of private properties. The Average Daily Traffic (ADT) is 47 vehicles per day. Cones Road is approximately 3.5m wide and holds a generally straight alignment, with a slight bend in the vicinity of the driveway at 352 Cones Road. The road gently inclines north of Carrs Road to a vertical crest 10m north of 352 Cones Road.

3.2. A walking track from the end of Cones Road to Boundary Road, through the unformed road reserve, is proposed. In March, the Rangiora – Ashley Community Board approved the walking track subject to the implementation of a 30km/h speed limit, installation of pedestrian warning signage, installation of an outdoor convex mirror at 352 cones Road and clearing of the area adjacent to the road.
3.3. The reason for reviewing the speed limit on Cones Road is that concerns have been raised by residents regarding the expected increase in numbers of pedestrians sharing the road with property owners’ vehicles and an independent safety review recommended a 30km/h speed limit.

3.4. In June, feedback on the proposed new 30km/h speed limit on Cones Road was sought through advertising in the local newspapers and on the Council's website. Also letters were sent to NZTA, the Police, the NZ Automobile Association Inc and the Road Transport Forum NZ as required by the Land Transport Rule: Setting of Speed Limits.

3.5. NZTA has recently released their new Speed Management Guide. This document includes guidance on appropriate speeds for different road environments. The new guide places an increased emphasis on roadside hazards, and carriageway width. It also outlines measures to manage speeds, including the use of speed limits and other treatments and activities.

3.6. For narrow, rural unsealed roads, NZTA’s new Speed Management Guide recommends a speed limit of 60km/h.

3.7. Abley Transportation Consultants carried out a safety assessment on Cones Road (TRIM 161202124829) which recommended that a speed limit of 30km/h on the unsealed portion of Cones Road be implemented. Further recommendations included installation of pedestrian warning signage, outdoor convex mirror, and widening of the road, to increase the visibility for road uses.

3.8. The existing operating speed was determined using data collected from a special count site on Cones Road, 200m north of Carrs Road. A mean speed of 50.3km/h and an 85th percentile speed of 67.2km/h were recorded between Thursday 22 June 2017 and Wednesday 5 July 2017. The Speed Management Guide requires a speed limit of less than 50km/h to have a mean operating speed within 5km/h of the proposed limit. If the mean speed is not within 5km/h of the proposed limit then traffic engineering measures will be required to achieve lower speeds.

3.9. The straight portion of Cones Road, between Carrs Road and 352 Cones Road, has good visibility and areas adjacent to the road where pedestrians can walk away from vehicle traffic. It should be noted that this length of road does not lend itself to a 30km/h speed limit, as shown from the operating speed count taken 200m north of Carrs Road.

3.10. The Abley Transportation Consultants safety assessment highlights visibility and stopping site distance as potential safety issues. The area where visibility is considered an issue is in the vicinity of the vehicle entrance to 352 Cones Road.

3.11. The vertical curve just north of the vehicle entrance to 352 Cones Road limits a driver’s Stopping Sight Distance (SSD) considerably. Abley Transportation Consultants safety assessment estimated the existing SSD on the curve to be between 40 to 45 metres. An on-site accurate measure of the site distance was carried out as part of the speed assessment and was found to be 38 m.

The table below outlines the required SSD for a vehicle travelling at 30km/h, 40km/h and 50km/m.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speed of Vehicle</th>
<th>Existing SSD at Vertical Curve</th>
<th>Required SSD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 km/h</td>
<td>38 m</td>
<td>35 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 km/h</td>
<td>38 m</td>
<td>52 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 km/h</td>
<td>38 m</td>
<td>75 m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table indicates that a driver travelling on this vertical curve at 40km/h or 50km/h would not be able to come to a complete stop for a hazard on the road. Targeted improvement work is required for a 40 km/h and 50 km/h speed limit. Clearing the area adjacent to the road at this location will help increase visibility. The steep incline can also be eased through localised shaping at the peak of the crest, which will in turn increase the visibility at this location. Positive traffic calming can be carried out through 30km/h speed advisory and pedestrian warning signage.
3.12. The intersection of Cones Road and the vehicle entrance to 352 Cones Road has steep banks and trees either side of the road that limit the Safe Intersection Sight Distance (SISD). Based on Abley’s Safety Assessment the existing intersection site distance is estimated to be 15 to 20 metres.

The table below outlines the required SISD for a vehicle travelling at 30km/h, 40km/h and 50km/h.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speed of Vehicle</th>
<th>Existing ISD at #352</th>
<th>Required SISD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 km/h</td>
<td>15 m</td>
<td>60 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 km/h</td>
<td>15 m</td>
<td>90 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 km/h</td>
<td>15 m</td>
<td>120 m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table indicates that a driver approaching the intersection of Cones Road and the vehicle entrance to 352 Cones Road at 30km/h, 40km/h or 50km/h would not be able to come to a complete stop for a hazard on the road. Targeted improvement work is required. An outdoor convex mirror opposite the driveway at 352 Cones Road would significantly increase the driver’s field of vision along the road. Clearing the area adjacent to the road and localised road widening will also help increase visibility.

3.13. Improvements to the timber site rails at the beginning of the unsealed portion of Cones Road, will help create a “threshold” and minimise through traffic. Improvements include re-painting the timber site rails, and installing “No Exit”, and “No Turning or Parking Available Beyond this Point” signage.

3.14. The table below outlines the speed limit options for Cones Road, north of Carrs Road, which have been considered, and assessed against predicted outcomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Advantage</th>
<th>Disadvantage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 30 km/h Speed Limit | • Adequate SSD is achieved without any targeted improvement work carried out.  
                          • Less dust generated on the road.                                           | • Under the Speed Management Guide, this option requires a mean operating speed of no more than 35km/h. The existing mean operating speed is 50km/h so positive traffic calming would need to be installed to create the lower speed environment.  
                          • Severe traffic calming improvements would be required to obtain a mean operating speed of no more than 35km/h. These improvements may create other negative impacts (e.g. limiting accessibility for larger vehicles).  
                          • The straight section Cones Road, starting at Carrs Road, does not lend itself to a 30km/h speed limit. This section has good visibility and areas adjacent to the road where pedestrians can walk away from vehicle traffic. Compliance is predicted to be low.  
                          • There may be some resistance from local residents. Therefore, compliance may be an issue. |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speed Limit</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40 km/h</td>
<td>• Less traffic calming is required than the 30km/h speed limit option. Traffic calming can be concentrated at the locations where SSD is an issue.</td>
<td>• Under the Speed Management Guide, this option requires a mean operating speed of no more than 45km/h. The existing mean operating speed is 50km/h so positive traffic calming would need to be installed to create the lower speed environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Less targeted improvement work is required to achieve the required SSD than the 50km/h speed limit option.</td>
<td>• Targeted improvement work is required to increase the SSD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• There may be some resistance from local residents. Therefore, compliance may be an issue. However, this will be less than the 30km/h speed limit option.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 km/h</td>
<td>• Under the Speed Management Guide, this option requires a mean operating speed of no more than 55km/h. The existing mean operating speed is 50km/h, so therefore this speed limit complies.</td>
<td>• Severe targeted improvement work is required to increase the SSD at the required locations. Site constraints may make this level of improvement work impractical.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Increase in dust generated on the road may create amenity issues. However, this may also help warn pedestrians of an approaching car.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• There may be some resistance from local residents. However, the existing mean operating speed is 50km/h and consultation with residents outlining this will help mitigate this risk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100km/h</td>
<td>The road environment is anticipated to change with the development of the new walkway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Leave as is)</td>
<td>The mean operating speed is currently 50km/h.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This option is not considered appropriate for the new road environment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.15. Based on the above assessment a speed limit of 40km/h is recommended on Cones Road, north of Carrs Road, along with the following safety improvements:

- Positive traffic calming through speed advisory and pedestrian warning signage concentrated at the locations where SSD is an issue. 30km/h speed advisory signs are to be installed either side of the vertical curve north of 352 Cones Road.

- Improvements to the timber site rails at the beginning of the unsealed portion of Cones Road, to create a “threshold” and minimise through traffic. Improvements include re-painting the timber site rails, clearing and maintaining vegetation adjacent to the rail, and installing “No Exit”, and “No Turning or Parking Available Beyond this Point” signage.

- Localised shaping of the vertical curve north of 352 Cones Road and minor widening of the road, to help provide improved stopping site distance.

- An outdoor convex mirror opposite the driveway at 352 Cones Road to increase visibility at the intersection with Cones Road.

- Clearing of vegetation adjacent to the road and including the berm areas in the Council’s maintained mowing list. This will also help with visibility, while also providing an area for pedestrians to walk.
3.16. All improvements will be monitored to ensure the correct outcomes are being achieved.

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

4. THE COMMUNITY VIEWS

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

- The local community that is considered to be affected by the proposed speed limit
- The Commissioner of Police
- The Chief Executive Officer of NZ Transport Agency
- The Chief Executive Officer of the NZ Automobile Association Inc
- The Chief Executive Officer of the Road Transport Forum NZ

4.2. In June, feedback on the proposed new speed limits was sought through advertising in the local newspapers and on the Council’s website. Also letters were sent to all adjoining property owners, NZTA, the Police, the NZ Automobile Association Inc and the Road Transport Forum NZ as required by the Land Transport Rule: Setting of Speed Limits. A summary of the submissions is below and the details are attached.

4.3. A total of 32 submissions were received on the proposal. Ten submissions fully supported the proposal to change the speed limit to 30km/h on Cones Road.

4.4. Two submissions thought a combination of lowering the speed limit and widening the road was needed. Two more submissions agreed with decreasing the speed limit on Cones Road, however thought a speed limit of 30km/h was too low.

4.5. Eighteen submissions were fully opposed to the change and thought the speed limit should stay at 100km/h. It was noted that five of the eighteen submissions were opposed to the future walking track, and ten of the eighteen submissions thought other safety measures were required, including improvements to the Cones Road / Carrs Road intersection. Options for intersection improvements on the Cones Road / Carrs Road intersection are being developed. Feedback on these options will be sought from the Community Board and local residents.

4.6. A letter was sent to NZTA on 23 June 2017 and a following up email on 30 June 2017 requesting feedback on the speed limit proposal. No formal submission has been received from NZTA. However, WDC carried out a site visit with NZTA earlier this year, where no concerns were raised regarding the speed limit proposal. There have been no formal responses from the NZ Automobile Association, the Police or from the Road Transport Forum NZ to this proposal.

4.7. The submissions received on this proposal have been distributed to the Board along with a covering memo for their information.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISK

5.1. The total cost of the new speed limit and other signage and road improvements can be met from existing budgets.

5.2. There are no significant risks associated with changing this speed limit.
6. **CONTEXT**

6.1. **Policy**

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

6.2. **Statute**

Section 145 of the Local Government Act 2002 empowers the Council to make a bylaw for its district to protect, promote and maintain public health and safety.

The Land Transport Rule: Setting of Speed Limits Rule requires that permanent speed limits be set by bylaw.

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

6.3. **Links to Community Outcomes**

6.3.1. There is a safe environment for all:

- Crime, Injury and road accidents are minimised
- Harm to people from natural and manmade hazards is minimised

6.3.2. Transport is accessible, convenient, reliable, affordable and sustainable

- The standard of our District’s roads is keeping pace with increasing traffic numbers

---

Ken Stevenson   Harriette Davies   Bill Rice
Roading Manager   Roading Projects Engineer   Senior Transport Engineer
## CONES ROAD SPEED LIMIT REVIEW SUBMISSIONS

### PROPOSED 30km/h SPEED LIMIT ON CONES ROAD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRIM</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>FULLY SUPPORT</th>
<th>CONDITIONAL SUPPORT</th>
<th>FULLY OPPOSE</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>170713072748</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P MORRIN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>I wish to go on record as being strongly opposed to this speed change proposal as it represents an unworkable safety compromise. If the elected WDC Councilors decide that it is in the greater public good to support a walking track through the unformed portion of Cones Road then I call on them to take responsibility for both pedestrian and vehicle users’ safety. (See TRIM 170713072748 for Full Submission)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170717073756</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>M SKELLEY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>I would suggest 30Km is too low for the first section of the road where it is wide enough for pedestrians to walk well away from the road. In fact it is wider than Carrs road's boundary at places on this section. My other concern is the lack of visibility where Carrs Road joins Cones Road (See TRIM 170717073756 for Full Submission)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170718074255</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ONLINE SURVEY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The road would need to be widened for the walkers so they aren't walking on the road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170718074255</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>ONLINE SURVEY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1. The recommendations by Abley for a 30 kph restriction MUST be implemented for the walking/cycling track to operate safely, but this will be extremely hard (and potentially impossible) to do; 2. As the reduced speed limit is a vital part of the Abley recommendations, it MUST be put in place before any work starts on the walking/cycling track; 3. Even with the speed limit in place, some sort of physical measure is required at the crest curve to slow vehicles down in this critical location but nothing has been proposed; 4. Cars will park at the Carrs/Cones intersection and will increase the road safety risk in an already dangerous location 5. The proposed budget is way off target because it misses important elements and places huge reliance on volunteer donations of time and materials. The Council is being set up for ongoing costs that are not discussed. (See TRIM 170718074255 for Full Submission)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170718074255</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>ONLINE SURVEY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Quite simply the road is not suitable for both traffic and pedestrians. I personally drive the road at least twice a day. I have a large vehicle often towing a large heavy trailer. With the steep gradient and metal road the stopping distance is greatly extended. If you are going to do this project, do it properly and safely otherwise do nothing at all. If you want to spend ratepayers money on something then fix Cones/Carrs intersection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIM</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>FULLY SUPPORT</td>
<td>CONDITIONAL SUPPORT</td>
<td>FULLY OPPOSE</td>
<td>COMMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170718074255</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>ONLINE SURVEY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>One day that road just may be useful as a road so if you now give it to walkers now, you'll be stuffed then. Look what happened with river road. The walkers wanted a foot path. The speed was dropped, at the inconvenience of the majority of road users, till the footpath was built. Then the walkers said oh no it would be dangerous to walk on our footpath and have cars and truck using the road a the old speed. So now we have a road on the proposed bypass route at 50 km/h, for ever more.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170718074255</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>ONLINE SURVEY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Walkers should be kept back and out of the way of road users, not the road users inconvenienced for the sake of walkers. This section of road at present may only be in use by residents, but future plans and expansion might make it a more major thoroughfare, where the current speed limit of 100km/h would be more appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170718074255</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>ONLINE SURVEY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes without a doubt &amp; severely enforced by police.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170718074255</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>ONLINE SURVEY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I support the formation of a walking track. I support the proposed reduction in speed limit. Knowing the road in question it is only common sense that 100kph is just not possible by anyone other than Haydon Patton. Also the actual speed done now by residents would be around 30kph because it simply is not possible to go any faster. Thus a 30kph limit would not inconvenience anyone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170718074255</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>ONLINE SURVEY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The law requires you to be able to stop within half your visible distance on a road without a center line, having driven along this road, this would limit the speed to about 30km/hr any way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170718074255</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>ONLINE SURVEY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Anyone who tried to do 100km/h on that pot-holey road would really have their work cut out!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170718074255</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>ONLINE SURVEY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ultimately, the roadside fences will need to be shifted to the correct alignment to provide adequate separation for pedestrians on the long acre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170718074255</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>ONLINE SURVEY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30km is too slow - 60km is appropriate. As a walker in the area I'm more concerned for my safety with cars zooming around the Carrs Rd corner (BLIND) WAY TOO FAST. If a speed alteration is being considered for Cones rd, what about Boundary rd at the other end of the proposed walking track.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170718074255</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>ONLINE SURVEY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>You would be doing pretty good driving along there at 100, if you are going to open it up for pedestrians surely you will be putting in a walking track along the road, far too narrow as it is and a danger to all people using it. Would think there is more important things to be done.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170718074255</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>ONLINE SURVEY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What about the dangerous corner at Carrs Rd/Cones Rd? Where about are pedestrians going to walk? What about widening the road? What about addressing the 'blind' spots on Cones Rd?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TRIM: 170713072801
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRIM</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>FULLY SUPPORT</th>
<th>CONDITIONAL SUPPORT</th>
<th>FULLY OPPOSE</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>170718074255</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>ONLINE SURVEY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Reducing the speed limit to 30km/h does not address the more dangerous issues that are far more important, ie the dangerous corner at the Carrs Rd / Cones Rd intersection and the need for a separate walking track to get pedestrians off the road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170718074255</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>ONLINE SURVEY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>the council should be spending our rate paying money on making the Carrs Rd / Cones Rd corner safer for turning traffic and other road users before any thought of chasing some mans pipe dream of a walking track, also if there is going to be a track there has to be a separate foot path for walkers and look at widening the cones rd to allow 2 cars to pass safely!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170718074255</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>ONLINE SURVEY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>This option is a cheap compromise that leaves pedestrians at risk by encouraging them to share the same road space as cars and farm equipment on a narrow and substandard unsealed road/track. (See TRIM 170718074255 for Full Submission)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170718074255</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>ONLINE SURVEY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Won't fix the problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170718074255</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>ONLINE SURVEY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>It doesn't fix the issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170718074255</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>ONLINE SURVEY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>This does not solve the issue!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170718074255</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>ONLINE SURVEY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Changing the speed limit is not the real issue to be debated first. Shouldn't the survey be about who supports the walking track?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170718074255</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>ONLINE SURVEY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Really looking forward to this track being formed.....but I understood it was also for cycling?!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170718074255</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>ONLINE SURVEY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30kmh might be tediously slow and in practice, almost no-one would stick to it. This is another example of how ridiculous speed limits are in NZ. On this particular stretch of road, 100kmh would be ludicrous, plus it effectively 'goes nowhere', so a change is a good idea, but that change must be practical or it's pointless. Best course of action would be to amend the speed limit to 50kmh, and provide signage around pedestrian use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170718074255</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>ONLINE SURVEY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>walkers- cyclists and cars don't mix. it needs to be 30km/h or less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170718074255</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>ONLINE SURVEY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Just another wee zone for our boys and girls in blue to sit on fridays and get their quota! People who walk the paths will be fine. Stupid idea to lower it to 30!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TOTAL | |   | 10 | 4 | 18 |
1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to provide Council with further costing information and a community action plan for the construction and maintenance of the proposed Cones Road walkway. This was requested by Council at the Council meeting dated 5th September 2017.

1.2. This report seeks approval for $11,800 to be included in the Draft Long Term Plan, which is currently included in the Draft Recreation Budget.

Attachments:

i. Action Plan.
ii. Aerial photograph of Cones Road Walkway approximate route.

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No.180104000506

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

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

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

(e) Notes that the Roading report Trim # 170822090365 regarding the reduction of the speed limit on Cones Road and other safety related changes to Cones Road is still lying on the table and will be considered when the Long Term Plan is finalised.
3. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

3.1. The Rangiora Community Board were approached by Mr Harris at the July 2015 meeting with his proposal for the development of a walkway in Loburn between the existing northern terminus of Cones Road and following the unformed portion of legal road to its connection with Boundary Road. The proposed walkway would provide a worthwhile and safe pedestrian link between Rangiora and the Ashley Forest area as well as providing additional options as part of local walking circuits for Loburn residents.

3.2. At the October 2015 meeting of the Rangiora Community Board, Greenspace and Roading presented reports advising that staff would work with Mr Harris to construct the walking track. The next steps to progress the walkway at that time were to:

- undertake further consultation with the community, and
- seek professional advice regarding the potential impacts the walkway would have on existing traffic and pedestrian movements.

3.3. Staff consulted each adjacent landowner by letter inviting them to have their say on the proposal.

3.4. A public meeting was then held to hear the community’s views, the feedback received at this meeting being collated and documented.

3.5. Following this meeting Roading staff commissioned a report from Abley Traffic Consultants to assess possible safety issues that may arise as a result of walkway development.

Abley Consultants found that while there were some safety concerns which were considered valid these are low risk and a reduced speed limit on the unsealed portion of Cones Road was recommended.

3.6. At the March 2017 Rangiora / Ashley Community Board meeting a resolution was passed supporting the construction of the track subject to a series of safety changes first being implemented on Cones Road.

3.7. The Roading report to Council (TRIM 180104000506), presented to Council on 5th September 2017, recommended the implementation of a number of the safety related changes including a reduced speed limit of 40 km/h and is currently lying on the table. Council requested additional information relating to costs for the project and a community action plan for the construction and maintenance of the proposed track. The action plan is included in this report as attachment i.

3.8. The action plan includes information relating to costs for the track construction. The Council at the 5 September 2017 meeting requested additional information relating to the safety improvements identified in the Roading report. Roading staff will provide this information as an update at the Council meeting on the 30th January 2018.

3.9. The construction of the track currently relies on the successful implementation of the safety changes to Cones Road which include the lowering of the speed limit. It also relies on Council approving $11,800 for the track construction. Should the recommendations in the Roading report (TRIM 180104000506) be approved and funding of $11,800 be approved then staff will work closely with local residents on the track construction.
3.10. Maintenance of the track will initially be undertaken by the community although it is likely that Council will ultimately be responsible for this maintenance which will be of minimal cost.

3.11. Staff believe that there are a number of options available to Council. These include the following:

- Include no financial provision for the development of the track. Staff do not support this option. Staff believe that the development of the track is a positive addition to the districts walking and cycling network. If funding is not provided it is possible that those in the community who want the track to be constructed will start to do so. This has the potential have a track created that is not fit for purpose.

- Defer the allocation of funding until a later financial year. Staff do not support this option. The process regarding the track development which has included a large amount of community consultation has now been going for more than two years. Those members of the community who want to start building the track have already expressed concern over the time it has already taken.

- Include the $11,800 in the Draft Long Term Plan. Staff support this option. The $11,800 has already been added to the Reserve budget Sheets. Support for the track has already been provided by the Rangiora Ashley Community Board and Roading staff have undertaken consultation regarding the lowering of the speed limit on the unsealed part of cones Road.

4. COMMUNITY VIEWS

4.1. Letter to concerned residents - sent out 30th October 2015 to adjacent residents.

4.2. Council Roading and Greenspace staff held a site meeting on 14th December 2015 with residents in support and against the walkway proposal.

4.3. In February 2016 a letter was received on behalf of 14 residents of the area immediately surrounding the site highlighting their concerns and opposition to the proposal.

4.4. Council facilitated a public meeting in Rangiora in July 2016 which was attended by approximately 100 people. The concerns raised were summarised in a previous report to Council (Greenspace report to Rangiora-Ashley Community Board 13th March 2017).

4.5. Stu Harris presented a petition in favour of the walkway signed by 200 supporters and this was included in a Greenspace report to the Woodend – Ashley Community Board dated 9th November 2016.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

5.1. It is anticipated that for the project to be feasible, much of the track would need to be constructed using volunteer labour with personally owned hand tools. This would save considerably on contractor operator and machinery time and reduces the budget to $11,800 mostly required for excavator operation and materials.

5.2. Staff have already added this budget to the draft Long Term Plan budget sheets for Councils consideration.

5.3. The Roading report (TRIM 180104000506) identifies the costs associated with the implementation of the safety changes to Cones Road.
5.4. With a land status of unformed legal road the Council is responsible for the health and safety of the volunteers undertaking track building works. Staff will work closely with the volunteers to ensure health and safety is managed as required under HASWA 2015.

6. CONTEXT

6.1. Policy

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

The Cones Road walkway is consistent with the desired outcomes as outlined in the Council’s strategies:

- The Community Greenspace Activity Management Plan includes the desired outcome of provision of open space that …..provides recreational and ecological linkages as these provide opportunities for linked walking and cycling networks.

- The Walking and Cycling Strategy 2017 - 2022 seeks to achieve the key priorities of inclusive infrastructure, community connections, safe travel and healthy lifestyles.

6.2. Legislation


6.3. Community Outcomes

The distinctive character of our towns, villages and rural areas is maintained.

Public spaces and facilities are plentiful, accessible and of a high quality.

---

Chris Brown
Community and Greenspace Manager
Attachment 1 – Cones Road Walkway Community Action Plan November 2017

Vision
To provide an enhanced recreational opportunity in the Ashley/Loburn area in close proximity to Rangiora combining quiet country roads, bush walk and great views.

Objectives
- Utilise the unformed section of Cones Road to construct a 600 metres section of walking track to act as a linkage to provide a 5 km walking circuit. Track to be built utilising DOC Track Construction and Maintenance Guidelines 2008.
- Provide for more direct pedestrian access from Rangiora up to Two Tree Hill which could potentially be enhanced with picnic tables, car park, and a plain table (outside scope of this plan).
- Potential for future development of a separate mountain bike track (outside scope of this plan).
- Enhance fitness activity opportunities in this rural area.
- Transform this unformed section of Cones Road that is currently overgrown in gorse and blackberry into a native bush gully with the planting of native trees and shrubs which will enhance indigenous biodiversity values and provide a desirable setting for walkers.

Table 1: Action Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>By Whom</th>
<th>By When (From WDC approval)</th>
<th>$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clearance of vegetation to provide initial access to: - determine and mark legal boundaries. - mark most practical route for track within road reserve.</td>
<td>Volunteers with scrub bars, hand tools &amp; excavator. WDC staff to establish legal boundaries.</td>
<td>Within 2 months</td>
<td>Excavator $1200. Volunteer hours. WDC staff time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear vegetation on walking track route by scrub cutters, hand tools and excavator to enable track formation.</td>
<td>Volunteers with scrub bars, hand tools &amp; excavator.</td>
<td>Within 6 months</td>
<td>Excavator $1200 Volunteer hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formation of walking track built to (DOC Guidelines &amp; SNZ HB 8630:2004) including: - benching - steps - stiles - culverts - surface metal</td>
<td>Volunteers with scrub bars, hand tools &amp; excavator.</td>
<td>Within 12 months</td>
<td>Excavator hours $1200 Shingle $5000 Steps $1600 Stiles $300 Signage $500 PPE $300 Volunteer hours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Spray off weeds along track. Growsafe
trained volunteer
Within 12 months
• Chemical $500

Planting native seedlings in areas cleared by hand. Gorse and broom will be retained where possible to protect soil and water values and provide nursery for new plantings. Seedlings sourced for free and planted by volunteers. Commence within 12 months and then ongoing
• Volunteer hours

Ongoing Maintenance including:
• Track surface/culverts
• Overgrowing vegetation
• Releasing seedlings
Volunteers Ongoing
• Volunteer hours

Total cost $11,800

Notes:
• Volunteers – core group of 14 supporters, MTB Club with 100 members plus offers of use of excavators.
• Signage – walkway entrances and H & S (temporary).
• Excludes road safety improvements.

Attachment 2 – Aerial photo of proposed Cones Road walkway route (approximate)
Cones Road Safety Assessment

Prepared for: Waimakariri District Council
Job Number: 4769-00
Issue Date: 18 March 2016
Prepared by: Katie Dugan, Senior Transportation Engineer
Reviewed by: Jeanette Ward, Associate

1. Introduction

A walking track from the end of Cones Road to Boundary Road through the unformed road reserve is currently being developed. To get to the start of this track there is an existing narrow unsealed road that provides access to private properties. Walkers would need to share the road with property owners’ vehicles, which has raised some concern amongst the residents.

Abley Transportation Consultants were commissioned by the Waimakariri District Council to carry out a safety assessment of the unsealed road section for use by walkers. A site visit to assess potential safety issues was carried out by Katie Dugan and Andrew Wilson on Wednesday 9 March. Data collection on-site included driving the unsealed road at varying speeds in each direction while taking video footage, walking the road in both directions, taking photographs, observing road user behaviour and making note of any engineering concerns along the way. During the site visit one car and one walker with a dog were observed using the unsealed section of Cones Road.

The assessment identified three main safety concerns. The potential issues and corresponding recommended mitigation measures are presented in Section 3 of this technical note.

2. Site Description

The Cones Road reserve between Carrs Road and Boundary Road is generally oriented in a northwest-southeast direction and currently consists of two distinct sections:

1) Unsealed road from Carrs Road to the driveway of #380 Cones Road, approximately 750 metres long.
2) Unformed road reserve from the driveway of #380 Cones Road to Boundary Road, approximately 600 metres long.

The two sections, along with the primary driveway accesses off Cones Road, are highlighted in Figure 2.1. The adjacent land use is primarily rural residential and agricultural. There is one Slow Children warning sign located at the southern end of the unsealed road section and also one located at the driveway of #352 Cones Road.
The intersection of Cones Road and Carrs Road is at a superelevated horizontal bend in the road with straight spurs of each road intersecting behind the curve. This creates a triangle of land behind the curve and this space currently houses letter boxes. Cones Road becomes an unsealed road at this point and continues north through a 4m wide gap in a wooden fence as shown in Figure 2.1. The unsealed road section north of the intersection is generally 3.5m wide for its entire length.

The road alignment is generally straight, with one slight bend in the vicinity of the driveway of #352 Cones Road. Proceeding northerly from the southern end, the unsealed section of Cones Road gently inclines then meets a vertical curve with a crest located approximately 10 metres north of the driveway of #352 Cones Road. The crest vertical curve is immediately followed by a sag vertical curve with a low point approximately 110 metres north of the driveway of #352 Cones Road. After the sag vertical curve the unsealed road gently inclines again until it ends where the driveways for both #367/379 (to the west) and #380 (to the east) intersect the road as shown in Figure 2.2.
3. Findings and Recommendations

3.1 Stopping Sight Distance

The crest vertical curve in the vicinity of the driveway of #352 Cones Road limits a driver’s Stopping Sight Distance (SSD) considerably. As can be seen from Figure 3.1 and Figure 3.2, taken on the vertical curve and facing north and south respectively, a person walking on the road will quickly disappear from a driver’s line of sight past the crest. Based on engineering judgement, site observation and review of video footage, the existing stopping sight distance on the curve is estimated to be 40 to 45 metres. It is strongly recommended that accurate measurement of the sight distance be performed as part of the project development.

The Austroads formula for car stopping sight distance is shown to the right. For this particular curve a reaction time of 2.0 sec, a coefficient of deceleration of 0.27 (braking on unsealed roads) and a longitudinal grade of -6% are assumed. Given these assumptions, the required stopping sight distance for a car is calculated to be 75 metres at an operating speed of 50 km/h and 35 metres at 30 km/h. These calculations indicate that a driver traveling on this vertical curve at 50 km/h would not have time to come to a complete stop after observing a hazard in the middle of the road. While it is not anticipated that a driver would need to come to a stop when encountering a walker, it is important to give both the pedestrian and the driver as much time as possible to observe the potential conflict and manoeuvre to the side of the road to avoid each other.

\[
SSD = \frac{R \cdot V}{3.6} + \frac{V^2}{254(d + 0.01a)}
\]

R = reaction time (sec)
V = operating speed (km/h)
d = coefficient of deceleration (longitudinal friction factor)
a = longitudinal grade (% for upgrades and – for downgrades)

Source: Austroads Guide to Road Design Part 3: Geometric Design, section 5.3
Recommendation: It is recommended that a speed limit of 30 km/h be established and posted on the unsealed portion of Cones Road to keep drivers’ speeds low enough to provide adequate stopping sight distance on the crest vertical curve. Pedestrian warning signage is also recommended in the vicinity of the curve. Widening of the road and/or clearing the area adjacent to the road at this location is also advisable if scope of the project allows.
3.2 Safe Intersection Sight Distance

Banks and the presence of trees at the intersection of Cones Road and the driveway of #352 Cones Road limit the intersection sight distance, especially on the minor approach (i.e. the driveway) as shown in Figure 3.3.

The Austroads formula for car Safe Intersection Sight Distance (SISD) is the same as the SSD discussed in Section 3.1, except that SISD uses decision time instead of reaction time. Given the same assumptions used for SSD, a car’s required SISD at this location is calculated to be **120 metres at an operating speed of 50 km/h** and **60 metres at 30 km/h**. The existing sight distance from the driveway is estimated to be only **15 to 20 metres**. It is strongly recommended that accurate measurement of the sight distance be performed as part of the project development. While this is an existing issue that is impractical to fully resolve and is functional in its current state, it is worth noting here that adding pedestrians to the situation increases the overall safety risk at this location.

**Recommendation:** It is recommended that an outdoor convex mirror be installed opposite the driveway of #352 Cones Road to increase the driver’s field of vision along the road. The previous recommendation of establishing a speed limit of 30 km/h on the unsealed portion of Cones Road will additionally decrease the required sight distance at the driveway. Widening of the road and/or clearing the area adjacent to the road at this location is also advisable if scope of the project allows.

3.3 Speed

During the site visit a vehicle was observed driving down the unsealed portion of Cones Road at a speed of approximately 50 km/h, which produced a significant dust trail. It is assumed that the primary users of this road are property owners or their guests who would be familiar with the road. Research has shown that speed choice is affected by route familiarity: speed increases and risk is underestimated with the repetition of travel on the same route[1].

---

The safety assessment team drove the road at 40 km/h and perceived it to feel slightly fast (as unfamiliar users), but not uncomfortable to drive. When driving the road at 30 km/h it was observed that the driver had to apply the brakes to keep the car from increasing speed on downgrades.

As shown in Sections 3.1 and 3.2, as speed increases, the sight distance required for drivers to react to potential hazards also increases. Road dust in the air produced by faster moving vehicles can pose serious safety issues by impairing vision of both walkers and drivers. Vehicle speeds also have an effect on walkers’ perceived comfort levels.

**Recommendation:** It is recommended that a speed limit of 30 km/h be established and posted on the unsealed portion of Cones Road to keep drivers’ speeds low enough to decrease required sight distances, lower the effects of road dust on visibility, and create a more comfortable environment for walkers. Pedestrian warning signage is also recommended to alert drivers to the potential conflict. Widening of the road and/or clearing the area adjacent to the road to increase the buffer between walkers and vehicles along the road is also advisable if scope of the project allows.

### 3.4 Additional Considerations

The unsealed portion of Cones Road discussed herein is on average 3.5m wide. This is sufficient for a pedestrian (minimum clearance of 1.2m for mobility access) and a 90th percentile car to pass each other. It is assumed that road volumes are low enough that if two cars needed to pass each other they can wait for an adequate location to pull off the road and allow the other to pass.

Fenced animal pastures and the presence of fence gates on the western side of the road suggest that farm vehicles or tractors may occasionally need the road to access these properties. Such vehicles are typically wider than standard private vehicles and may require further mitigation investigation if conflicts with these larger vehicles become recurring. Additionally, aerial imagery suggests that clearing/logging activities have been performed at Cones Road properties in the past. If this is to be a use of the unsealed road again in the future then a safety assessment in that context is recommended.

Approximately 10 metres south of the driveway of #352 Cones Road, there is a pinch point in the shoulder of the road where the western property fence is only 2 metres away from the edge of the road. It is noted that many of the fences along the western side of the road are located within the road reserve. If widening of the road or shoulders is required then these fences may need to be relocated.

### 4. Conclusions

The site visit and safety assessment of the unsealed section of Cones Road between Carrs Road and #380 Cones Road revealed three potential safety issues for the Waimakariri District Council to consider. While the speed issues and geometric features limiting sight distance raise safety concerns, they are assumed to be low risk given the existing minimal volume of vehicles on the road which is not anticipated to increase as part of this project. The safety assessment recommends the following mitigation measures, or a combination thereof, be considered as the project progresses:

- Implement a posted speed limit of 30 km/h on the unsealed portion of Cones Road
- Install pedestrian warning signage at appropriate locations along the road
- Install an outdoor convex mirror for the driveway of #352 Cones Road
- Widen the road or clear the area next to the road to give users more space to avoid conflicts

Overall and subject to the preceding comments, the proposed walking route along Cones Road can be supported from a traffic and safety perspective.
1. SUMMARY

1.1 This report is to request that $35,000 of funding be brought forward from the Ashley Gorge Road Trunk Main budget of $218,000 in 2024/25 to allow a section to be constructed in the current financial year.

1.2 This work is part of a wider future project to construct a new 125mm diameter main along Ashely Gorge Road to accommodate growth on the scheme, and to bring an existing main out of private property.

1.3 The reason for constructing a portion early is to address an issue with a section of shared lateral in private property that has been a cause of an ongoing dispute between two property owners and has involved the Council.

1.4 The key cause of a dispute is that the point of supply that Council has provided to one property is not against their property boundary, meaning that they need to run a lateral through another resident’s property.

Attachments:

i. Nil

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180717079353.

(b) Approves $35,000 of the $218,000 capital budget in 2024/25 to be brought forward to the 2018/19 financial year to allow a section of this project to be constructed early.

(c) Notes that this work is ultimately required to accommodate growth on the scheme, but by constructing this portion early it will allow Council to resolve an ongoing dispute by providing a point of supply at the property frontage to 101 Ashley Gorge Road, rather than their point of supply requiring pipework through a neighbouring property.
3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1. The residents at 101 Ashley Gorge Road have been in contact with Council staff regarding claims that their neighbour at 120 Sales Road has been taking some of their water. Their water is currently supplied as per the image below:

![Existing Layout Diagram](image)

**Figure 1: Existing Layout**

3.2. The issues with the current arrangement are:

- There is a shared lateral that runs through private property from Sales Road up to the tank location where the connection points / restrictors are located. Under the Water Supply Bylaw 2012 the point of supply (delineation between Council owned infrastructure and privately owner infrastructure) is at the toby box. This could create issues if future maintenance is required on this main.

- The owner of the property at 101 Ashley Gorge Road does not own any land between their point of supply and their property. This means for them to get the water from their point of supply to their property the pipe either needs to run through their neighbour’s property, or run through the section of unallocated crown owned land. While there may be legal provisions for this pipe to exist on land privately owned by a third party, it makes it problematic to undertake repairs.

- The property owner at 101 Ashley Gorge Road is concerned they are not getting their full allocation. While Council can verify this at their point of supply, this does not address their concerns that their full allocation is not making its way through the private section of infrastructure.

3.1. The above issues have led to the involvement of Council’s 3 Waters staff, Environmental Health Officers and the Oxford Police however it is very difficult to resolve. The future project to install a new trunk main along Ashley Gorge Road provides an opportunity for a resolution, therefore has been investigated by Council staff.

4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1. It is proposed that in order to resolve the issues identified above a 143m section of pipe be installed on Ashley Gorge Road. This would achieve the following:
• Provide connections at the frontage of 101 and 103 Ashley Gorge Road as is current practice (to have the point of supply at the property frontage), so that they would no longer need connections in private property. It is noted that while the property owners at 101 Ashley Gorge Road are motivated to relocate their connection to this point at present, the property owners at 103 Ashley Gorge Road may not wish to do this at this date. However by installing this pipe now, it would provide them with the ability to do this in the future.
• This would facilitate the future reclassification this section of shared pipe in private property (that currently runs from Sales Road to the private tanks) to a privately owned lateral serving the property at 120 Sales Road.
• This would allow for future growth in the area. It is noted that there is a project proposed as part of the 2018-28 Long Term Plan to install a 100mm internal diameter main along this section of Ashley Gorge Road as part of a wider project. This is planned for 2024/25 at present.

4.2. The proposed solution is depicted below:

Figure 2: Proposed new main to provide connections at property frontage.

4.3. If the new main was required just to serve the existing properties at 101 and 103 Ashley Gorge Road, it would be proposed that a 50mm internal diameter main be installed. Given that there is however an upcoming project to install a 100mm internal diameter main along this alignment, it is proposed that a main of this size be installed at present, effectively carrying out a portion of this project early.

4.4. The alternative option would be to not construct this section of main until the wider project goes ahead in 2024/25. This is not recommended as the current issues faced would remain, with no other resolution being identified in the meetings held to date. Given the benefits offered by the proposed solution and the fact that it is required in the future regardless of these issues, it is recommended that this proceed.

4.5. The Management Team have reviewed this report and support the recommendations.
5. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

5.1. Groups and Organisations

5.2. Wider Community

6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. Financial Implications

6.2. The cost of the proposed section of pipe has been estimated at $35,000 out of the total capital budget in 2024/25 of $218,000. The total budget is comprised of $143,000 for the growth portion and $75,000 for the renewal portion. This proposed first stage for $35,000 would be split using the same ratio (66% growth, 34% renewal).

6.3. In 2017/18 the first stage of the Ashley Gorge Trunk Main project was completed, with approximately $110,000 of the total budget allowance for this portion of $405,000 unspent. It was originally intended that this section of pipe be installed in 2017/18 using this unspent budget, however agreement with the affected landowner regarding the works they are required to undertake within their property had not been reached at that time.

6.4. Community Implications

6.5. There are not expected to be any community implications to this project, other than the benefits to the immediately affected residents.

6.6. Risk Management

6.7. There is a risk that if this section of pipe is not installed at this time that the dispute between the property owners and with Council may escalate further.

6.8. Health and Safety

6.9. A health and safety alert has been raised with one of the affected properties following an incident relating to the dispute. By ultimately taking these connections out of private property this will negate the need for staff to enter these private properties as part of maintenance of the Council owned water infrastructure.

7. **CONTEXT**

7.1. Policy

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

7.2. Legislation

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

7.3. Community Outcomes

The following community outcomes are relevant in this matter:

- There is a safe environment for all
- Core utility services are provided in a timely and sustainable manner.
7.4. Delegations

The Council has the delegated authority to reallocate the budget to the current financial year as recommended.
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT FOR DECISION

FILE NO and TRIM NO: BYL-59/ 180815091951

REPORT TO: Council

DATE OF MEETING: 4 September 2018

FROM: Councillors N Atkinson (Chair), W Doody and J Meyer

Hearing Panel

SUBJECT: Adoption of the Alcohol Control Bylaw 2018

Recommendation of the Hearing Panel

SIGNED BY: (for Reports to Council,

Committees or Boards) Department Manager Chief Executive

1. SUMMARY

1.1 This report presents the recommendations of the Hearing Panel that considered submissions to the draft Alcohol Control Bylaw 2018. As part of the drafting of the Alcohol Control Bylaw 2018, a review of the current Liquor Ban Bylaw 2007 was undertaken.

1.2 The Panel recommends that the elements of the Liquor Ban Bylaw 2007 of 24/7 alcohol control areas in the central business areas of Rangiora, Kaiapoi, Woodend and Oxford are maintained. An extension to the alcohol control area to include Murphy Park during the rugby/rugby league seasons (24/7) is also proposed.

1.3 Eleven submissions were received in support of the draft Alcohol Control Bylaw with two supporting extending the alcohol control area to include Murphy Park and two against this proposal. Of note five submitters requested an extension to include Pegasus. This was declined by the Panel.

1.4 The Hearing Panel recommends the adoption of the Alcohol Control Bylaw 2018 with the extended area into Murphy Park during the rugby/rugby league season.

1.5 If the Alcohol Control Bylaw 2018 is adopted it will apply from 1 October 2018, because this is a new bylaw the statutory review period is five years (2023). At the same time the Liquor Ban Bylaw 2007 will be revoked.

Attachments:

i. Alcohol Control Bylaw and maps of proposed alcohol control areas (TRIM 180409037733)
ii. Table of elements and summary of submissions with recommendations (Trim 180816092935)

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council

(a) Receives report No. 180815091951.
(b) **Adopts** the draft Alcohol Control Bylaw 2018 (TRIM: 180409037733), incorporating the changes made by the Hearing Panel as attached, to take effect from 1 October 2018.

(c) **Notes** the extension of the alcohol control area to Murphy Park during the rugby/rugby league season (1 April to 1 September).

(d) **Revolves** the Liquor Ban Bylaw 2007 on 1 October 2018.

(e) **Notes** an audit of all signage will be undertaken by staff.

(f) **Notes** a copy of this report will be sent to the Community Boards for their information.

3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1 The Waimakariri District has had a Liquor Ban Bylaw in effect for many years. It was last reviewed in 2007.

3.2 The Police have always been very supportive of the bylaw and would like the alcohol control areas maintained. Police enforce the bylaw under the provisions of the Local Government Act 2002 (LGA).

3.3 The Local Government (Alcohol Reform) Amendment Act 2012 commenced on 18 December 2013. The amendments under s147, 147A and 147B require a higher level of evidence to be provided to maintain and/or introduce alcohol control areas. A s155 report determining whether a bylaw made under the LGA 2002 is appropriate to address the perceived problem must be prepared as part of the review process. Section 147A stipulates that Council must be satisfied that:

(a) the bylaw can be justified as a reasonable limitation on people’s rights and freedoms; and

(b) a high level of crime or disorder (being crime or disorder caused or made worse by alcohol consumption in the area to which the bylaw is intended to apply if the bylaw is not made; and

(c) the bylaw is appropriate and proportionate in the light of that likely crime or disorder.

4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1. The Statement of Proposal had two options for the community to consider, either: (a) to revoke the Liquor Ban Bylaw 2007, or (b) to complete the review of the 2007 bylaw and draft an Alcohol Control Bylaw 2018 in accordance with the amendment act.

4.2. After consideration of the submissions and the documentation provided in the Statement of Proposal, the Hearing Panel have recommended the adoption of the draft Alcohol Control Bylaw 2018.

4.3. The draft Alcohol Control Bylaw underwent review by Martin Bell, Solicitor (Corcoran French). As a result changes were made to the form of the bylaw to ensure all legal requirements have been met and to improve the ‘readability’ of the document. The review did not affect the elements of the bylaw addressing the alcohol control areas apart from clarifying the restrictions applying to Murphy Park.

4.4. The extension of the alcohol control area into Murphy Park was proposed in a letter from the Northern Bulldogs Rugby League Club and supported by Police prior to the consultation beginning. The request from the Club was for Council to implement an alcohol control area for Murphy Park that is enforceable by Police. The club had been experiencing issues with spectators consuming alcohol on the side-lines and being unwilling to abide by any attempt to introduce alcohol control areas.
4.5. Five submitters requested an extension of the alcohol control ban into the lake and recreation area at Pegasus. The Local Government (Alcohol Reform) Amendment Act 2012 requires evidence of a high level of crime and disorder, shown to have been caused by or made worse by alcohol consumption in the area and that a bylaw is the appropriate and proportionate reaction in the light of that crime and disorder. Currently there is no evidence to support the extension of the alcohol control areas to Pegasus Lake and surrounds. Although the current situation does not meet the requirements of the Act, it is recommended that ongoing monitoring should be undertaken.

4.6. The amendment act (as described in 3.3) requires a higher level of evidence to be provided to meet s147A. The evidence in support of the draft bylaw is provided in the statement of proposal with the commentary from Police and the Council’s Greenspace Team.

4.7. An audit of all signage will be undertaken to ensure all signs reflect the changes to the Act and the Bylaw. New or updated signs will be installed where necessary as soon as practicable.

4.8. Discussion will take place with Environment Canterbury as owner around the park, about the alcohol control area for Murphy Park to ensure the area affected by the control is clearly identified and signalled for the public.

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

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. Groups and Organisations

New Zealand Police, Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga and the Waimakariri District Council’s Youth Council and key Council staff were all consulted regarding the review of this bylaw. Key Stakeholders were also consulted as outlined in the project plan. There was ongoing support for the development of the Alcohol Control Bylaw, particularly from the Council’s Greenspace Team and Police as outlined in the Statement of Proposal.

5.2. Wider Community

The wider community had the opportunity to express their views through the public consultation submissions process between 11 May and 11 June 2018. Eleven submissions were received. Two submitters supported the seasonal alcohol control area at Murphy Park and two submitters opposed this proposal.

6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1. Financial Implications

The cost of reviewing the Liquor Ban Bylaw 2007 and developing the draft Alcohol Control Bylaw 2018 is programmed and met from existing budgets and staff resources.

6.2. Community Implications

The extension of the alcohol control area to Murphy Park will be a restriction to individual rights and freedom during the league season. The bylaw provides for this restriction to be advertised prior to the beginning of each season.

6.3. Risk Management
The Liquor Ban Bylaw 2007 review must be completed before 18 December 2018 or it will lapse under s11 of the *Local Government (Alcohol Reform) Amendment Act* 2012. The proposed time-frame to adopt the Alcohol Control Bylaw 2018 and bring it into force on 1 October 2018, at the same time revoking the Liquor Ban Bylaw 2007, avoids this risk.

### 6.4. Health and Safety

The Bylaw contributes to wider community health and safety by helping decrease the likelihood of damage to property or the creation of dangerous litter.

### 7. CONTEXT

#### 7.1. Policy

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

#### 7.2. Legislation

*Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act* 2012

The object of this Act is that:

(a) The sale, supply and consumption of alcohol should be undertaken safely and responsibly; and

(b) The harm caused by the excessive or inappropriate consumption of alcohol should be minimised.

*Local Government Act* 2002

*Local Government (Alcohol Reform) Amendment Act* 2012

*New Zealand Bill of Rights Act* 1990

#### 7.3. Community Outcomes

**There is a safe environment for all**

- Harm to people from natural and man-made hazards is minimised and our district has the capacity and resilience to respond to natural disasters.
- Crime, injury and harm from road accidents, gambling, and alcohol abuse are minimised.

**The distinctive character of our towns, villages and rural areas is maintained**

- The centres of our main towns are safe, convenient and attractive places to visit and do business

#### 7.4. Delegations

The Hearing Panel had the delegation to hear submissions and make recommendations to Council.

Lynley Beckingsale
Policy Analyst

Malcolm Johnston
Environmental Services Manager
DRAFT WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT
ALCOHOL CONTROL BYLAW 2018
Waimakariri District Alcohol Control Bylaw 2018

1 General

1.1 Introduction

1.1.1 This Bylaw may be cited as the Waimakariri District Alcohol Control Bylaw 2018.

1.1.2 This Bylaw supersedes the Waimakariri District Liquor Ban Bylaw 2007 and comes into force on 23 October 2018.

1.1.3 This Bylaw is made by the Waimakariri District Council in exercise of the powers and authority vested in the Council by section 147 of the Local Government Act 2002.

1.1.4 The purpose of this Bylaw is to enhance safety and public enjoyment of public places by providing for alcohol controls in restricted public places, and for restricted periods and events.

1.1.5 Before making this Bylaw, Council was satisfied that those matters listed in section 147A(3) of the Local Government Act 2002 apply.

1.2 Objectives

The objective of the Bylaw is to prohibit the possession and/or consumption of alcohol in restricted areas, thereby:

(a) protecting the public from nuisance in public places
(b) protecting, promoting and maintaining public health and safety in public places
(c) minimising the potential for offensive behaviour in public places
(d) minimising alcohol related harm.

1.3 Definitions

For the purposes of this Bylaw the following definitions shall apply:

Alcohol has the meaning given by section 5(1) of the Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2012.

Alcohol ban means those restrictions outlined at clause 2.1 of this Bylaw, and as may be amended by clauses 2.2 and 2.3 of this Bylaw, which specify those public places and time periods whereby the consumption and possession of alcohol is restricted or banned, as well as those restrictions which may be imposed by Council in accordance with clause 3.1 of this Bylaw.

Council means the Waimakariri District Council.

Licensed premises has the meaning given by section 5(1) of the Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2012.

Public notice has the meaning given in section 5 of the Local Government Act 2002.
Public place has the same meaning provided in section 147 of the Local Government Act 2002, that is:

(a) a place that is open to or is being used by the public, whether free or on payment of a charge, and whether any owner or occupier of the place is lawfully entitled to exclude or eject any person from it; but

(b) does not include licensed premises.

For the avoidance of doubt this definition includes, but is not limited to, roads, footpaths, berms, parks, beaches and riverbanks.

Restricted public place is a public place Specified in this Bylaw at clause 2.1, and as may be amended by Council in accordance with clauses 2.2 and 2.3 of this Bylaw, or in a Council resolution passed in accordance with clause 3 of this Bylaw, and in respect of which an alcohol ban is imposed.

Restricted period is a time period designated in this Bylaw at clause 2.1, and as may be amended by Council in accordance with clauses 2.2 and 2.3 of this Bylaw, or in a Council resolution passed in accordance with clause 3 of this Bylaw, and in respect of which an alcohol ban is imposed.

Time period is a period of time, which may include days and specific dates and/or times of the day.

Ashley Gorge is as described in Schedule 1 of this Bylaw.

Beach Settlements is as described in Schedule 1 of this Bylaw.

Kaiapoi town is as described in Schedule 1 of this Bylaw and outlined in the accompanying map of the area and marked Kaiapoi, alcohol control area as at 1 October 2018.

Rangiora town is as described in Schedule 1 of this Bylaw and outlined in the accompanying map of the area and marked Rangiora, alcohol control area as at 1 October 2018.

Woodend town is as described in Schedule 1 of this Bylaw and outlined in the accompanying map of the area and marked Woodend, alcohol control area as at 1 October 2018.

Oxford is as described in Schedule 1 of this Bylaw and outlined in the accompanying map of the area and marked Oxford, alcohol control area as at 1 October 2018.

Murphy Park Reserve is as described in Schedule 1 of this Bylaw and outlined in the accompanying map of the area and marked Murphy Park, seasonal alcohol control area.
2 Designated alcohol bans

2.1 Alcohol bans specified in this Bylaw

No person shall possess or consume in, or bring alcohol into, the restricted public places and during the restricted time periods, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Days and times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashley Gorge</td>
<td>7.00 pm 31 December to 3.00 am 1 January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach settlements</td>
<td>7.00 pm 31 December to 3.00 am 1 January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi town</td>
<td>24 hours, 365 days a year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora town</td>
<td>24 hours, 365 days a year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend town</td>
<td>24 hours, 365 days a year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford town</td>
<td>24 hours, 365 days a year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murphy Park Reserve</td>
<td>24 hours, from 1\textsuperscript{st} April to 1\textsuperscript{st} September</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2 Murphy Park Reserve specified periods

2.2.1 Council may amend, alter or remove the specified period in relation to the Murphy Park Reserve by resolution in accordance with sections 147B and 151 of the Local Government Act, and in consideration of the dates of the current year’s Rugby and Rugby League season.

2.2.2 Any resolution made in accordance with clause 2.2.1 above will be publically notified.

2.3 Amendment to Bylaw

Council may remove, add to, or alter any of the listed restricted public places and may amend the restricted periods outlined at clause 2.1 of this Bylaw in accordance with section 156 of the Local Government Act 2002.

3 Designation of specified events and periods

3.1 In addition to those restrictions imposed in clause 2.1 of this Bylaw, Council may, by resolution in accordance with sections 147B and 151 of the Local Government Act 2002, restrict the bringing, consumption and possession of alcohol

3.1.1 in a public place and during a time period; and

3.1.2 for a public event, function or gathering in a public place.

3.2 Any resolution made in accordance with clause 3.1 of this Bylaw, will be notified by public notice.
4 Vehicles

4.1 No person may consume or possess alcohol in any vehicle while in any restricted public place and during any restricted time period as designated under clause 2.1 of this Bylaw or by resolution under clause 3.1 of this Bylaw, save for those exceptions outlined at clause 6 of this Bylaw.

5 Offences and penalties

A person who commits a breach of this Bylaw commits an infringement offence under section 239A of the Local Government Act 2002 and may be liable for an infringement fee.

6 Exceptions

6.1 This Bylaw does not prohibit, regulate or control, in the case of alcohol in an unopened bottle or other unopened container:

(a) the transport of the alcohol from licensed premises next to a public place, if –
   (i) it was lawfully bought on those premises for consumption off those premises; and
   (ii) it is promptly removed from the public place; or

(b) the transport of the alcohol from outside a public place for delivery to licensed premises next to the public place; or

(c) the transport of the alcohol from outside a public place to premises next to a public place by, or for delivery to, a resident of the premises or his or her bona fide visitors; or

(d) the transport of the alcohol from premises next to a public place to a place outside the public place if –
   (i) the transport is undertaken by a resident of those premises; and
   (ii) the alcohol is promptly removed from the public place.

6.2 This Bylaw does not apply to those registered campsites at the Beach Settlements and those registered camp sites at Ashley Gorge.

7 Powers of New Zealand Police

7.1 In accordance with section 169 of the Local Government Act, a constable of the New Zealand Police may, without warrant, for the purpose of ascertaining whether alcohol is present, search a container in the possession of a person who is in, or entering a restricted public place and during a restricted period, or a vehicle that is in, or entering, a restricted public place and during a restricted period.
7.2 A constable may without warrant also:

7.2.1 Seize and remove any alcohol, and its container, that is in breach of an alcohol ban;
7.2.2 Arrest any person whom the constable finds committing an offence under this Bylaw;
7.2.3 Arrest any person who has refused to comply with a request by a constable –
   (i) To leave a restricted public place;
   (ii) To surrender to a constable any alcohol that, in breach of an alcohol ban, is in
        the person’s possession.

7.3 Before exercising such power outlined at clauses 7.1 and 7.2 of this Bylaw, the
member of the New Zealand Police must –
7.3.1 inform the person in possession of the container or the vehicle, as the case may be,
        that he or she has the opportunity of removing the container or the vehicle from the
        restricted public place;
7.3.2 provide the person with a reasonable opportunity to remove the container or the
        vehicle as the case may be, from the restricted public place.

8 Signage

8.1 Where reasonable, signage will be erected within the restricted public places to
provide information to the public on the alcohol bans.

8.2 To avoid any doubt, the absence of any signage in a restricted public place does not
authorize breach of this Bylaw.

9 Revocation

The following Bylaw is hereby revoked: Liquor Ban Bylaw 2007 (December 2007)

10 Review of Bylaw

This Bylaw shall be reviewed by 1 September 2023.

This Bylaw can be reviewed at any other time before that date by resolution of
Council.
Schedule 1: Alcohol Ban Areas and Maps

ASHLEY GORGE means the public area known as the Ashley Gorge Reserve including the picnic area and camping ground from its entrance on Ashley Gorge Road and including the banks and waterways of the Ashley River/Rakahuri which adjoins the picnic area and including all roadways within the Reserve, but excludes camp sites and such buildings as may be designated by the camping ground caretaker.

BEACH SETTLEMENTS means the public areas (parks, reserves, etc) plantations, beaches, lagoons and roadways bounded by the Waimakariri River in the south, the Ashley River/Rakahuri in the north, the low water mark on all the beach frontage between those points and east from the intersection of Waikuku Beach Road with Kings Avenue and Preecees Road, Waikuku, extending in a straight line to the corner of Woodend Beach Road where it intersects with Stalkers Road, Woodend Beach, and intersections of Beach Road, Featherstone Avenue and Dunns Avenue at Pines Kairaki and continuing in a straight line from there to the Waimakariri River.

The ban applies to all roadways within the motor camps of Waikuku, Woodend Beach and Pines Kairaki, but excludes the registered campsites

KAIAPOI TOWN means Kaiapoi town centre from the intersection of Courtenay Drive and Williams St., north to the intersection of Williams St and Sewell St. Charles St river bank from the Mandeville Bridge east to Jones St., including Trousselot Park, Morgan Williams Reserve, Tom Ayers Reserve and that part of Corcoran Reserve that contains the skateboard park. Raven Quay from Black St east including the Memorial Reserve and across Williams St. to the east end of the Cure Boating Club. Black St from Raven Quay to Hilton St. The public car park between Raven Quay and Hilton St east of Williams St. Ohoka Rd from Williams St east to Stone St. Stone St. Courtenay Drive from Williams St to Kaikanui St St. Kaikanui St. Carew St from Williams St to Hills St.


RANGIORA TOWN means Rangiora town centre from the intersection of High Street and Church Street east to the railway line, Ivory Street from High Street to Cone Street, Cone Street Alfred Street from Ivory Street to Percival Street, Victoria Street from Queen to High Street, Percival Street from Queen Street to High Street, King Street from Queen Street to Blackett Street, Church Street from Dudley Pool to High School, the car parking area behind the library and Rangiora Service Centre, Durham Street from High Street to Blackett Street, Blake Street, the Blake Street public car park. Good Street to Blackett Street to High Street, the service lane behind New World supermarket and the public carpark to the east of New World, Ashley Street from High Street to Blackett Street, Blackett Street from Ashley Street to Durham Street, Burt Street, Albert Street from High Street to Burt Street. Allen Reserve, Ashley Picnic Area, Ashgove Park, Ballarat Reserve, Bells Siding, Bridge Lane Reserve, Bush St Reserve, Chelsea Court Reserve, Dudley Park, Elephant Park, Elm St Reserve, Good St Reserve, Green St Walkway, Grove Place Reserve, Hazeldean Reserve, Janelle Place Reserve, Kowhai Ave Reserve, Kippenberger War Memorial Reserve, Lilybrook Reserve, Manchester Place Reserve, Maria Andrews Park, Matawai Park, Neil Aitken


MURPHY PARK RESERVE means the area of reserve bounded to the north by the Kaiapoi River and west by Raven Quay and up to but not including the area south east of the reserve that contains the Kaiapoi Croquet Club and the Kaiapoi Boat Club Reserve.
Seasonal Alcohol Control in Public Areas

Murphy Park

Date: 22/08/2018

Legend

- Orange: Murphy Park Seasonal Alcohol Control Area

DISCLAIMER

Boundary information is derived under licence from LINZ Digital Cadastral Database (Crown Copyright Reserved). The Waimakariri District Council does not give and expressly disclaims any warranty as to the accuracy or completeness of the information or its fitness for any purpose. Information on this map may not be used for the purposes of any legal dispute. The user should independently verify the accuracy of any information before taking any action in reliance upon it. Land and property information is based on includes LINZ’s data which is licensed by Land Information New Zealand (LINZ) for re-use under the Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 New Zealand licence.
# Draft Alcohol Control Bylaw 2018

## Summary of elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Replace all use of the word “liquor” with the word “alcohol” to reflect the amended legislation, including replacing the definition of “liquor” with a definition of “alcohol”.</td>
<td>Updated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amend date references to reflect that this is a new bylaw.</td>
<td>Amended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amend definitions to bring them in line with the amended legislation.</td>
<td>Amended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add Murphy Park to the table in section 2: 24/7 alcohol control from beginning of rugby/rugby league season each year. To be advertised two weeks prior to the beginning of the season and at the end of the season.</td>
<td>Section 2.2.1 inserted to allow Council to amend, alter or remove the specified period in relation to Murphy Park Reserve. Any resolution made in accordance with this will be publically notified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add section 3 to link the means of providing public notice of a resolution with the LGA definition of “public notice”, including any future amendments of this term, allowing for notice to be by electronic or other means in future should the legislative definition of this term allow for it.</td>
<td>Updated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add section 4.2 to include vehicles within public places, in light of changes to the wording of section 147 of the LGA.</td>
<td>Section 4.1 added.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amend the wording of section 5 to reflect the new wording of section 147(4) of the LGA (the existing wording reflected former section 147(3) of the LGA which has been replaced by section 147(4)).</td>
<td>Amended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correct minor formatting and consistency errors.</td>
<td>Form of bylaw updated in accordance with legal opinion from Martin Bell, Solicitor (Corcoran French).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendation for Section: Support new Alcohol Control Bylaw

Group: General

Alcohol.6.3 in Submission Alcohol.6 by Mrs Wendy Howe
Relief Sought: I would like the new bylaw with changes described in the statement of proposal.

Alcohol.5.3 in Submission Alcohol.5 by Mrs Nicola Trolove
Relief Sought: Support the adoption of the new Alcohol Control Bylaw.

Alcohol.4.1 in Submission Alcohol.4 by Mr Ward and Mrs Glover
Relief Sought: Support the adoption of a new Alcohol Control Bylaw as described in the statement of proposal.

Alcohol.2.3 in Submission Alcohol.2 by Mr Bruce McLaren
Relief Sought: Adopt a new bylaw with changes as described in the statement of proposal.

Alcohol.8.1 in Submission Alcohol.8 by Mr Barry Burns
Relief Sought: Adopt a replacement (bylaw) as per proposed amendments.

Alcohol.7.3 in Submission Alcohol.7 by Mrs Fiona Clark
Relief Sought: I support the option of adopting a new bylaw with the suggested changes.

Alcohol.13.2 in Submission Alcohol.13 by Mrs Ruth Zahner
Relief Sought: Support the new bylaw with changes as described.

Alcohol.14.1 in Submission Alcohol.14 by Mr Graham Wood
Relief Sought: Support the development of the Alcohol Control Bylaw as described.

Alcohol.15.2 in Submission Alcohol.15 by Mrs Sarah Lodge Whitham
Relief Sought: Supports the development of the Alcohol Control Bylaw as described.

Alcohol.22.2 in Submission Alcohol.22 by Waimakariri Youth Council
Relief Sought: The Youth Council supports the development of the Alcohol Control Bylaw.

Alcohol.25.2 in Submission Alcohol.25 by Te Ngai Tu Ahuriri Runanga Inc

Summary: Everyone should be able to use public places safely and without fear of potentially encountering antisocial behaviour (caused by the consumption of alcohol).

Relief Sought: Controlling the consumption of alcohol in the public areas of our District's main towns as described in the draft bylaw is supported by the Kaitiaki.

Officer recommendations
Accept: Alcohol.6.3, Alcohol.5.3, Alcohol.4.1, Alcohol.2.3, Alcohol.8.1, Alcohol.7.3, Alcohol.13.2, Alcohol.14.1, Alcohol.15.2, Alcohol.22.2, Alcohol.25.2

Recommendations: Acknowledges the support for the new Alcohol Control Bylaw.
Recommendation for Section: Alcohol Ban Pegasus Town

Group: General

Alcohol.6.4 in Submission Alcohol.6 by Mrs Wendy Howe

Relief Sought: I would prefer that Pegasus town was included in the bylaw, the new shopping areas and around the lake.

Alcohol.5.4 in Submission Alcohol.5 by Mrs Nicola Trolove

Relief Sought: Would like Pegasus town included in the liquor ban areas.

Alcohol.12.1 in Submission Alcohol.12 by Mr Roger Rule

Summary: I believe that with the increase in residential housing and local business both in Pegasus and pending in Ravenswood (particularly with McDonalds and New World coming on stream) that this poses an ideal environment for people to purchase alcohol from the supermarket and fast food to be consumed around lake sites with resultant garbage left for us to clean up.

Relief Sought: An alcohol ban around the lake would be a proactive measure rather than the ambulance at the bottom of the cliff approach.

Alcohol.16.2 in Submission Alcohol.16 by Mrs Rhonda Mather

Summary: As a member of this community and a volunteer with the Pegasus Community Watch group, I have seen many instances of alcohol related problems in our town in the form of rubbish (including drug paraphernalia), verbal abuse, youths parked up for alcohol or drug consumption, youths trying to hide (on foot or in vehicles).

The current bylaw does not currently include Pegasus. Alcohol related litter is regularly found on Pegasus Boulevard from the SH1 gateway to the Infinity Drive roundabout. The levels of rubbish in this area suggest that vehicles are stopping to consume food and drink (including alcohol) and are dumping their rubbish and driving off.

I find it astounding that alcohol-free zones cannot be created without a significant amount of evidence of alcohol-related harm, nuisance or vandalism. What is wrong with our society that we cannot say 'here is a spot I can take my family for a picnic and no have to worry about their exposure to alcohol and/or alcohol related problems'?

Pegasus is a new and growing town. The current guidelines (legislation) state we have to have significant problems before we create safer areas does not make sense. With the commercial area at Ravenswood set to grow in the very near future we expect to see an increase in alcohol consumption in and around Pegasus. We already get a lot of McDonalds rubbish on Pegasus Blvd and the nearest McDonalds is in Kaiapoi or Rangiora.

Relief Sought: Suggested Alcohol Ban Areas in Pegasus:

- Pegasus Boulevard from State Highway 1 to Infinity Drive roundabout.
- Pegasus Main Street commercial area, unless on licensed or private premises.
- Motu Quay.
- Pegasus Lake Island and bridges - these areas are isolated and have many hazards. There is a picnic area on the island with a BBQ. This little island is surrounded by rocks and deep water.
- Tiritiri Moana Drive from gate to Pegasus Beach car park.
- All playgrounds.

Alcohol.19.1 in Submission Alcohol.19 by Mrs Ronel Stephens

Summary: We are a fast growing community and we have recently seen the opening of a liquor outlet and will have a new open area restaurant in a high foot traffic area before the end of winter. During
summer time this is a busy space with now two added alcohol suppliers. The McDonald's fast food chain is opening in an area (Ravenswood) with no residential development yet which could potentially invite people to the lake, parks and reserves that we would not normally have in Pegasus. The reasons sighted above are speculative but looking at the history you have documented for areas that you now have under bylaws should be enough evidence to warrant concern for what could be future alcohol hotshots in Pegasus.

**Relief Sought:** I would like to add the parks and reserves in Pegasus to the existing bylaws that we have for other similar areas in the Waimakariri District.

---

**Officer recommendations**

**Not Accept:** Alcohol.6.4, Alcohol.5.4, Alcohol.12.1, Alcohol.16.2, Alcohol.19.1

**Reasons:** The Local Government (Alcohol Reform) Amendment Act 2012 requires evidence of a high level of crime and disorder that is shown to have been caused by or made worse by alcohol consumption in the area. It is also required that the bylaw is appropriate and proportionate in the light of that crime and disorder.

Currently there is no evidence to support the extension of the alcohol control areas to Pegasus Lake and surrounds.

**Recommendations:** Advises that although the current situation at Pegasus Lake and the surrounds does not meet the requirements of the Local Government (Alcohol Reform) Amendment Act 2012 ongoing monitoring should be undertaken. If the level of crime and disorder increases and the requirements of the Act are met, the Council may consider extending the Alcohol Control area to Pegasus Lake and the surrounds by a resolution of Council.
Recommendation for Section: Include Murphy Park in Alcohol Control Area

Group: General

Alcohol.25.3 in Submission Alcohol.25 by Te Ngai Tu Ahuriri Runanga Inc

Summary: The Kaitiaki also understand that WDC is proposing to extend the alcohol control area to include Murphy Park, during both the rugby and rugby league season. We would support this ban.

The Kaitiaki are aware of antisocial behaviou occurring (including fights breaking out amongst spectators and players) which is generally caused by excessive drinking that has been allowed to occur over a long period of time (i.e. from the morning of a game through to the late evening).

Relief Sought: The Kaitiaki support the rugby club in seeking provisions in this bylaw to ensure the safety of all people, including children, attending the games throughout the season.

### Officer recommendations

Accept: Alcohol.25.3

Reasons: The Northern Bulldogs Rugby League Club has requested an extension of the alcohol ban area to include Murphy Park during the rugby/rugby league season. This request has been strongly supported by Police.

Recommendations: Recommended to extend the alcohol control area as requested. Appropriate signage will be erected and public notice given prior to the alcohol control area coming into force.
Recommendation for Section: No Alcohol Control area, Murphy Park

Group: General

Alcohol.23.1 in Submission Alcohol.23 by Ms Maria Clough

Summary: I have become aware of the North Canterbury Rugby Leage Club's proposal to put a liquor ban at Murphy Park through the league season. I totally disagree with this. I like to go down and support our senior teams.

Relief Sought: Do not include Murphy Park in the liquor ban area.

Alcohol.24.1 in Submission Alcohol.24 by Ms Natalie Leary

Summary: I do believe the Club is over-reacting and should leave well alone. We go and support the senior teams, meet up with everyone and enjoy the afternoon. Over the years it has been a pleasure watching our seniors play and especially from children to young adults. I hold a general licence and have done for many years so I am aware of what goes on and I don't think there is a problem.

Relief Sought: I do not support the liquor ban on Murphy Park through the league season.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Officer recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Accept: Alcohol.23.1, Alcohol.24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasons: The request for an extension to the alcohol control area to Murphy Park for the duration of the rugby/rugby league season has been received from the Northern Bulldogs Rugby League Club, supported by Police.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations: With strong support for an alcohol control area by both the Northern Bulldogs Rugby League Club and Police it is recommended an alcohol ban (24/7) is in place from 1 April to 1 September each year. Appropriate signage and public notice will be given.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **SUMMARY**

1.1 The purpose of this report is to seek Council adoption of the **Business Zone 1 and 2 Public Spaces Policy** following public consultation that took place during June and July 2018. The policy broadly guides how the public realm in the business zones is utilised and is designed to be complementary with existing policies and town centre plans.

1.2 The policy acts as a framework for aiding ongoing discussion about striking a favourable balance between public accessibility and enjoyment of public spaces in an environment that also stimulates, supports and enhances vibrant business and entrepreneurial activity.

1.3 Development of the policy was assisted by the input and direction of an external Reference Group comprising community board members, business owners and advocacy groups. Engagement with the public and business further informed the preparation of this policy.

**Attachments:**

i. Draft **Business Zone 1 & 2 Public Spaces Policy** (TRIM No. 180822095030).

ii. Officer Submission Report (TRIM 180823095900).

iii. Submissions: Business Zone 1 & 2 Public Spaces Policy (TRIM 180828097227)

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180803087217.

(b) **Adopts** the Business Zones 1 & 2 Public Spaces Policy following minor amendments noted in officer recommendations with the Policy to come into effect from Wednesday 5 September 2018.

(c) **Notes** that public consultation took place from 25 June to 30 July 2018 with a total of fifteen submissions received in support of the policy.

(d) **Notes** that feedback received through consultation was considered by a staff Working Group and, where appropriate has been reflected in the final policy.

(e) **Notes** that the final policy will be circulated for information to all Community Board members and to Advisory Group members who provided input into policy development.
3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1. The policy has been in development since December 2017. An Advisory Group consisting of community board representatives and community advocates have met three times from late 2017 to early 2018 to assist in drafting the policy content and direction.

3.2. The policy’s ambit is restricted to public spaces adjacent to Business 1 and 2 Zones in the towns of Rangiora, Kaiapoi, Woodend, Pegasus and Oxford, as zoned in the District Plan.

3.3. The development of this policy supports the success and implementation of existing Council documents relating to the public realm including the *Signage Bylaw 2012*, *Commercial Charity Bylaw 2017* and the *Accessibility Strategy 2017-2021*.

3.4. This policy has also been developed to align with outcomes sought in the *Smoke Free Green Spaces Policy 2012* and is complementary to the Government’s Smokefree Aotearoa 2025 initiative.

4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1. A total of 711 letters were sent out to Business Zone 1 and 2 business owners or tenants. In total, seventeen submissions were received. Two were received from anonymous submissions. Key stakeholders were individually contacted, inviting them or their members to prepare a submission.

4.2. All Business Zone 1 & 2 owners and tenants on Enterprise North Canterbury’s (ENC) mailing list were invited to the ENC-hosted ‘Our District Our Future’ event on July 26 at which the draft Public Spaces Policy was profiled. A question and answer session was also held with the Waimakariri Youth Council at their June meeting.

4.3. The bulk of the submissions received were from Rangiora and Southbrook business owners. Organisations including Grey Power North Canterbury and Canterbury District Health Board also made submissions. One submission was received from a Kaiapoi business.

4.4. Most submitters were in support of the policy. The issues featuring most prominently in submitter points centred around outdoor smoking, skateboards and accessibility.

4.5. Three submitters raised points about accessibility. In general, these submitters would like to see increased accessibility and fewer obstacles within business zones, in particular, in proximity to pedestrian crossings.

4.6. With regard to smoking outdoors, the tone of submitter comments was to maintain discouragement of smoking in dining areas and seek a wider curtailment of smoking throughout main streets within business areas.

4.7. Four submitters commented on skateboard issues. They raised issues about inappropriate or inconsiderate behaviour by skateboard scooter users and if action can be taken to restrict or stop their activities. Submitters have been advised that the effect of the *Skates and Skateboard Bylaw 2007* to control inconsiderate activity is being assessed.

4.8. A number of submitters raised matters not directly related to the scope of the policy or were operational issues. These have been referred as requests for service.

4.9. Of the two anonymous submissions received, one submitter commented that if any fees were introduced, that it should be done so at a reasonable rate. The second submitter...
makes a point not connected to the discussion draft; this matter is being addressed and will be advised separately.

4.10 The setting of any fees for a Licence to Occupy for businesses utilising laneway and accessway public spaces, will be the subject of a future report to Council.

4.11 The costs of implementing this policy are within existing levels of service.

4.12 The Management Team has reviewed this report and support the recommendations.

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. Groups and Organisations

Views have been incorporated from Grey Power North Canterbury, Enterprise North Canterbury, local businesses, the Waimakariri Access Group and the Canterbury District Health Board.

5.2. Wider Community

The consultation process was also promoted on the Council’s Facebook page, via exposure through an article in the Northern Outlook and through display copies made available at the three service centres and the Rangiora Library.

6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1. Financial Implications

There are no direct funding commitments in preparing this policy, although its implementation will need to be considered in operational budgets, including enforcement.

6.2. Community Implications

Introduction of this policy will likely enhance the community’s accessibility to and mobility within business zone public spaces.

6.3. Risk Management

There are no organisational risks associated in developing this policy.

6.4. Health and Safety

Health and safety outcomes, with risks reduced for the wider community, are likely to be improved with the introduction of this policy. It is anticipated the greatest benefits will be realised by embedding smokefree elements into the policy.

7. CONTEXT

7.1. Policy

Adoption of this policy will require consequential change to existing Council policy, in particular the review of the Signage Bylaw 2012. This matter is not a matter of significance in terms of the Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.

7.2. Legislation

7.3. Community Outcomes

This report relates to the following community outcomes:

**Governance**
- The Council takes account of the views across the community including mana whenua.
- Opportunities for collaboration and partnerships are actively pursued.

**Environment**
- Crime, injury and harm from road crashes, gambling, and alcohol abuse are minimised.

**Places and Spaces**
- There is a wide variety of public places and spaces to meet people’s needs.
- There are wide-ranging opportunities for people to enjoy the outdoors.
- There are wide-ranging opportunities for people of different ages, abilities and cultures to participate in community life and recreational activities.

**Services**
- There are sufficient and appropriate places where businesses are able to set up in our District.
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1 Introduction

A good town centre is not just a shopping centre; it has many functions. Business activities (shops and offices) when co-located with community, civic, recreational and entertainment facilities, and public artworks, create and enhance vibrant public spaces where people like to go and return to.

The Council is responsible for providing and maintaining a number of public spaces in its business zones including roads, footpaths, laneways, on-street car parking and off-street car parking. It also provides public facilities and buildings and regulates requirements for other buildings.

This policy is restricted to public spaces within Business 1 and 2 Zones in the towns of Rangiora, Kaiapoi, Woodend, Pegasus and Oxford in Waimakariri District as zoned in the District Plan and is important for businesses, groups and individuals in promoting the public image of the District.

The Business 1 Zone is a significant resource reflected in its day-to-day use by the community. The public spaces they embrace are used for culinary, entertainment and cultural experiences that generate business centre activity and vibrancy.

Industrial and commercial areas with the Business 2 Zone are becoming increasingly important in attracting customers and creating their own business vibrancy and activity as the District’s population continues to grow.

2 Policy Context

The Waimakiriri District Council needs policy in this area to broadly guide how the public realm in the District’s business zones is utilised, including the intersect with leases in public spaces, relevant bylaws such as the Signage Bylaw 2012 and relevant Council strategic approaches: town centre strategies, the Walking and Cycling Strategy 2017-2022 and the Waimakariri Accessibility Strategy 2017.

Businesses and members of the public are expected and encouraged to use footpaths, laneways and accessways in business zones for non-pedestrian activities in a fair and responsible way that does not impair or obstruct safe and efficient pedestrian movement.

Footpath, laneway and accessways users are responsible for managing these activities in accordance with:

- Any other relevant legislation and standards, including for health and safety, and advertising.

It is important that public spaces in the District’s business areas:

- Are clean, safe and promote a welcoming image of the District.
- Facilitate safe and unobstructed access for pedestrians and cyclists.
- Allow for the access of goods, service and private vehicles.
- Provide spaces for people to gather for social engagement and interaction; and
- Strengthen the existing function of, and interconnection between, public space locations.
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3 Interpretation

Definitions are set out below:

3.1 Amenity Lighting means the provision of lighting at night for public amenity (e.g. pedestrian accessways).

3.2 Business Zone means any area zoned Bus1 and Bus2 in the District Plan, in the towns of Rangiora, Kaiapoi, Woodend, Pegasus and Oxford in Waimakariri District.

3.3 Busker means any person or persons who perform and may seek voluntary donations in a public space.

3.4 Commercial means business activity, that is, an exchange of goods or services for monetary gain or reward.

3.5 Council means the Waimakariri District Council or any officer authorised to exercise the authority of the Council.

3.6 District means the Waimakariri District.

3.7 Footpath means so much of any road as it is laid out or constructed by authority of the Council primarily for pedestrians, and includes the edging but excludes the curbing or channeling.

3.8 Goods display means a display located in a public space outside a premise from which goods are offered or exposed for sale, such as clothing hanging on racks.

3.9 Heritage buildings means buildings of special character as defined in the District Plan.

3.10 Licence to Occupy means an agreement between the Council as Land Owner (Licensor) and the Occupier (Licensee) whereby the Licensor permits the Licensee occupation of the land or premises for a defined period of time with specified conditions. In the event of the land being a reserve or legal road reserve, the occupation is not exclusive.

3.11 Mobile vendor means a mobile unit, whether self-propelled or not, from which goods, wares or merchandise (including food) are offered or exposed for sale, or from which such goods, wares or merchandise may be ordered, while such mobile unit is in any public space. It does not include any unit used for the purpose of transporting and delivering goods, wares or merchandise pursuant to a prior order placed for delivery of such goods, wares or merchandise.

3.12 Premises means:
   (i) a property or allotment which is held under a separate certificate of title or for which a separate certificate of title may be issued and in respect of which a building consent has been or may be issued; or
   (ii) a building or part of a building that has been defined as an individual unit by a cross-lease, unit title or company lease and for which a certificate of title is available.
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3.13 Public space means:
(i) a space that is under control of the Waimakariri District Council; and
(ii) a space that is open to, or being used by, the public, whether or not there is a charge for admission, and
(iii) a road, street, footpath, alley, lane, accessway, pedestrian mall, court, in Business Zone 1 and 2 under Council control.

3.14 Real estate sign means a sign including information about the proposed or pending sale of any premises or business.

3.15 Signage means any display or device intended to attract attention for the purposes of directing, identifying, informing or advertising and includes any frame or supporting structure but does not include signs erected by the New Zealand Transport Agency or the Waimakariri District Council.

3.16 Skateboard means a board fitted with wheels used to support a person and propelled by that person using muscular energy or with the assistance of a declining gradient and which has limited or no mechanical means of braking. This includes longboards, scooters, carts, trolleys or similar devices.

3.17 Skates means any footwear fitted with wheels and propelled by that person using muscular energy or with the assistance of a declining gradient and which has limited or no mechanical means of braking and includes in-line skates, roller skates or rollerblades.

3.18 TGSI Tactile ground surface indicators (TGSI) are ground-level warning and directional indicators which provide blind, deafblind and vision impaired pedestrians with visual and sensory information.

4 Policy Objective

This policy seeks to make the Council’s public spaces; its lanes, footpaths, streets, buildings and artworks accessible so as to:
- Promote vibrancy in the public domain adjacent to business areas.
- Protect the public from nuisance and obstructions.
- Protect, promote and maintain public health and safety.
- Ensure public spaces are used in ways that positively contribute to the District’s identity and people’s enjoyment of public spaces.
- Establish an equitable and consistent procedure for charging fees in the Council reserve (business zones).

It has been developed to provide a framework for the successful and sustainable on-going utility and management of Waimakariri District’s business zones and will be integrate with and help to assist implementation of key Council documents such as the District Plan.

5 Fees and Licence to Occupy

The Council wishes to encourage activity and vibrancy in public spaces within Business Zones 1 & 2. However, the Council needs to balance activity and vibrancy with prescribing at the appropriate level a
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Licence to Occupy which retains existing businesses while not acting as a disincentive to new businesses wishing to establish themselves.

The Council thus reserves the right, in alignment with its revenue and financing policy, to set an equitable fee structure for occupation of the Council reserve, for example, outdoor dining, selling of goods and mobile vendors.

A one-off processing fee will be administered in association with a Licence to Occupy for business owners or lessees utilising the Council reserve. The Deed of Licence will be reviewed bi-annually, or annually for premises with a liquor licence as part of the Licence to Occupy.

In the case of a licensee relinquishing their lease, the new licensee is not subject to a new administration fee unless the nature of the business changes, for example, from a premises selling food to one selling clothing.

Inspections or audits of premises will be carried out up to twice annually as part of the one-off processing fee. The premises fee is set in the first schedule of a licensee’s Deed of Licence.

The Council reserves the right to set at zero, the fees for some licensed activities including busking, street performance, street appeals and charity fundraising.

6 Policy Statement

6.1 Accessibility, safety and mobility

The primary purpose and priority use for footpaths and other public accessways and spaces is for safe and efficient pedestrian accessibility and mobility. Activities and obstructions that interfere with pedestrian flows such as street furniture, signboards and clothing stands, can create pedestrian congestion and safety hazards.

There shall be a continuous two metre clearway maintained on all footpaths, accessways and lanes at all times. Council requires that minimum continuous unobstructed footpath widths are maintained to ensure that pedestrian priority and safe and efficient pedestrian movement is upheld. The minimum widths are guided by the volume of pedestrian traffic.

Pedestrian crossings are also an important accessway within business zones and access to them should not be hindered or their pedestrian safety compromised. Pedestrians should be clearly able to see approaching motorists and vice versa. No signage or other obstruction shall be located adjacent to or within 1.0 m of any pedestrian crossing or any tactile ground surface indicators (TGI) which announce the presence of a crossing.

Spacing and clearances for the placement of signage and goods for display are shown in Schedule A. Similarly, the layout of furniture in outdoor dining areas shall allow for unobstructed and efficient pedestrian movement (refer to Schedule B).

Business owners or interested parties can apply to the Council for the closure of footpath space for special events by prior arrangement. Similarly, they may also utilise public off-street parking spaces on a temporary basis for specific purposes by prior arrangement.

The owners of businesses are encouraged to adopt best practice design and installation principles for pedestrian accessibility according to New Zealand Transport Authority’s best practice guideline RTS14 – Guidelines for facilities for blind and vision impaired pedestrians (2015).
6.2 Outdoor dining

High quality outdoor dining areas can add to the vibrancy of public spaces if well designed and located. Outdoor dining areas contribute to the District’s town centres and their sense of place and provides the public with an enjoyable leisure option. They can also add significant economic value to town centres with cafes, bars and restaurants through increased customer capacity and demand.

In general, the Council wants to encourage outdoor seating because it adds to the quality of public spaces. However, if outdoor seating is not managed well it can clutter the footpath and create obstacles for pedestrians.

Cafes, bars and restaurants wishing to use part of the footpath space directly outside their premises for outdoor dining are required to obtain a Licence to Occupy from Council’s Property Unit. An applicant wishing to serve alcohol as part of an outdoor dining area must apply to the District Licensing Authority for an alcohol licence or a variation of the area to which their alcohol licence applies. The Liquor Ban Bylaw regulates the control of liquor in public places.

The holder of a Licence to Occupy must:

- Manage activities for accessible journeys and design elements in accordance with New Zealand Standard 4121:2001 Design of Access and Mobility – Buildings and Associated Facilities (NZS4121).
- Locate outdoor dining furniture located in a way that does not impinge on the continuous clearway through the pedestrian zone, observing the setback requirements in Schedules A and B.
- Use barriers or other appropriate street furniture to clearly define the boundaries of an outdoor dining area from opening of trading until the end of the trading day, unless permitted by specific lease or Licence to Occupy conditions,
- Not allow the outdoor dining area to cause damage to any verge, kerbing or heritage building.
- Arrange all street furniture and objects such as tables, chairs, umbrellas and menu boards within the dining areas in compliance with this policy and as provided for in the Licence to Occupy.
- Use street furniture of durable construction which has no sharp features which could cause injury.
- Allow for adequate supervision of the outdoor dining area to be maintained from opening of trading until the end of the trading day.
- Between the end of the trading day and 7:00 am, secure together all street furniture used in an outdoor dining area so that it cannot be used by the public.

Additionally, the holder of a Licence to Occupy must:

- Display their licence to occupy or have this available for inspection by a Council enforcement officer, if requested.
- Have adequate space set aside (in their site proposal) and have a management regime for waste storage and disposal.
- Be responsible for cleaning the footpath and removing rubbish in the outdoor dining areas.
- Not allow waste material including sweepings, detergents and cleaning agents to be disposed of into the street gutter or stormwater drains.
- Remove all their street furniture from the pedestrian zone when requested by Council during a special event, or to enable street works, services or repairs.

Where provided for, road build-outs can be utilised for outdoor dining by the business they are directly adjacent to as part of that business’s Licence to Occupy.

The Council reserves the right to set equitable fees across business zones for utilisation of outdoor dining spaces, and to recover where necessary the costs of enforcing and monitoring this policy.
The owner of the premises must also hold public liability insurance to a minimum value of $2,000,000 indemnifying Council against any claim arising from damage or injury caused by any piece of outdoor furniture or other moveable fitting in the outdoor dining area.

6.3 Smoking outdoors

Smoking, or use of electronic cigarettes (e-cigarettes), is not encouraged in outdoor dining areas for cafes, bars and restaurants; or at public events staged within business zones. Smoke-free environments help support the health and wellbeing of individuals, families and whānau. It is also the Government’s goal that New Zealand be smokefree by 2025.

Where a business creates an outdoor smoking area, business owners are encouraged to adopt the policy approach outlined in the Smokefree Aotearoa 2025 programme and utilise practical guidance, in particular for outdoor dining, to help create a wider network of smoke-free environments within the District’s business zones (refer to Schedule C).

This part of this policy complements the Council’s approach taken in the Smoke Free Green Spaces Policy 2012. The policy is not a ban on smoking, rather it supports a voluntary environment where people can chose to act responsibly around children and young people.

The Council already has a policy providing for smoke-free green spaces, a key component for the Council to take action and become part of the Government’s commitment to becoming a ‘Smokefree New Zealand’ by 2025. Smoke-free outdoor policies are based on the rationale of good behaviour role modelling to children and younger people.

6.4 Signage

Signage plays an important role in directing the public, and advertising and displaying information to the public for businesses, business customers, community groups and visitors. There can be a detrimental effect of signage upon the environment: aesthetically, visually or physically; or if poorly located or not compatible with the surrounding environment. Signage can also have an effect on vehicular traffic with the potential to cause a traffic accident.

The placement of signage in Business Zones 1 and 2 is guided by this Policy. The Signage Bylaw regulates signs on business-zoned land affecting traffic. The District Plan controls requirements for signage placed on privately owned premises including any signage placed on a verandah. Signage includes moveable sandwich boards and more recent designs that sit in a weighted support base, including sail-shaped flags and teardrop-shaped flags. Refer to Schedule D for signage dimensions.

Signage is permitted on footpaths and accessways where it meets the following conditions:

- Activities are managed for accessible journeys and design elements in accordance with New Zealand Standard 4121:2001 Design of Access and Mobility – Buildings and Associated Facilities (NZS4121).
- Footpath signage shall be located in a way that does not impinge on the continuous clearway through the pedestrian zone, observing the placement requirements in Schedule A.
- Each business may place one sign per road frontage and an additional sign in the trading zone adjacent to the kerb zone, if space allows (see Schedule A).
- Any material displayed or the advertising matter on any signage shall relate only to the business carried on in the premises and maintained to an acceptable standard.
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- The business owner is responsible for any safety issues of both customers and the general public passing by, ensuring any signage is secured so it cannot blow around in the wind.
- Sail-shaped and teardrop-shaped flags which are able to move in windy conditions shall be located so that they do not sway into the pedestrian zone clearway (see Schedule B).
- Signage should be safe and have no sharp edges or protrusions that may create an obstacle or a safety hazard for pedestrians.
- Rotating designs can be used in business zones, however, dimensions should be consistent with contemporary street signage (see Schedule D).
- Advertising shall not be illuminated, have reflective surfaces or resemble a traffic sign.
- All displays and sign boards shall be removed from the footpath each day after the expiry of normal trading hours of the business concerned.
- No signage shall be located adjacent to or within 1.0 m of any TGSI, pedestrian crossing, accessibility car park or bus stop.

In cases where there are several businesses operating within the same accessway or laneway, the Council will work with the affected business and property owners to develop a compliant solution such as shared directional signage so as to maintain accessible and unobstructed footpath traffic.

The design and location of signs in a public space outside a listed heritage building in a business zone shall also be compatible with the heritage significance of the building so they do not detract from the significance or features of that building.

Council land is not to be used for the erection of election signs, either for Parliamentary elections (including by-elections) or local body elections (including by-elections). This Policy also does not apply to signs erected for or on behalf of the Council.

6.5 Display of goods

An accessible and unobstructed footpath for pedestrians needs to be consistently maintained while allowing business owners to utilise the zone outside their property for trading purposes. Similarly, there needs to be clear space in the kerb zone to maintain access to parked vehicles. Merchandise displays shall observe the requirements on setbacks and clearways set out in Schedule A.

Applications to display goods or services for sale or hire in a public space, e.g. a footpath, lane court area will be considered on a case-by-case basis. The Council will take into account:

- The impact on local existing businesses.
- The nature of the display and goods involved.
- The quality (aesthetics) of the display and the desire to avoid excessive visual clutter in and along the footpath zone.
- The environment the applicant requests to operate in, including the width of the footpath and the volume of pedestrian movement.
- Access requirements for visually impaired members of public as well as mobility aids including mobility scooters, assisted walking aids, wheelchairs and pushchairs.

When goods are displayed in accessways, they are to be managed to allow for safe and accessible journeys and design elements in accordance with New Zealand Standard 4121:2001 Design of Access and Mobility – Buildings and Associated Facilities (NZS4121).

Display of goods items or services for sale are permitted where they meet the following conditions:

- Trading is permitted to extend 0.8 m out from the property boundary, allowing for both display of goods and the ability of the public to stop in front of or move around the display.
The display of goods should not hinder access to doors and entranceways. The trading zone should allow at least 0.5m clearance on either side of entrances to the building.

Merchandise can be displayed adjacent to the kerb zone if the width of the footpath or accessway allows the 2.0 m pedestrian zone clearway to be maintained (see Schedule A).

All goods shall be elevated from the ground, for example on a table or rack.

In the instance of goods display, some deviation from size limitations for signage may be allowed at the discretion of Council.

6.6 Mobile trading

Mobile trading is the temporary trading activity from a location where goods, wares or merchandise (including food) are offered or displayed for sale. Examples include vendors selling their goods from a public open space or roadside, for example, produce stalls, coffee carts and ice cream trucks. Mobile trading also includes persons offering their goods on foot.

Open air markets and food stall areas can encourage foot traffic activity and visitors to the business zones, however, mobile vendors shall not obstruct pedestrian accessways, impede entry to any premises or hinder traffic flow.

Anyone wishing to trade will need to apply for and obtain a mobile trading licence from the Council’s Environmental Services Unit. If the vendor intends to sell food, they will also need to obtain a certificate of registration under the Food Act 2014.

The Council reserves the right to set equitable fees for mobile vendors and to recover where necessary the costs of enforcing this policy.

6.7 Buskers and commercial charitable collectors

Buskers and street performers can help to enhance the District’s reputation as being energetic and interactive. The Council welcomes high-quality street performances to complement business activities where these are appropriate. However, a busker should obtain permission from the owner of the business adjacent to the public space where the proposed busking is to take place.

Buskers are permitted to use voice enhancement equipment (including, microphones, amplifying equipment and loud hailers). Noise, however, must not be excessive, remain under the busker’s control and have shall be courteous and mindful of surrounding businesses and the general public.

Between the hours of 7:00 am and 1:00 am, buskers may perform in public spaces but are not permitted to remain in a single location for longer than 2 continuous hours. Buskers shall not impede or inconvenience the flow of pedestrians and customers along footpaths and accessways.

The provisions of the Commercial Charity Bylaw 2017 allow for persons receiving a personal financial reward or other direct benefit from registered or unregistered charitable entities to operate in public spaces within the Rangiora, Kaiapoi, Woodend, Pegasus and Oxford business zones.
6.8 Skates and skateboards

Skates, skateboards and self-propelled scooters can provide adults and children with a valuable form of exercise and transport, however their usage in busy public spaces has the potential to be dangerous or cause a nuisance.

No person shall use a skateboard, skates or self-propelled scooter in any road or public space within Business 1 and 2 Zones, in such a manner or at such a time as may cause damage to property or may cause annoyance, danger or inconvenience to residents or members of the public in the vicinity.

6.9 Amenity lighting

Street and amenity lights provide lighting to roads and accessways for traffic and pedestrian accessibility and safety purposes. Major streets within the business zones are brightly lit, with less street lighting provided on lanes and accessways.

Council will continue to embrace new lighting technologies where these are cost effective and practical to install. Street lighting shall be designed in accordance with the national street lighting standard, AS/NZS 1158: Lighting for roads and public spaces. Private amenity lighting shall not be connected to the Council's street lighting system.

7 Links to legislation, other policies and community outcomes

7.1 Legislation and regulation

Under the Local Government Act 2002, the Council has a responsibility to promote the social, environmental, cultural and economic wellbeing of its residents. Under the Heath Act 1956, there is a duty of this Council to improve, promote and protect public health within its District.

In particular, this policy gives effect to the following provisions in the Signage Bylaw, provisions applying to avoiding public nuisance and enhancing road safety, namely:

- Real estate signage (Clause 8.1);
- Community and non-profit event signage (Clauses 9.1-9.4);
- Footpath signage and advertising (Clauses 10.1-10.3);
- The display of signs (Clauses 10.4-10.6);
- The display of advertising goods for sale (Clause 10.7);
- Signage overhanging footpaths or roads (Clauses 11.1-11.3); and
- Signs affecting traffic (Clauses 12.1-12.3).

The Policy also gives effect to the Commercial Charity Bylaw which applies to charity collectors in business zones within the District’s five towns.

Pedestrian crossing design and placement is set out in the New Zealand Transport Authority’s Pedestrian planning and design guide (2007).

7.2 Other Council Documents

This policy guides how public spaces in the District’s business zones are utilised and is also aligned to the following Council documents:

| Waimakariri District Plan | Policy should be read in conjunction with the relevant rules, policies and objectives in Chapter 16 - Business Zones. |

Adopted Council 04 09 2018
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Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan 2011
The future Kaiapoi town centre will be an economically viable centre where both residents and visitors want to spend time and money.

Rangiora Town Centre Strategy (RCT 2020)
A town centre which is sustainable, prosperous, vibrant, easily accessible, contains safe and attractive pedestrian-orientated streets and spaces.

Woodend Pegasus Area Strategy 2013
The area is home to well-connected communities and prosperous businesses, has attractive public spaces and a healthy environment.

Walking and Cycling Strategy 2017-2022
The environment is friendly, safe and accessible to walkers and cyclists.

Accessibility Strategy 2017-2021
Everyone, including people with impairments have access to public services, facilities and spaces.

Council Community Action Plan on Alcohol 2009
Promotes safe and responsible use of alcohol and seeks to minimise alcohol-related harm to the people and communities.

Smoke Free Green Spaces Policy 2012
This policy seeks to denormalise smoking in green spaces that are owned and managed by Council by making it less visible, particularly to children and youth.

Local Alcohol Policy 2015
Allows the Council to further control the location and number of licensed premises and maximum trading hours.

7.3 Community Outcomes
This policy assists the Council meet its community outcomes, which describe how the Council aims to achieve meeting the current and future needs of its communities with good-quality local infrastructure, providing local public services and performance of regulatory functions.

Community outcomes of particular relevance include:
- Public spaces and facilities are plentiful, accessible and high quality;
- There is a safe environment for all;
- Businesses in the District are diverse, adaptable and growing;
- Our community’s needs for health and social services are met;
- The community’s cultures, arts and heritage are conserved and celebrated;
- The distinctive character of our takīwā - towns, villages and rural areas is maintained;
- People are friendly and caring, creating a strong sense of community in our District.

Disposal of waste in business zones by the public is not provided for under this policy and can be referred to in the Public Refuse Bins Policy (2002).

8 Adopted by and date
This policy was adopted by Council on [Day] [Month] 2018.

9 Review
The policy will be reviewed:
- every six years; or
- sooner at the request of Council; or
- in response to any issues that may arise.
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Schedule¹ A - Footpath Zones (General)
Guidelines for acceptable retail display and signage setup:

1. Of primary importance is that there shall be a continuous 2.0 metre unobstructed pedestrian clearway maintained on all footpaths and accessways at all times.

2. The extent of the permitted trading zone is defined by the property boundary along footpath frontage allowing for at least 0.5m clearance on either side of entrances to the building.

3. The goods display may extend to 0.8m from the property boundary to allow customers to stop and view goods where the pedestrian zone clearway still allows sufficient space for this.

4. Customers, including those in control of pushchairs and mobility aids, are expected to remain within the viewing area as far as is practicable while they view goods displays or interact with each other.

5. Signage, goods for display and outdoor dining furniture shall be placed a minimum distance of 0.5m from the kerb so as to provide access to vehicle parking.

¹ Note that the schedules are explanatory and not part of the policy. They are intended to explain its general effect and can be amended by Council resolution.
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Schedule B - Footpath Zone (Outdoor Dining)

Acceptable zones for outdoor dining on footpaths in areas zoned Bus1 and Bus2.
POLICY & STRATEGY

DRAFT BUSINESS ZONE 1 & 2 PUBLIC SPACES POLICY 2018

Schedule C – Smokefree policy and guidance

1. Smokefree Aotearoa 2025

This policy seeks to denormalise smoking in public open spaces that are owned and managed by Council by making smoking less visible, particularly to children and youth. A similar approach is adopted in the Smoke Free Green Spaces Policy 2012.

Business owners and lessees are encouraged to make their outdoor dining space smokefree in line with the intent of Smokefree Aotearoa 2025, the core of which is reproduced as follows:

Nearly 85% of New Zealanders are smokefree – that means most of us are choosing not to smoke. The New Zealand Government has set a goal so that by 2025 fewer than 5% of New Zealanders will be smokers. This will be achieved by:

- Protecting children from exposure to tobacco marketing and promotion
- Reducing the supply of, and demand for tobacco
- Providing the best possible support for quitting.

Being smokefree and having smokefree environments help support the health and wellbeing of our families and whānau. We know tobacco kills, so it makes sense.

- You will be healthier.
- There is less chance your children will smoke.
- You won’t be breathing in second-hand smoke – in New Zealand approximately 500 people die prematurely due to second-hand smoke and globally this is estimated to be 600,000 people every year.
- You will save money by not buying cigarettes or tobacco – lots of money!
- You will not be supporting an industry that contributes to about 6 million deaths globally each year.

2. Smokefree Outdoor Dining

For cafes, restaurants and licensed venues in Waimakariri District considering smoke-free dining spaces on existing or new locations, please refer to the ‘Smokefree Outdoor Dining’ guidance prepared by the Cancer Society and Canterbury District Health Board, or contact the Cancer Society (Canterbury - West Coast Division) directly (ph. 03 379 5835).
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Schedule D – Signage Dimensions
Guideline dimensions for placement of signage displays on footpath.

1. Feather / sail / teardrop style flags: no wider than 0.75m; no higher than 3.2m.

2. Contemporary style street signage including sandwich boards: no wider than 0.6 metres; no higher than 0.75 metres; maximum base spread is 0.6 metres.
Project: Public spaces within our Business Zones

Report: Officer Recommendations
Outdoor Dining

PSBZ.10.1 in Submission PSBZ.10 by Luisetti Seeds

Relief Sought: The submitter supports and encourages outdoor dining.

PSBZ.12.2 in Submission PSBZ.12 by Mr Rodger Pearson

Summary: The submitter has concerns about encroachment by outdoor dining activities into public thoroughfares.

Relief Sought: The submitter asks that outdoor dining activities be situated so as not to encroach into public thoroughfares.

Officer recommendations

Accept PSBZ.10.1, PSBZ.12.2

Recommendations: Outdoor dining is encouraged in town centres. The Council works with business owners to ensure dining activity does not encroach into public thoroughfares.

Signage

PSBZ.10.3 in Submission PSBZ.10 by Luisetti Seeds

Relief Sought: The submitter wishes that display of signage operating in business zones be discouraged.

PSBZ.12.4 in Submission PSBZ.12 by Mr Rodger Pearson

Summary: The submitter comments that signage aspects of the policy are covered in existing local legislation.

Relief Sought: The submitter considers the existing Signage Bylaw to be adequate to address signage issues if signage breaches are adequately policed.

PSBZ.13.2 in Submission PSBZ.13 by Grey Power North Canterbury Association (Inc.)

Summary: The submitter in general has no specific comments about signage.

Relief Sought: While it was not a important issue for most members, one of submitter’s members noted that there too many footpath signs.

Officer recommendations

Accept PSBZ.13.2

Not Accept PSBZ.10.3

Partially Accept PSBZ.12.4

Reasons: Inclusion of a signage section in the policy helps reinforce the purpose and objectives of the Signage Bylaw 2012. The Council also works with business owners to ensure signage is placed appropriately and will follow up on signage-related complaints.
Display of goods

PSBZ.10.4 in Submission PSBZ.10 by Luisetti Seeds

Relief Sought: The submitter seeks a restriction (time and space) on the display of goods in business zones.

PSBZ.12.5 in Submission PSBZ.12 by Mr Rodger Pearson

Summary: The submitter considers that display of goods aspects of the policy are covered in existing local legislation.

Relief Sought: The submitter considers existing legislation to be sufficient adequate to address display of goods issues.

Officer recommendations

Partially Accept PSBZ.10.4, PSBZ.12.5

Reasons: Goods for sale are displayed outdoors during normal business hours. Inclusion of a goods display section in the policy helps to reinforce the purpose and objectives, in particular clause 10.7, of the Signage Bylaw.

Mobile trading

PSBZ.12.6 in Submission PSBZ.12 by Mr Rodger Pearson

Summary: The submitter considers that existing bylaws adequately control hawking activities.

Relief Sought: The submitter would like to see increased monitoring and control of unlicensed traders.

Officer recommendations

Partially Accept PSBZ.12.6

Reasons: Charitable collecting is controlled under the Commercial Charity Bylaw. The Council's Environmental Services Unit monitors hawking activity and responds to any public complaints.

Buskers

PSBZ.10.5 in Submission PSBZ.10 by Luisetti Seeds

Relief Sought: The submitter supports buskers operating in business zones.

PSBZ.12.7 in Submission PSBZ.12 by Mr Rodger Pearson

Relief Sought: The submitter requests that all buskers be permitted and present their permit upon request.

PSBZ.13.3 in Submission PSBZ.13 by Grey Power North Canterbury Association (Inc.)

Summary: The submitter supports the policy approach to buskers.

Relief Sought: The submitter wishes to see buskers and street performers encouraged within town centres.
Officer recommendations

Accept: PSBZ.10.5, PSBZ.13.3

Partially Accept: PSBZ.12.7

Reasons: No fee is associated with busking activity. The Council allows buskers to perform in business zones; however, they must first acquire a licence which allows them to perform, typically for a period of a few hours.

Commercial charitable collectors

PSBZ.10.6 in Submission PSBZ.10 by Luisetti Seeds

Relief Sought: The submitter supports charitable collectors operating in business zones provided they are licensed.

PSBZ.12.8 in Submission PSBZ.12 by Mr Rodger Pearson

Relief Sought: The submitter requests that legitimate charitable collectors present their permit upon request.

PSBZ.13.4 in Submission PSBZ.13 by Grey Power North Canterbury Association (Inc.)

Summary: A submitter member has a mild level of concern about being approached by collectors seeking donations.

Relief Sought: The submitter infers the provisions of the Commercial Charity Bylaw are sufficient to manage charity collectors.

Officer recommendations

Accept: PSBZ.10.6, PSBZ.12.8

Partially Accept: PSBZ.13.4

Reasons: Charity collector activity is controlled under the Charity Collector Bylaw. Charity collectors must present their licence to Council staff if requested. Council issues a cost-free licence for collectors typically for a period of a few hours.

Skates and skateboards

PSBZ.1.2 in Submission PSBZ.1 by Mrs Marilyn Ayers

Summary:

The submitter advises she has almost been knocked down by skateboarders, at differing times of the day. She adds that skateboarders have a negative impact on other footpath and lanes uses, and local businesses, especially in the afternoon after the schools close. The submitter considers that skateboarders, who tend to be young persons, may be unaware that footpaths are a shared amenity. The submitter advises she has encountered rude and abusive skateboard users.

Relief Sought: The submitter would like to see skateboard use banned in Rangiora’s High Street between East Belt and King Street and the main retail ares of Rangiora.
PSBZ.10.7 in Submission PSBZ.10 by Luisetti Seeds

**Relief Sought:** The submitter does not support the use of skates and skateboards in business zones.

PSBZ.12.9 in Submission PSBZ.12 by Mr Rodger Pearson

**Summary:** The submitter considers that skate and skateboard users are inconsiderate of other footpath users and public property.

**Relief Sought:** The submitter would like to see the use of skates and skateboards banned from all business areas with an infringement system applied when necessary.

PSBZ.13.5 in Submission PSBZ.13 by Grey Power North Canterbury Association (Inc.)

**Summary:** The submitter raises concerns about skateboard and scooter users, especially some older people who at times, especially at night, are not able to avoid skateboard and scooter activity.

**Relief Sought:** The submitter would like to see action taken against skateboard and scooter users to restrict or stop their activities within business zones.

**Officer recommendations**

**Accept:** PSBZ.1.2, PSBZ.10.7, PSBZ.12.9, PSBZ.13.5

**Reasons:** The effect of the Skates and Skateboards Bylaw 2007 to control inconsiderate activity and behaviour is currently being assessed. As part of this assessment, the Council will look at ways to inform the public of the danger of using and riding skateboards and scooters in a high-volume pedestrian areas.

Smoking outdoors

PSBZ.1.1 in Submission PSBZ.1 by Mrs Marilyn Ayers

**Summary:**Submitter notes that main outdoor dining areas in Melbourne are smoke free with smokers required to go to a designated area away from diners.

**Relief Sought:**
Submitter considers at a minimim the main streets and shopping areas should be smoke free. Submitter specifically suggests a wider no-smoking area to include East Belt to King Street, Conway Lane and the main sports reserves.

PSBZ.7.1 in Submission PSBZ.7 by Ms Melanie Ward

**Summary:** The submitter comments that smoking in public spaces detracts from her enjoyment of walking and shopping, especially along High Street.

**Relief Sought:** The submitter supports no smoking in public outdoor dining areas and would like to see wider discouragement of smoking, in surrounding shopping areas and food outlets.

PSBZ.10.2 in Submission PSBZ.10 by Luisetti Seeds

**Relief Sought:** The submitter suggests a ban be introduced on smoking in outdoor dining areas.

PSBZ.12.3 in Submission PSBZ.12 by Mr Rodger Pearson

**Relief Sought:** The submitter wishes to see outdoor smoking banned from all public areas within business zones.
PSBZ.13.1 in Submission PSBZ.13 by Grey Power North Canterbury Association (Inc.)

Summary: The submitter, by majority support of its membership base, supports a wider curtailment of smoking within business zones.

Relief Sought: The submitter would like to see wording in the policy amended to favour banning of smoking outdoors as opposed to encouraging people through good example not to smoke.

**Officer recommendations**

Not Accept: PSBZ.10.2, PSBZ.12.3

Partially Accept: PSBZ.1.1, PSBZ.7.1, PSBZ.13.1

Reasons: The policy intent is to discourage smoking in and around outdoor dining areas. The approach of discouraging rather than banning smoking in Council parks and reserves has worked well under the 2012 Smoke Free Green Spaces Policy. Introducing a widespread outdoor smoking ban would require significant amendments to government legislation before any position could be contemplated and adopted by a local authority.

Smoking outdoors - Fresh Air Project

PSBZ.3.2 in Submission PSBZ.3 by Canterbury District Health Board

Summary:
Submitter commends the Council for acknowledging the importance of creating smokefree public spaces, and including references to the current Council Smokefree Greenspaces Policy 2012 and national Smokefree 2025 goal.

Relief Sought:
Submitter recommends under Schedule C that reference and a link be included to the Fresh Air Project website ([www.freshairproject.org.nz](http://www.freshairproject.org.nz)) as a resource to support businesses introducing smokefree outdoor dining.

**Officer recommendations**

Accept: PSBZ.3.2

Reasons: Schedule C in the policy will be amended to incorporate the suggested Fresh Air Project weblink.

Amenity lighting

PSBZ.12.10 in Submission PSBZ.12 by Mr Rodger Pearson

Summary: The submitter considers there is sufficient security lighting on buildings and in garden areas.

Relief Sought: The submitter suggests that security cameras should be introduced in business area to reduce vandalism and tagging.
Officer recommendations
Partially Accept: PSBZ.12.10
Reasons: The Council currently has sufficient security cameras installed in Rangiora and Kaiapoi which act as a deterrent to wilful damage. Any problematic or recurring vandalism and tagging issues are reported by Council staff to the Police.

Amenity lighting - Flaxton Road - McDonalds to Fernside Road
PSBZ.4.1 in Submission PSBZ.4 by Amuri Group Limited
Summary: The area of Flaxton Road from Lineside Road to Fernside Road has poor or no street lighting.
Relief Sought: Improve amenity lighting along Flaxton Road between Lineside Road to Fernside Road to address security and safety concerns for business owners.
PSBZ.2.1 in Submission PSBZ.2 by Mr Daniel Gerber
Summary: We believe that the street lighting along Flaxton road from McDonalds to the turn off to the Transfer station is not adequate enough and should be improved.
Relief Sought:
Improve street lighting along Flaxton road from McDonalds to the turn off to the Transfer Station.

Officer recommendations
Accept: PSBZ.4.1, PSBZ.2.1
Reasons: Your concerns about amenity lighting on Flaxton Road have been noted and your comments have been referred to the relevant Council unit as a service request.

Amenity lighting - Hilton Street - Fire Station to William street
PSBZ.6.1 in Submission PSBZ.6 by Mr John Moody and Ms Dianne Gray
Summary: The submitters identify inadequate lighting on Hilton Street between the Fire Service building (#51 Hilton Street) and the intersection with William Street.
Relief Sought: The submitters are seeking improved lighting along this stretch of Hilton Street for both property and personal security.

Officer recommendations
Accept: PSBZ.6.1
Reasons: Your concerns about amenity lighting in Hilton Street have been noted and your comments have been referred to the relevant Council unit as a service request.
Accessibility

PSBZ3.1 in Submission PSBZ.3 by Canterbury District Health Board

Summary:
Submitter commends the Council on producing a draft policy that reflects the principles of universal design and takes into consideration the needs of pedestrians of all ages and abilities in designing public spaces within business zones.

Relief Sought:
No specific relief sought.

PSBZ12.1 in Submission PSBZ.12 by Mr Rodger Pearson

Summary: The submitter has concerns about general accessibility within business areas, noting the difficulty experienced by impaired and wheelchair-bound people have negotiating pedestrian crossings.

Relief Sought: The submitter wishes to see increased accessibility within business zones. The submitter also wishes to see the quality of pedestrian crossing access be improved.

PSBZ13.6 in Submission PSBZ.13 by Grey Power North Canterbury Association (Inc.)

Summary: The submitter has concerns about safety, traffic volume, visibility and obstruction issues relating to the pedestrian crossings on High Street, from both a pedestrian and driver perspective. The submitter also considers that the pedestrian crossings may not comply with the WHO age-friendly community features checklist, in particular around obstructions and accessibility.

Relief Sought: The submitter wishes to see obstructions such as planter boxes removed from around crossings and consideration given to having traffic lights installed on High Street crossings.

Officer recommendations

Accept PSBZ.3, PSBZ.12, PSBZ.13

Reasons: This policy encourages members of the public to use footpaths, accessways and roadways in a fair and responsible manner. The Council recognises there are periodic issues around ill placed signage and obstructions in proximity to pedestrian crossings and responds to complaints on these matters. The Council also periodically assesses the requirement for light-controlled pedestrian crossings; however, no light controls are being considered currently for central business zone areas.

Accessibility - cycle lanes and footpaths

PSBZ11.1 in Submission PSBZ.11 by Rangiora Equestrian Supplies

Summary: The submitter has concerns about cyclists using footpaths instead of cycle lanes and affecting businesses.

Relief Sought: The submitter would like to see more direct and public consultation with business owners on matters which affect business zones or corridors.
Officer recommendations
Accept: PSBZ.11.1
Reasons: The Walking & Cycling Strategy 2017 promotes active travel modes such as walking and cycling, including shared pathways where these are suitable. The Council assesses periodically what is needed in parts of the District to further promote active travel and where appropriate, direct consultation will be undertaken with affected parties.

Licence to occupy
PSBZ.14.1 in Submission PSBZ.14 by K.E.F. Ltd (F.O.D. Cafe)
Summary: The submitter raises concerns over the introduction of a proposed fee structure, that they may impact on the viability of hospitality business owners,
Relief Sought: The submitter requests that if any compliance fees are to be introduced for hospitality businesses, then these need to be carefully considered.

Officer recommendations
Accept: PSBZ.14.1
Reasons: The Council wishes to maintain and enhance vibrant business activity. Currently, we are carefully considering a fee structure that would not unduly disadvantage the business community.

Railway Road - drain
PSBZ.5.1 in Submission PSBZ.5 by Automotive Parts
Summary:Submitter describes a non-related issue, that a drain outside his property may need to be assessed for new pipework installation and parking access.
Relief Sought:Submitter comments referred as a service request
PSBZ.8.1 in Submission PSBZ.8 by Engineering North Canterbury
Summary: The submitter identifies an issue which is outside the consultation brief
Relief Sought: An issue around the condition of the drain outside the submitter's property will be referred as a service request.

Officer recommendations
Partially Accept: PSBZ.5.1, PSBZ.8.1
Reasons: Your concerns about drainage in Railway Road have been noted and your comments have been referred to the relevant Council unit as a service request.

Newnham Street - parking
PSBZ.12.11 in Submission PSBZ.12 by Mr Rodger Pearson
Summary: Submitter describes a non-related issue, that parking restrictions may need to be introduced into Newnham Street.

Relief Sought: Submitter comments referred as a service request.

**Officer recommendations**

**Partially Accept** [PSBZ.12.11]

**Reasons**: Your concerns about parking in Newnham Street have been noted and your comments have been referred to the relevant Council unit as a service request.

**Newnham Street - poplar trees**

**PSBZ.12.12 in Submission PSBZ.12 by Mr Rodger Pearson**

Summary: Submitter describes a non-related issue, that consideration be given to removal of two poplar trees in this part of Newnham Street.

Relief Sought: Submitter comments referred as a service request.

**Officer recommendations**

**Partially Accept** [PSBZ.12.12]

**Reasons**: Your concerns about a request for tree removal in Newnham Street have been noted and your comments have been referred to the relevant Council unit as a service request.

**Blake Street - car park**

**PSBZ.15.2 in Submission PSBZ.15 by Mrs VP Robinson**

Summary: The submitter describes a non-related issue, the disruption caused, and potential for accidents, by large truck movements in and out of a Blake Street carpark.

Relief Sought: Submitter comments referred as a service request.

**Officer recommendations**

**Partially Accept** [PSBZ.15.2]

**Reasons**: Your concerns about vehicle movements in the Blake Street carpark have been noted and your comments have been referred to the relevant Council unit as a service request.

**Footpaths - Murray Street and Queen Street**

**PSBZ.13.7 in Submission PSBZ.13 by Grey Power North Canterbury Association (Inc.)**

Summary: The submitter reports the lack of a footpath on one side of Murray Street can make it difficult for older to people to cross this street and access the bus service. The submitter also reports on the uneven nature of footpath surfaces in Queen Street.

Relief Sought: Submitter comments referred as a service request.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Officer recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partially Accept: PSBZ.13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reasons</strong>: Your concerns about footpath conditions in Murray Street have been noted and your comments have been referred to the relevant Council unit as a service request.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Blake Street - footpath**

PSBZ.15.1 in Submission PSBZ.15 by Mrs VP Robinson

**Summary**: The submitter lives on the boundary of Rangiora’s business zones and describes the lack of footpath accessibility on her side of Blake Street.

**Relief Sought**: Submitter comments referred as a service request.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Officer recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partially Accept: PSBZ.15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reasons</strong>: Your concerns about lack of footpath access in Blake Street have been noted and your comments have been referred to the relevant Council unit as a service request.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Submitter
Title: Mrs
First Name: Marilyn
Last Name: Ayers

Submission Details

We welcome your opinion on the following or any other aspect of the Policy:

1. Accessibility, safety and mobility

2. Outdoor dining -see number 3

3. Smoking outdoors This goes together with no 2. If smoking is permitted outside then non smokers are not able to dine outside. When in Europe last year my husband and I found we were eating inside on our own because of smokers in outdoor dining spaces. In Melbourne last week I noticed that the main outdoor dining areas were smoke free and smokers were forced to go to a designated area at the back.

This is about making the most of a public amenity and at a minimum the main streets and shopping areas should be smoke free. This could be from East Belt to King Street, Conway Lane and the main sports reserves.

4. Signage

5. Display of goods

6. Mobile trading

7. Buskers and commercial charitable collectors

8. Skates and skateboards Skateboards are the main detractor from an otherwise very attractive Main Street. My granddaughter and I have both almost been knocked down by skateboarders at different times. My granddaughter is so scared she hides behind me when she sees them in the distance.

I attribute the almost empty High Street after 3.15 to skateboarders. I am sure this has a negative impact on local businesses.

The people using skateboards are not all “hoons”. They are often young people unaware that footpaths are a shared amenity and are unaware of other users. Some do go out of their way to terrorise people and are rude and extremely abusive.

Other towns and cities I have been in do not appear to have this problem. Is it because they have enforced bi laws or is it because Rangiora has this culture?

I would like to see skateboards banned in High Street between East Belt and King Street and the main retail areas of the town.

9. Amenity lighting
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Submitter
Title: Mr
First Name: Daniel
Last Name: Gerber

Submission Details

We welcome your opinion on the following or any other aspect of the Policy:

1. Accessibility, safety and mobility
2. Outdoor dining
3. Smoking outdoors
4. Signage
5. Display of goods
6. Mobile trading
7. Buskers and commercial charitable collectors
8. Skates and skateboards
9. Amenity lighting

Hi,

We believe that the street lighting along Flaxton road from McDonalds to the turn off to the Transfer station is not adequate enough and should be improved.

Kind regards,

Daniel Gerber
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Submitter
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Title: Ms
First Name: Bronwyn
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The body of this submission have been uploaded from a file and the content of that file is in the following page(s)
Submission on Waimakariri District Council’s Business Zone 1 and 2 Public Places Policy 2018

To: Waimakariri District Council
    215 High Street, Rangiora

Submitter: Canterbury District Health Board

Attn: Bronwyn Larsen
Community and Public Health
C/- Canterbury District Health Board
PO Box 1475
Christchurch 8140

Proposal: Waimakariri District Council Business Zones 1 and 2 Public Places Policy Consultation
SUBMISSION ON BUSINESS ZONES 1 AND 2 PUBLIC PLACES POLICY

Details of submitter

1. Canterbury District Health Board (CDHB).

2. The submitter is responsible for promoting the reduction of adverse environmental effects on the health of people and communities and to improve, promote and protect their health pursuant to the New Zealand Public Health and Disability Act 2000 and the Health Act 1956. These statutory obligations are the responsibility of the Ministry of Health and, in the Canterbury District, are carried out under contract by Community and Public Health under Crown funding agreements on behalf of the Canterbury District Health Board.

3. The Ministry of Health requires the submitter to reduce potential health risks by such means as submissions to ensure the public health significance of potential adverse effects are adequately considered during policy development.

Details of submission

4. We welcome the opportunity to comment on the Waimakariri District Council Business Zone 1 and 2 Public Places Policy. The future health of our populations is not just reliant on hospitals, but on a responsive environment where all sectors work collaboratively.

5. While health care services are an important determinant of health, health is also influenced by a wide range of factors beyond the health sector. Health care services manage disease and trauma and are an important determinant of health outcomes. However health creation and wellbeing (overall quality of life) is influenced by a wide range of factors beyond the health sector.

6. These influences can be described as the conditions in which people are born, grow, live, work and age, and are impacted by environmental, social and behavioural factors. They are often referred to as the ‘social determinants of health’\(^1\). The diagram\(^2\) below shows how the various influences on health are complex and interlinked.

---


7. The most effective way to maximise people's wellbeing is to take these factors into account as early as possible during decision making and strategy development. Initiatives to improve health outcomes and overall quality of life must involve organisations and groups beyond the health sector, such as local government if they are to have a reasonable impact. 

General Comments

8. The CDHB commends the Waimakariri District Council on producing a draft policy that reflects the principles of universal design and takes into consideration the needs of pedestrians of all ages and abilities in designing public spaces within business zones.

9. The CDHB commends the Waimakariri District Council for acknowledging the importance of creating smokefree public spaces, and including references to the current Council Smokefree Greenspaces Policy 2012 and national Smokefree 2025 goal.

Specific comments

10. The CDHB recommends under Schedule C Smokefree Policy and Guidance, Item 2 Smokefree Outdoor Dining that reference and a link be included to the successful Fresh Air Project website (www.freshairproject.org.nz) as a resource that includes all of the relevant information to support businesses introducing smokefree outdoor dining.

Conclusion

11. Thank you for the opportunity to submit on the Business Zone 1 and 2 Public Places Policy.

Person making the submission

Dr Anna Stevenson Date: 30/07/2018
Public Health Physician

Contact details
Bronwyn Larsen
For and on behalf of Community and Public Health C/- Canterbury District Health Board PO Box 1475 Christchurch 8140
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Submitter
Company Name: Amuri Group Limited
Title: Mr
First Name: Chris
Last Name: Roberts

Submission Details

9. Amenity lighting

Hi Team

Our street of Kingsford Smith Drive does have good street lighting however the area of Flaxton Road from Lineside Road to Fernside Road does have poor or no street lighting. Over recent years business growth has occurred in this area and it would be good to see street lighting for security and safety. Cars do tend to drive faster on that stretch as there is a feeling it's more rural than the 50kph limit. When cars are travelling into the area from the south it is more evident at night.

Happy how Rangora progressing. Keep up the good work.

Regards

Chris Roberts
Public Spaces Policy Submissions
Waimakariri District Council
Private Bag 1005
Rangiora 7440

Please return your submission no later than 5pm, Monday 30 July 2018

Name: Jacqueline Park
Business or Organisation: Jamie Hobby
Email: aomchvnpk@xmcv.o.m
Primary Phone: 03 337 2114
Alternate Phone:
Postal Address: 17 Railway Rd
Town/City, Postcode: Rangiora 7440
Public Spaces within our business zones.

The Council welcomes comments on the draft Business Zones 1 and 2 Public Spaces Policy. You can view the policy and make your submission on our website waimakariri.govt.nz/public spaces or at any of our service centres or libraries, alternatively use this form, or write to us.

Any business owner, premises lessee or individual can make a written submission. We welcome both general and detailed comment. Your submission will be considered by the staff project team prior to adoption of a final policy by Council in September 2018.

Please complete the name and contact details over the page. Anonymous feedback will be considered at the Council’s discretion.

Please return your submission no later than 5pm, Monday 30 July 2018.

Key Issues

We welcome your opinion on the following items or any other aspect of the Business Zones 1 & 2 Public Spaces Policy.

1. Accessibility, safety and mobility
2. Outdoor dining
3. Smoking outdoors
4. Signage
5. Display of goods
6. Mobile trading
7. Buskers and commercial charitable collectors
8. Skates and skateboards
9. Amenity lighting

Drain outside property needs to be reduced eg new pipe & filled in to allow for more parking access.

Please attach additional pages as required.
Public Spaces within our business zones.

The Council welcomes comments on the draft Business Zones 1 and 2 Public Spaces Policy. You can view the policy and make your submission on our website waimakariri.govt.nz/public_spaces or at any of our service centres or libraries, alternatively use this form, or write to us.

Any business owner, premises lessee or individual can make a written submission. We welcome both general and detailed comment. Your submission will be considered by the staff project team prior to adoption of a final policy by Council in September 2018.

Please complete the name and contact details over the page. Anonymous feedback will be considered at the Council's discretion.

Please return your submission no later than 5pm, Monday 30 July 2018.

Key Issues

We welcome your opinion on the following items or any other aspect of the Business Zones 1 & 2 Public Spaces Policy.

1. Accessibility, safety and mobility
2. Outdoor dining
3. Smoking outdoors
4. Signage
5. Display of goods
6. Mobile trading
7. Buskers and commercial charitable collectors
8. Skates and skateboards
9. Amenity lighting

The lighting on the side of Hilton St where our property is situated is inadequate - only 2 street lights between the corner (where the roundabout is) and the fire service. We are 59 Hilton St and for security purposes it is very dark at night-time, both for property & people.

Please attach additional pages as required.
Public Spaces Policy Submissions
Waimakariri District Council
Private Bag 1005
Rangiora 7440

Please return your submission no later than 5pm, Monday 30 July 2018

Name: ____________________________________________________________

Business or Organisation: __________________________________________

Email: ___________________________________________________________

Primary Phone: ____________________________________________________

Alternate Phone: _________________________________________________

Postal Address: __________________________________________________

Town/City, Postcode: ______________________________________________

We welcome your comments, use this form or write to us:
Freepost Authority Number 1667
Waimakariri District Council
Private Bag 1005
Rangiora 7440

Email: records@wmkd.govt.nz
Phone: 0800 965 469

Or return this feedback form (no stamp required).
Public Spaces within our business zones.

The Council welcomes comments on the draft Business Zones 1 and 2 Public Spaces Policy. You can view the policy and make your submission on our website waimakariri.govt.nz/publicspaces or at any of our service centres or libraries, alternatively use this form, or write to us.

Any business owner, premises lessee or individual can make a written submission. We welcome both general and detailed comment. Your submission will be considered by the staff project team prior to adoption of a final policy by Council in September 2018.

Please complete the name and contact details over the page. Anonymous feedback will be considered at the Council's discretion.

Please return your submission no later than 5pm, Monday 30 July 2018.

Key Issues

We welcome your opinion on the following items or any other aspect of the Business Zones 1 & 2 Public Spaces Policy.

1. Accessibility, safety and mobility
2. Outdoor dining
3. Smoking outdoors
4. Signage
5. Display of goods
6. Mobile trading
7. Buskers and commercial charitable collectors
8. Skates and skateboards
9. Amenity lighting

3. Smoking Outdoors. I need policy for this as it is not appropriate for people to smoke in public places. Why not make it like the Alcohol ban in the main business area. Why should I have to breathe in other people's smoke while walking/ shopping along main High St area. When I choose for the good of my health not to smoke. Don't let the minority rule our spaces. NZ is trying to become smoke free, so why not make this a reality at least in our shopping areas & food outlets ie seats & tables on the footpath or outside a premises.

Please attach additional pages as required.
Public Spaces Policy Submissions
Waimakariri District Council
Private Bag 1005
Rangiora 7440

Please return your submission no later than 5pm, Monday 30 July 2018

Name: Melanie Ward
Business or Organisation: 
Email: melfossiward@gmail.com
Primary Phone: 03 3139939
Alternate Phone: 021 2106729
Postal Address: 60 Johns rd, Rangiora
Town/City, Postcode: Rangiora 7400
Public Spaces Policy Submissions
Waimakariri District Council
Private Bag 1005
Rangiora 7440

180725083047
POL-08-61

Please return your submission no later than 5pm, Monday 30 July 2018

Name: Doug Milne
Business or Organisation: Engineering Mt Cartelbray
Email: engineering@xero.co.nz
Primary Phone: 03 313 4748
Alternate Phone: 
Postal Address: 13 Railway Rd
Town/City, Postcode: Rangiora 7440

We welcome your comments, use this form or write to us:
Freepost Authority Number 1667
Waimakariri District Council
Private Bag 1005
Rangiora 7440
Email: records@wmk.govt.nz
Phone: 0800 965 468
Or return this feedback form (no stamp required).
Public Spaces within our business zones.

The Council welcomes comments on the draft Business Zones 1 and 2 Public Spaces Policy. You can view the policy and make your submission on our website waimakariri.govt.nz/public spaces or at any of our service centres or libraries, alternatively use this form, or write to us.

Any business owner, premises licence or individual can make a written submission. We welcome both general and detailed comment. Your submission will be considered by the staff project team prior to adoption of a final policy by Council in September 2018.

Please complete the name and contact details over the page. Anonymous feedback will be considered at the Council’s discretion.

Please return your submission no later than 5pm, Monday 30 July 2018.

Key Issues

We welcome your opinion on the following items or any other aspect of the Business Zones 1 & 2 Public Spaces Policy.

1. Accessibility, safety and mobility
2. Outdoor dining
3. Smoking outdoors
4. Signage
5. Display of goods
6. Mobile trading
7. Buskers and commercial charitable collectors
8. Skates and skateboards
9. Amenity lighting

Drain outside property needs to be re-done
New pipe + filled in to allow for more parking access.

Please attach additional pages as required.
Public Spaces Policy Submissions
Waimakariri District Council
Private Bag 1005
Rangiora 7440

Please return your submission no later than 5pm, Monday 30 July 2018

Name: EO LUSETTI
Business or Organisation: LUSETTI SEEOS
Email: info@luissetti.co.nz
Primary Phone: 03 313 7176
Alternate Phone:
Postal Address: BOX 77
Town/City, Postcode: RANGIORA

We welcome your comments, use this form or write to us:
Freepost Authority Number 1667
Waimakariri District Council
Private Bag 1005
Rangiora 7440
Email: records@wmk.govt.nz
Phone: 0800 965 468
Or return this feedback form (no stamp required).
Public Spaces within our business zones.

The Council welcomes comments on the draft Business Zones 1 and 2 Public Spaces Policy. You can view the policy and make your submission on our website waimakariri.govt.nz/public spaces or at any of our service centres or libraries, alternatively use this form, or write to us.

Any business owner, premises lessee or individual can make a written submission. We welcome both general and detailed comment. Your submission will be considered by the staff project team prior to adoption of a final policy by Council in September 2018.

Please complete the name and contact details over the page. Anonymous feedback will be considered at the Council’s discretion.

Please return your submission no later than 5pm, Monday 30 July 2018.

Key Issues

We welcome your opinion on the following items or any other aspect of the Business Zones 1 & 2 Public Spaces Policy.

1. Accessibility, safety and mobility
2. Outdoor dining
3. Smoking outdoors
4. Signage
5. Display of goods
6. Mobile trading
7. Buskers and commercial charitable collectors
8. Skates and skateboards
9. Amenity lighting

2. I would encourage outdoor dining.
3. I would ban smoking in these spaces.
4. I would discourage signage.
5. Display of goods should be restricted.
6. Acceptable providing they are licensed.
7. Buskers are ok.
8. No skates or skateboards.

Please attach additional pages as required.
Public Spaces within our business zones.

The Council welcomes comments on the draft Business Zones 1 and 2 Public Spaces Policy. You can view the policy and make your submission on our website waimakariri.govt.nz/public spaces or at any of our service centres or libraries, alternatively use this form, or write to us.

Any business owner, premises lessee or individual can make a written submission. We welcome both general and detailed comment. Your submission will be considered by the staff project team prior to adoption of a final policy by Council in September 2018.

Please complete the name and contact details over the page. Anonymous feedback will be considered at the Council’s discretion.

Please return your submission no later than 5pm, Monday 30 July 2018.

Key Issues

We welcome your opinion on the following items or any other aspect of the Business Zones 1 & 2 Public Spaces Policy.

1. Accessibility, safety and mobility
2. Outdoor dining
3. Smoking outdoors
4. Signage
5. Display of goods
6. Mobile trading
7. Buskers and commercial charitable collectors
8. Skates and skateboards
9. Amenity lighting

Key issues is the taking of parking space for silly bike lanes when all the people on bikes use the footpath and not the lanes. Perhaps before you effect business you should talk with them. Posting little notices in the “Public Notices” section just lowers your rear end.
Public Spaces Policy Submissions  
Waimakariri District Council  
Private Bag 1005  
Rangiora 7440

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Ken Wilson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business or Organisation:</td>
<td>Rangiori Equestrian Supplies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:info@rangiori.equestrian.co.nz">info@rangiori.equestrian.co.nz</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Phone:</td>
<td>312 1674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate Phone:</td>
<td>021 339 844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postal Address:</td>
<td>623 Lineside Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town/City, Postcode:</td>
<td>7440</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear Sir/Madam,

I am the occupier of 22B Newnham Street, Rangiora and wish to submit some requests and make some observations.

1. Accessibility, Safety and Mobility
   The more accessible we make our business areas the better. I consider myself lucky not to have to negotiate these areas. I have observed impaired and wheelchair bound people trying to negotiate poorly formed crossings and shop entrances thus requiring more scrutiny by council.

2. Outdoor Dining
   Providing this does not encroach on public thoroughfares, I do not have a problem. I object to council funding and providing these spaces on public land with public money.

3. Outdoor smoking
   Ban this practice in all public areas in commercial zones

4. Signage
   Local legislation already covers this area and only needs policing

5. Display of Goods
   Once again I think you already have sufficient legislation to sensibly control this.

6. Mobile Trading
   I believe your hawking by-laws adequately cover this. More needs to be done to control rogue sellers such as clean air sales (indoor), water purifiers, etc.

7. Buskers/Commercial Charitable Collectors
   Buskers should need to be permitted. Legitimate charitable collectors should also need a present permit on request.

8. Skaters and Skateboards should be banned in all business areas. The users of these devices have scant regard for other footpath users. I have observed skateboarders using the cenotaph for jumps etc. There should be penalties given to these perpetrators.

9. Controlled Lighting
   I have no problem with controlled lighting on significant buildings and gardens as they also act as a security. I think more cameras should be added to these areas and also the business areas to try to reduce vandalism and tagging.

Other Areas:
As stated previously I own and occupy 22B Newnham St. This street is extremely narrow so could you introduce no parking to the east side only and parking to the
west side only. I observe most of the parked cars on the street during the day belong to “Sicon” and “Delta”. When I built my building at 22B I was required to have designated parking. How come these council subcontractors are excluded from this rule? Also I have complained to the local police about trade service trucks being parked on the street at night unlit, contrary to your own council by-law passed in about July 1976.

Outside my property are two large black poplar trees which spread vast quantities of catkins in spring and a tremendous amount of leaves and small branches which fill my yard and street frontage and also fill my 4 client’s shed with leaves etc. They also clog my gutters which require cleaning along with waste water points which if not cleaned overflow to cause flooding in my yard. I have to spend considerable time and energy collecting and disposing of your rubbish not to mention cost of disposal at your appointed recycling plant. In the past 14 years I have made two visits to your council members with absolutely no joy in having the trees removed. In my time I recall 7 or 10 of these trees along the street, the rest having been removed mysteriously easy. The last being by the contractor “Excel” when they occupied the “Sicon” site. I would appreciate a considerate site visit by your representative. One can only imagine the damage being done to underground services as the concrete kerb is also worse for wear due to root damage from these unwanted trees.

Kind regards
Rodger F. Pearson (owner 22B Newnham Street)
Public Spaces within our business zones.

The Council welcomes comments on the draft Business Zones 1 and 2 Public Spaces Policy. You can view the policy and make your submission on our website waimakariri.govt.nz/public spaces or at any of our service centres or libraries, alternatively use this form, or write to us.

Any business owner, premises lessee or individual can make a written submission. We welcome both general and detailed comment. Your submission will be considered by the staff project team prior to adoption of a final policy by Council in September 2018.

Please complete the name and contact details over the page. Anonymous feedback will be considered at the Council’s discretion.

Please return your submission no later than 5pm, Monday 30 July 2018.

Key Issues

We welcome your opinion on the following items or any other aspect of the Business Zones 1 & 2 Public Spaces Policy.

1. Accessibility, safety and mobility
2. Outdoor dining
3. Smoking outdoors
4. Signage
5. Display of goods
6. Mobile trading
7. Buskers and commercial charitable collectors
8. Skates and skateboards
9. Amenity lighting

Please attach additional pages as required.
Public Spaces Policy Submissions
Waimakariri District Council
Private Bag 1005
Rangiora 7440

Please return your submission no later than 5pm, Monday 30 July 2018

Name: ___________________________________________

Business or Organisation: _______________________________________

Email: _______________________________________

Primary Phone: ____________________________

Alternate Phone: ____________________________

Postal Address: _______________________________________

Town/City, Postcode: ____________________________

We welcome your comments, use this form or write to us:
Freepost Authority Number 1667
Waimakariri District Council
Private Bag 1005
Rangiora 7440
Email: records@wmk.govt.nz
Phone: 0800 965 468
Or return this feedback form (no stamp required).
Submission of the Grey Power North Canterbury Association (Inc)  
To the Waimakariri District Council Health Board  
On the  
Draft Business Zone 1 & 2 Public Spaces Policy 2018

This submission was prepared by Jan Pentecost  
Secretary Grey Power North Canterbury Association (Inc)  
(On behalf of the Grey Power North Canterbury Association)
1/08/18

1. Introduction

1.1 This submission is made on behalf of the Grey Power North Canterbury Association (Inc.)

1.2 The contact is Association Secretary
Jan Pentecost
113 Stringers Road
RD 7
Rangiora 7477
Phone 03 312 9331

1.3 The Grey Power North Canterbury Association (Inc) is a non-party political advocacy organisation that aims to advance, promote and protect the welfare and well-being of older people in its region which extends from the Waimakariri River to the Conway River.

1.4 The Association has approximately 750 subscribing members and is affiliated to the Grey Power New Zealand Federation (Inc) - (membership approximately 68,000).

1.5 The North Canterbury Grey Power Association (Inc) wishes to comment on the Draft Business Zone 1 & 2 Public Spaces Policy 2018 and we thank Mike O’Connell for alerting us to the public consultation.

2. Grey Power North Canterbury’s Submission:

Lack of time before submissions were due meant that we were unable to invite Mike to attend a Grey Power North Canterbury general meeting but we did contact those members who are on our email tree. The number of respondents was not large but they made specific statements on the four policy areas as provided below which we hope will add some value to public consultation.

Policy clause 6.3 - Smoking outdoors

Smokefree environments help support the health and wellbeing of individuals, families and whānau. Smoking is not encouraged in outdoor dining areas for cafes, bars and restaurants or at public events staged within business zones.

The majority response to this issue was more in favour of banning smoking in public spaces rather than the policy statement which does not ban smoking but hopes that encouragement not to smoke will work. However, one respondent said “it was fine to smoke outside.”

Policy clause 6.4 - Signage

Signage plays an important role in conveying information to the public for businesses, customers and visitors. The Council wishes to see signage placed so as to minimise or avoid any detrimental effects. Signage placement is also regulated under the Signage Bylaw 2012.

This part of the policy did not appear to be very important to the respondents although one did comment that there were “too many footpath signs.”

Policy clause 6.7 - Buskers and commercial charitable collectors

The Council welcomes high-quality street performances to complement business activities where these are appropriate. Charitable entities are regulated under the Commercial Charity Bylaw 2017.
Only one person responded to this clause and she agreed with the first sentence by commenting that: “buskers should be encouraged to add atmosphere to main street.”

A further comment though were less favourable to the commercial charitable collectors notwithstanding the provisions of the Commercial Charity Bylaw 2017. The reasons provided were that “… not many folks carry cash these days and it feels embarrassing to have to say sorry, no cash.”

Policy clause 6.8 - Skates and skateboards
Skates and skateboards can provide adults and children with exercise and a means of transportation. Their usage in public spaces has the potential to be dangerous or cause a nuisance. The Council does not allow skates and skateboards to be used within business zones.

This issue was the foremost concern of respondents and the comments we received disclose that the policy statement, last sentence, as précised above hopefully will help alleviate that concern. We were told by members that they find skate boarders and scooters very scary because some older people cannot move out of the way quickly enough, especially at night.

3. Recommendation:
Grey Power North Canterbury therefore recommends that the draft policy as written for clauses 6.4, 6.7 and 6.8 are retained in the final document but that clause 6.3 regarding smoking in the business zone be changed to a ban rather than relying on encouragement to prevent others from suffering the ill effects of second-hand smoke.

4. Conclusion:
4.1 Grey Power North Canterbury would like to thank the Wamakariri District Council for informing us of this consultation; we really appreciate the opportunity to be involved and we look forward to reading the final policy document.

Although not really part of the consultation topic we would like to add some comments which respondents made re:

1. Pedestrian crossings on Rangiora’s main street from both a pedestrian and a car driver point of view. One said “it would be my wish that there would be traffic lights on the crossing … this is my hope that we could walk safe as the lights give the ok to walk and cars to stop.” And another commented that it is often difficult to see people on the crossings on the main street because of permanent obstructions like planters etc. and the large volume of traffic. One person believed that the area should be closed to traffic altogether.

2. The lack of a footpath on both sides of Murray Street makes it difficult for older people especially crossing the road, with a shopping trundler, to use the bus and uneven footpaths in Queen Street were mentioned.

Finally, Grey Power North Canterbury is very grateful to note that to a certain extent the policy appears to comply with relevant parts of the WHO essential age-friendly community features checklist. Especially the efforts to have the pavements free of obstructions and reserved, in the main, for pedestrians.

From respondents’ comments however, pedestrian crossings in the area do not appear to comply with the checklist because although they may be sufficient in number some of our members do not think they are safe for either drivers or pedestrians.
Hi Mike,

I've only just come up for air after the Winter Festival (as well as the businesses) and realised the deadline for submission is today.

My only concrete feedback is that as a Cafe utilising an outdoor space we recognise the benefits we get from utilising that space, but we also create a beneficial space for the residents of the town, create vibrancy, atmosphere etc and we also spend a considerable amount on creating the space - $10,000 alone on the outside umbrellas for Conway Lane for example. If we had to pay an outdoor fee of any type it would be unwelcome to put it mildly. Hospitality businesses in Rangiora are simply not profitable enough (too many of us) to absorb another compliance cost.

Yes - regulate the look, maintenance, hours, safety etc of those areas but be very careful charging us as well. We are a pretty busy Cafe but we can't afford any more fixed costs. We would simply pack up shop in terms of the outdoor area and withdraw to the cafe - which would leave the laneway without any life and frustrate customers.

Cheers
karl

---

Karl Horwarth
027 77 77 412
K.E.F. Ltd (F.O.D. Cafe)
Reality Bites Rangiora Ltd

On Thu, Jun 28, 2018 at 9:30 AM, Mike O'Connell <Mike.OConnell@wmk.govt.nz> wrote:

Hi Karl,

Thanks for your enquiry and we look forward to any submission you might make. Our consultation process is live now - https://www.waimakariri.govt.nz/ have-a-say/lets-talk/consultations/business-zones-1-and-2-public-spaces-policy - and you should receive an associated information letter by the end of this week.
Public Spaces Policy Submissions
Waimakariri District Council
Private Bag 1005
Rangiora 7440

We welcome your comments, use this form or write to us:
Waimakariri District Council
Private Bag 1005
Rangiora 7440
Email: records@wmk.govt.nz
Phone: 0800 965 468
Or return this feedback form (no stamp required).
Public Spaces within our business zones.

The Council welcomes comments on the draft Business Zones 1 and 2 Public Spaces Policy. You can view the policy and make your submission on our website waimakariri.govt.nz/public spaces or at any of our service centres or libraries, alternatively use this form, or write to us.

Any business owner, premises lessee or individual can make a written submission. We welcome both general and detailed comments. Your submission will be considered by the staff project team prior to adoption of a final policy by Council in September 2018.

Please complete the name and contact details over the page. Anonymous feedback will be considered at the Council's discretion.

Please return your submission no later than 5pm, Monday 30 July 2018.

Key Issues

We welcome your opinion on the following items or any other aspect of the Business Zones 1 & 2 Public Spaces Policy.

1. Accessibility, safety and mobility
2. Outdoor dining
3. Smoking outdoors
4. Signage
5. Display of goods
6. Mobile trading
7. Buskers and commercial charitable collectors
8. Skates and skateboards
9. Amenity lighting

We feel as homeowners whose home is valued under because of where we are, and we pay our rates as a home, not a business we are the very least deserve a footpath. The council only gave us a token when they bought the land off us.

Please attach additional pages as required.
Dear Sir,

I am writing in regards to the entry and exit into Blake St car-park. On a daily basis we have trucks exiting the car-park turning right with a 40 foot plus truck unit which is a very tight turn. Some days drivers have to have 2 or 3 attempts to turn and the other day one took over 5 mins. This is because the 1st park makes it near impossible to exit especially if the space opposite is occupied outside our house. My husband was a line-haul driver for 20+ years
driving a 40ft from Christchurch to Picton &
Christchurch to Nelson &
says this is one of the 
worst ones he has 
encountered. He says 
the only easy way he 
sees of correcting this 
is to remove the 
nearest park into the 
car park and also the 
park outside our place. 
This is so trucks can 
turn safely without having 
to back up and 
sometimes hold up traffic. 
Hoping you can remedy 
this soon before a 
bad accidents occurs.

Yours faithfully,
V. P. Robinson.
1. **SUMMARY**

1.1 This report seeks to amend previous Council decisions of membership on two upcoming hearing panels.

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180822095200.

(b) Appoints Councillor Meyer to the Unreinforced Masonry Building Hearing Panel, in the place of Councillor Gordon.

(c) Appoints Mayor Ayers to the Kaiapoi Town Centre Hearing Panel, in the place of Councillor Barnett.

3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1 At the Council meeting of 7 August 2018 the Council appointed Councillors Blackie, Doody and Gordon to the Unreinforced Masonry Building Hearing Panel. Subsequent discussions to arrange suitable hearing and deliberation meeting dates was incompatible among all the appointed members. Councillor Gordon withdrew from the panel due to other competing time commitments and had approached Councillor Meyer as an alternative.

3.2 At the Council meeting of 3 July 2018 the Council appointed Councillors Barnett, Blackie and Meyer to the Kaiapoi Town Centre Review Hearing Panel. Subsequently Councillor Barnett has withdrawn from the panel due to a conflicting appointment.

4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1. With Councillor Gordon withdrawing due to unavailability, Councillor Meyer agreed informally to be part of the Unreinforced Masonry Building Hearing Panel. Councillor Meyer confirms his availability for the meetings.
4.2. The Unreinforced Masonry Building Hearing Panel will consider submissions at its hearing from 9am to noon on Tuesday 16 October and reconvene for deliberations on Tuesday 6 November from 9am to noon. This report seeks to formalise this arrangement. The hearing panel will report back to the December Council meeting.

4.3. The Council also need to appoint another Councillor on the Kaiapoi Town Centre Review Hearing Panel as Councillor Barnett has withdrawn due to unavailability.

4.4. The Kaiapoi Town Centre Review Hearing will be conducted on Wednesday 26 September from 1pm to 8pm at Kaiapoi. The deliberation meeting will occur on Tuesday 2 October from 10am to noon in Rangiora. Subsequently the hearing panel will report back to the November Council meeting.

4.5. Mayor Ayers and Councillor Williams have informally indicated interest in being appointed to the Kaiapoi Town Centre Review Hearing Panel.

4.6. The Management Team have reviewed this report.

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. Groups and Organisations
Not applicable.

5.2. Wider Community
Public consultation on the topics is occurring, and the panels consisting of three Councillors apiece will consider all viewpoints, before making recommendations to the Council.

6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1. Financial Implications
Nil.

6.2. Community Implications
Panel members will consider all submissions with an open mind and no predetermination.

6.3. Risk Management
Nil.

6.4. Health and Safety
Nil.

7. CONTEXT

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

7.2. Legislation
Not applicable.
7.3. **Community Outcomes**

**Governance:**

- There are wide ranging opportunities for people to contribute to the decision making that effects our District
- The Council makes information about its plans and activities readily available.
- The Council takes account of the views across the community including mana whenua.
- The Council makes known its views on significant proposals by others affecting the District’s wellbeing.
- Opportunities for collaboration and partnerships are actively pursued.

7.4. **Delegations**

Delegation of the Council to appoint hearing panels.

As it was the Council that appointed the panel, any amendments must be made by the Council.

Sarah Nichols  
Governance Manager
### SUMMARY

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

**Attachments:**
1. Discharging Officer Health and Safety Duties
2. August 2018 Health and Safety Dashboard Report

**RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) Receives report No 180821094715

### BACKGROUND

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

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

### ISSUES AND OPTIONS

3.1. There are eight work-related incidents in this report, one of which is pending investigation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Occurrence</th>
<th>Event description</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23/07/2018</td>
<td>Injury</td>
<td>Neck, shoulder, head pains - after prolonged use of mobile device (tablet) in the field.</td>
<td>Ergonomic assessment has been completed by external supplier (occupational therapist/physiotherapist). Recommended equipment will be procured. Risk assessment to be held to determine any other control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Measures required for all staff using mobile devices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/07/18</td>
<td>Injury</td>
<td>Bent over to pick something up off the floor and pulled muscle in lower back. Staff member was working at reception, bent over to pick some rubbish on the floor it wasn’t heavy and pulled something in her back. Required 3 days off work after seeing the doctor and providing a medical certificate.</td>
<td>Staff member has complained of back pain previously. Prevention: Make sure she is using correct technique when picking items from the ground.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/07/18</td>
<td>Injury</td>
<td>When packing up after a Civil Defence exercise volunteer tripped while carrying two boxes and put hand out to soften the landing and fractured a small bone on the outside of the wrist. Volunteer tripped on an electrical cord reel that was sitting in the carpark beside a road cone that was one of a number used to mark out the cordoned area of Welfare shipping container.</td>
<td>The reel was deliberately placed beside the cone to reduce the chances of someone stepping on it. The cone was not illuminated by light which may have reduced the chances of volunteer seeing the reel. Volunteer was aware of the cones though. CDEMM will either ensure such resources are illuminated or surround them (the reel) with cones on both side.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/07/18</td>
<td>Injury</td>
<td>Staff member went to leave the table in Rangiora Service Centre cafeteria and had to squeeze between a staff member (in their chair) and the couch to get out. Tripped over whilst squeezing out, and landed on knees. Very narrow gap between the back of the chair at the lunchroom table (when someone is sitting in it) and the back of the sofa (over by the men’s toilet shared wall).</td>
<td>In future, ask person to move before attempting to squeeze through a gap that could be too small. Rearrange furniture in the lunchroom to avoid small gaps when tables are being used. H&amp;S and Property review suggestions for furniture move and move if felt appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/08/18</td>
<td></td>
<td>A staff member and contractor were installing equipment in valve pit. The pump station was turned off to isolate flow/pressure from the pump station, it was thought that the downstream network beyond that point was not under pressure if the pumps were isolated. A pump kicked in from Parnham Lane Pump Station that re-pressurised the line back to this station and valve pit. This resulted in staff and contractor getting sprayed with sewage. No injury. Further isolations were then completed and new fitting installed and tested. Cleaned up and went home and showered.</td>
<td>Educate Staff on the network to ensure have full understanding how network runs and can be isolated to carry out upgrade or maintenance works. Water Unit Management have notified Staff to ask relevant person if unsure of how something operates and is fully isolated. Asset team have provided schematic map of how Kaiapoi sewer operates which have then been distributed to teams.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2. In addition: The Health and Safety Team have issued 5 new procedures in Promapp. Each of the processes are designed to manage key risks which have been identified in the WDC Health and Safety Risk Register. Each of these processes has gone through consultation with a workgroup of key stakeholders – in particular staff that are trained and currently working with each of the risks. The procedures are:

3.2.1. Work with Hazardous Substances Process (new)
3.2.2. Work Safely at Height Process (new)
3.2.3. Report Incidents Process (revised)
3.2.4. Prevent Discomfort Pain and Injury (Occupational Overuse Syndrome) Process (revised)
3.2.5. Prevent Discomfort, Pain and Injury (Manual Handling) Process (revised)

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

4. COMMUNITY VIEWS

4.1. Groups and Organisations

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

4.2. Wider Community

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

5. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

5.1. Financial Implications

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

5.2. Community Implications

5.2.1. Community implications have not been included in this report as this is internal compliance reporting, relating to Health and Safety at Work.

5.3. Risk Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8/08/2018</td>
<td>Staff member fainted while lifeguarding. May have hit head on the ground.</td>
<td>Lifeguard passed out on poolside, she hadn’t had lunch before she came to work and felt faint. Contributing factors: Hadn’t eaten or have enough to drink before her shift. Make sure staff member has food before she works.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/08/2018</td>
<td>WDC staff entered the New Woodend-Pegasus Supply Main – Tree Removal active work site through the temporary fence to look at well without hard hats.</td>
<td>Pending Investigation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.3.1. Risk Management is one of the key performance requirements of a functioning Health and Safety system, therefore an updated version of the Health and Safety Register Action Plan is a key aspect of this monthly report (see Attachment 2).

5.4. Health and Safety

5.4.1. Continuous improvement, monitoring, and reporting of Health and Safety activities are a key focus of the health and safety management system. Attachment 1 indicates the health and safety monitoring and improvement activities that are in progress at WDC.

6. CONTEXT

6.1. Policy

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

6.2. Legislation

6.2.1. The key legislation is the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015.

6.2.2. The Council has a number of Human Resources policies, including those related to Health and Safety at Work.

6.2.3. The Council has an obligation under the Local Government Act to be a good employer.

6.3. Community Outcomes

6.3.1. There is a safe environment for all

The Health, Safety and Wellbeing of the organisation, its employees and volunteers ensures that Community Outcomes are delivered in a manner which is legislatively compliant and culturally aligned to our organisational principles: ta mātou mauri.

6.4. Delegations

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OFFICER DUTIES</th>
<th>EXAMPLES OF ACTIVITIES TO SUPPORT DISCHARGE OF DUTIES</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>KNOW</strong></td>
<td>• Updates on new activities/major contracts</td>
<td>Various Committee reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Council reports to include Health and Safety advice as relevant</td>
<td>Monthly, as required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Audit Committee to receive minutes of Health and Safety Committee meetings</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Update on legislation and best practice changes to Audit Committee</td>
<td>As required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNDERSTAND</strong></td>
<td>• Induction of new Council through tour of District and ongoing site visits.</td>
<td>Start of each new term and as required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• H&amp;S Risk register to Audit Committee</td>
<td>Six monthly, or where major change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Training on H&amp;S legislation and best practices updates</td>
<td>At least annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• CCO activities reported to the Audit Committee</td>
<td>At least annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RESOURCES</strong></td>
<td>• LTP or Annual Plan to have a specific report on H&amp;S resources</td>
<td>Annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reports to Committees will outline H&amp;S issues and resourcing, as appropriate</td>
<td>As required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MONITOR</strong></td>
<td>• Report to every Council meeting – standing agenda item to include Dashboard Update and any major developments</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Risk register review by Audit Committee</td>
<td>Six monthly, or where major change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMPLY</strong></td>
<td>• Programme of H&amp;S internal work received by Audit Committee</td>
<td>Annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Internal Audit reports to Audit Committee</td>
<td>As completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Incident Investigations reported Audit Committee</td>
<td>As required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Worksafe review of incidents/ accidents reported to Audit Committee</td>
<td>As required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VERIFY</strong></td>
<td>• Receive any external audit results and remedial actions (if any) reported to Audit Committee</td>
<td>Two yearly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Worksafe audits, if undertaken</td>
<td>As completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Self-assessment against Canterbury Safety Charter and/or SafePlus reported to the Audit Committee</td>
<td>As completed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Objective 1: Improve Health and Safety systems, to align with organisational objectives

**Action 1:** Re-develop Safety Management System to ensure that all Policies align with SafePlus framework (see TRIM 180315027921), and all critical risk procedures are captured in Promapp.

- **Current Progress:** Policy structure has been drafted, and re-writing of policies has commenced. Policy structure has 3 key policies: Leadership & Commitment, Risk Management and Worker Engagement. There will be several sub-policies under the ‘Risk Management’ main policy, to address critical risks (e.g. Asbestos Management, Drug and Alcohol, Driver Safety etc.)
- **Comment:** To date, the following number of health and safety procedures have been captured in Promapp:
  - Published (finalised) = 23
  - Unpublished (in progress) = 2

- Additionally, the Water Unit are using Promapp to review and rewrite their Safe Working Procedures, and have a total of 93 unpublished procedures that are being developed.

**Action 2:** Implement Promapp training module to improve the management of all Health and Safety training.

- **Current Progress:** NO UPDATE FROM LAST MONTH

- **Comment:** The Promapp training module has been purchased, and key staff (including H&S Admin and Manager) are trained in how to use the module. Awaiting IT to implement single sign-on before transferring current training data across to the Promapp Training Module. Estimated date of go-live = 1 October 2018 (dependent on go-live of single sign-on).

### Objective 2: Maintain a fit-for-purpose internal health and safety auditing system to ensure that WDC is compliant with health and safety policies, procedures and legal requirements.

**Action 3:** Review and re-develop internal health and safety auditing system, aligned with SafePlus. (see TRIM 180315027921).

- **Current Progress:** NO UPDATE FROM LAST MONTH

- **Comment:** H&S team is awaiting the SafePlus Online Self-Assessment tool from WorkSafe. This is due for finalisation and distribution mid-August 2018. From there the team will complete the following actions:
  - Assess the suitability of the tool (and determine any changes in approach – if required)
  - Confirm audit timing and approach (report to Management Team)
  - Arrange audit
  - Complete audit and submit findings to Management Team
  - Develop action plan and monitoring schedule
  - Review process and adjust if required
### Objective 3: Ensure that all contractors are managed according to health and safety procedural requirements, and improve staff knowledge of those requirements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action 4: Contractor management process improvement project (carry-over).</th>
<th>NO UPDATE FROM LAST MONTH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Deliver training to all staff once Promapp processes are complete (Oct 2018).</td>
<td>Estimated date for Contract Management training delivery = Late September / Early October (dependent on go-live of Promapp single sign-on). The Contract Management Process Improvement Group is currently working on ensuring contract management processes are completed in time for training delivery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Develop audit function based on PDU audit role.</td>
<td>In the interim, Health and Safety Manager provides a H&amp;S Contract Management overview to all new staff at their induction, and has also provided an overview of current procedures to U&amp;R, Water Unit, Greenspace and Regeneration teams at a June workshop.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Objective 4: Improve the Health and Wellbeing of staff, and create measures to ensure success.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action 5: Wellbeing strategy development and implementation project (carry-over).</th>
<th>A Wellbeing Committee has been established, the wellbeing strategy is complete, and has been submitted to Management Team for their approval in early August. Additionally, the Management Team approved:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Wellbeing calendar of events</td>
<td>- Wellbeing calendar of events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Wellbeing presence on intranet</td>
<td>- Wellbeing presence on intranet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Wellbeing branding</td>
<td>- Wellbeing branding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Wellbeing communications plan.</td>
<td>- Wellbeing communications plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Wellbeing Committee will now take ownership of the strategy, and will co-ordinate and communicate all wellbeing activities going forward.

#### LEGEND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On track</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly behind schedule (less than one month)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behind schedule (greater than one month)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the above workplan, there will be a particular focus on working with volunteers to manage their health and safety. This will include creating written agreements with high risk volunteers, and proactively engaging with all volunteers to ensure that health and safety expectations are aligned with all parties.
Incidents/Injuries – August 2018 (**as at 20th August 2018)

Aug 2017 to Current: Worker Incident Reporting

- Accident
- Near Miss
- Incident
- Property Damage
- Notifiable Injury/Illness/Incident
- Fatality
Incidents/Injuries - August 2018 (**as at 20th August 2018)

Aug 2017 to Current: Worker Incident Reporting

- Accident: 32 (56%)
- Near Miss: 13 (23%)
- Incident: 5 (9%)
- Notifiable Injury/Illness/Incident: 0 (0%)
- Property Damage: 7 (12%)
- Fatality: 0 (0%)
Aug 2017 to Current: Worker - Cause of Incident

- Fall, trip or slip: 14 (29%)
- Being hit by moving objects: 6 (13%)
- Hitting objects with part of body incl. cuts: 11 (23%)
- Biological factors: 4 (8%)
- Mental stress: 2 (4%)
- Sound or pressure: 0 (0%)
- Chemicals or other substances: 2 (4%)
- Heat, radiation or energy: 2 (4%)
Lost Time Injuries:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Injuries</th>
<th>Total Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017/18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Body stressing x2 (manual handling) (63hrs)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Falls, trips, slips x2 (231hrs)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018/19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>46.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carryover Injury – Falls, trips, slips x1 total 46.50 hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Causes of LTIs are:

LEAD INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety Inspections Completed (Workplace Walkarounds)</td>
<td>Q2 2018 16 out of 16 areas completed and submitted. Hazards raised in Tech1 for any non-compliances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Delivered</td>
<td>2017/18 People Trained: 460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Delivered</td>
<td>2018/19 People Trained: 131 (to date)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contractor Database (drawn from SiteWise Database)

CONTRACTOR PIPELINE

CONTRACTOR ASSESSMENT SCORES

Your Contractors

- Number of your preferred contractors at each stage
- Your preferred contractors avg. score: 83%

All Contractors

- Number of contractors at each stage in SiteWise
- All contractors avg. score: 70%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk rating</th>
<th>Risk type</th>
<th>Suggested Actions</th>
<th>Action Owner</th>
<th>Due date</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Contractor Health and Safety Management</td>
<td>*Train all contract managers in H&amp;S processes/requirements at time of induction.</td>
<td>Charlotte Browne</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Contractor Health and Safety Management</td>
<td>*Develop comprehensive contract administration/contract management training package to deliver to all staff managing contractors.</td>
<td>Charlotte Browne</td>
<td>30/06/2018</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Contractor Health and Safety Management</td>
<td>*Identify volunteer groups and leaseholders that engage contractors on behalf of WDC and train in contract H&amp;S management processes.</td>
<td>Managers &amp; Team Leaders</td>
<td></td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Contractor Health and Safety Management</td>
<td>*Complete development of Safety in Design procedures and embed in design processes.</td>
<td>Gerard Cleary</td>
<td></td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Vehicle Use &amp; Driver Safety</td>
<td>*Deliver driver training as per training strategy (Driver Safety / 4WD)</td>
<td>Charlotte Browne</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Vehicle Use &amp; Driver Safety</td>
<td>*Identify any drivers that require further progressive driver training on an as-needs basis and provide relevant training.</td>
<td>Managers &amp; Team Leaders</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Vehicle Use &amp; Driver Safety</td>
<td>*Provide information and training regarding use of safety equipment such as fire extinguishers in staff pool vehicles to all drivers.</td>
<td>Charlotte Browne</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Vehicle Use &amp; Driver Safety</td>
<td>*Issue reminder to staff about winter driving season (re-send Driving in Waimakariri brochure).</td>
<td>Charlotte Browne</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Volunteers conducting hazardous activities</td>
<td>*Undertake a review of operations to ensure that all activity and training is being carried out as per internal H&amp;S processes.</td>
<td>Liz Ashton</td>
<td></td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Volunteers conducting hazardous activities</td>
<td>*Develop Memorandum of Understanding with NZRT12, which will define accountabilities and expectations. May require some further operational and administrative support to implement the requirements. (TBC)</td>
<td>Liz Ashton</td>
<td></td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Adverse weather</td>
<td>*Develop protocols for response to adverse weather events (especially at night), and include in Safe Working in the Field Manual *Include in Emergency Management Plan out-of-hours deployment in adverse weather.</td>
<td>Charlotte Browne, Kelly La Valley, Kalley Simpson, Chris Brown, Joanne McBride</td>
<td>31/07/2018</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Risk Area</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Responsible Person(s)</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Adverse weather</td>
<td>*Create pre-prepared briefing/toolbox talk for all field staff - regarding specific hazards of an extreme weather event, and the required control measures. Briefing prior to deployment.</td>
<td>Gerard Cleary</td>
<td>31/07/2018</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Adverse weather</td>
<td>*Investigate use of monitoring and tracking systems for all field staff for use in extreme weather events.</td>
<td>Charlotte Browne</td>
<td>30/06/2018</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Adverse weather</td>
<td>*Extend vehicle GPS tracking monitoring capability to the managers of all field staff.</td>
<td>Jill Brightwell/Liz Ashton</td>
<td>30/06/2018</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Airfield operations</td>
<td>*Develop of Airfield Safety Committee and appointment of Airfield Safety Co-ordinator to administer all actions from safety review.</td>
<td>Craig Sargison</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Airfield operations</td>
<td>*Develop of Airfield Operations Manual, and adoption of the manual by Council as the key safety document for the Airfield operations.</td>
<td>Craig Sargison</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Airfield operations</td>
<td>*Provide regular Airfield Operations report to Council</td>
<td>Craig Sargison</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Actions in blue bold are new (since the most recent Risk Register review).*
1. **SUMMARY**

1.1 This report is to seek approval from Council to limit acceptance of expanded polystyrene and other low-density materials to "domestic quantities" as from 8 September 2018.

1.2 Council has been advised by Transwaste that they are increasing the landfill gate charge for expanded polystyrene (EPS) to $5,800.00 per tonne (excluding GST) as from 10 September. Our current gate charge is $1,556.52 per tonne (excluding GST).

1.3 Staff consider that there is a risk that commercial loads of EPS will be brought to Southbrook resource recovery park for disposal as a result of the increased landfill charges. Southbrook is not configured to process commercial quantities of EPS, and the Council would not receive sufficient income through the current gate fee to cover the additional costs for processing, transporting and disposing of this material.

1.4 In order to reduce the risks to Council from an influx of commercial loads of EPS coming into Southbrook RRP, staff recommend that Council limits acceptance of this material to "domestic” quantities, i.e. a low-sided trailer load or up to 40kg, as from 8 September.

**Attachments:**

i. Letter from Transwaste dated 27/07/18 Updated EPS Disposal Price (Trim 180730084783)

ii. Letter from Transwaste dated 18/05/18 Updated Disposal Price 18/19 (Trim 180524057585)

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Solid & Hazardous Waste Working Party recommends:

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180802086601.

(b) **Approves** limiting acceptance at Southbrook resource recovery park of low density materials such as expanded polystyrene to a “domestic load” which is equivalent to a standard trailer holding up to a volume of 1.7m$^3$ or up to a maximum weight of 40kg as from 8 September 2018.

(c) **Notes** that changing a gate fee after the fee has been adopted through the Long Term Plan process would require Council to undertake some form of consultation which would delay the implementation of such an increase.
(d) **Notes** that expanded polystyrene is not accepted separately at Oxford transfer station and that general waste is charged by volume at this site.

(e) **Notes** that staff will bring a report to Council in October to request approval of changes to the Terms and Conditions of the Solid Waste and Waste Handling Licensing Bylaw 2016, and that maximum limits on acceptance of low density materials will be included in those proposed changes.

3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1. Transwaste is a joint venture company owned by six of the Canterbury region’s territorial authorities (“the Territorial Authorities”) and Canterbury Waste Services Limited. All members of the joint venture company are party to a memorandum of understanding dated 3 September 1998 (“the Memorandum of Understanding”).

3.2. The parties to the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) agreed that Transwaste would uplift, transport and dispose of waste on behalf of the Territorial Authorities and other refuse transfer station operators in the Canterbury region.

3.3. In accordance with the MoU, and in consultation with the Territorial Authorities, Transwaste prepared the Agreement to record the terms and condition upon which Transwaste uplifts, transports and disposes of waste on behalf of the territorial authorities or any other refuse transfer station operator.

3.4. All refuse transfer station operators intending to take waste to Kate Valley, including private operators, are covered by the Waste Receipt Agreement. The wording of the document was therefore standardised (apart from the schedules) to ensure that there is no possibility of disadvantaging different parties. The wording was debated at length, and the Canterbury Waste Sub Committee approved the document.

3.5. Subsequently to the original MoU, Transwaste were required under legislation to apply a $10/tonne levy to all waste sent to landfill, which is then paid to the Ministry for the Environment. This levy is charged monthly by TCL, however has not been included in the contract costs.

3.6. Transwaste provide an indicative transportation and disposal price to partner Councils at their Annual General Meeting to allow the Councils to include these costs in their annual budgets. The prices are then confirmed in May which enables Councils to adjust their budgets and gate-charges prior to Council adopting these as part of the Annual Plan or Long Term Plan.

3.7. On 18 May 2018, we received a letter from Transwaste confirming the general waste disposal charges and the transportation charges for the 18/19 financial year, which differed slightly but not significantly from those figures indicated at their 2017 AGM. This letter is appended as Attachment ii. Transwaste stated in this letter “We also wish to advise you that the disposal rate for expanded polystyrene is subject to further review due to the extremely high costs of handling this material and the low rates of compaction achievable. Any further resultant increase in disposal rates for this material will be advised to customers on completion of that review.”

3.1 On 27 July 2018 we received a letter from Transwaste advising us that the disposal charge for expanded polystyrene (EPS) would be increased from $1,222.75 to $5,800.00 per tonne (excluding GST), which is appended as Attachment i. The price increase will apply from 10 September 2018. The penalty figure for breaching the trigger levels of EPS in a general waste container (“undeclared expanded polystyrene in general waste”) remains at $500 per load (excluding GST).
3.2 Transwaste have explained that they have been getting an increased number of enquiries for the disposal of commercial volumes of low density materials such as expanded polystyrene, including EPS insulation materials. The new disposal rate is calculated based on the actual volume of airspace consumed by these materials.

3.3 Our gate charge at Southbrook resource recovery park (RRP) for non-recyclable polystyrene is set at $1,790.00 per tonne including GST ($1,556.52 excluding GST) which was sufficient to recover the original price but not the increased charge.

3.4 There is currently no upper limit set on acceptance of EPS, whether recyclable or non-recyclable, by weight at Southbrook RRP. We do specify acceptance of “domestic quantities” of specified materials such as tyres and hazardous wastes. Tyres are limited to up to 5 car or 4WD tyres, or 1 to two larger tyres; household hazardous waste, including used car oil, is limited to up to 20kg or 20 litres of any one waste type.

4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1. We have only once received a commercial truck and trailer load of EPS from a local contactor, who was undertaking demolition work. The material was accepted, and was stored on-site and mixed gradually with the general waste stream as it was fed into the compactor over a period of several days. Should this become a common occurrence there would be insufficient space available for storage of the EPS, and insufficient heavier material in which to mix the low density material to improve transportation efficiencies.

4.2. The smaller amounts of non-recyclable EPS that we receive currently can readily be included in the general waste stream, and these do not trigger the penalty levels set by Transwaste as mentioned in 3.1. The higher charges for EPS would most likely apply for loads containing 100% of that material, but may be applied to containers with a high percentage of EPS mixed with the general waste. This will have to be clarified with Transwaste, and will be followed up through the Canterbury Regional Landfill Joint Committee.

4.3. The Council set its gate charges for the 18/19 year when it adopted the Long Term Plan in June 2018, and cannot now make any changes until the next Annual Plan budget and consultation round, unless it undertakes some form of consultation “to give due consideration to the views and preferences of persons likely to be affected by the matter”. It would take a minimum of two months to complete any consultation and for a higher gate charge to be approved by Council. The timeframe would be significantly greater, should the Council need to undertake a SCP.

4.4. Transfer stations in Christchurch may increase their gate charges to recover this increased cost for disposal of expanded polystyrene and other low-density materials. Commercial companies may seek cheaper disposal alternatives than carting their EPS into those Christchurch facilities or direct to Kate Valley. The Waimakariri District Council is therefore now at risk of receiving large quantities of this material as a result of ‘waste flight’.

4.5. The impacts of commercial quantities of expanded polystyrene coming in to Southbrook RRP would be considerable. The site is not set up for processing large quantities of EPS through the refuse pit, and we would be unable to achieve the desired compaction rates to maximise tonnage for transportation to the landfill. EPS causes considerable ‘litter’ issues when broken up, which would cause problems with neighbours and in the wider environment. Finally the current gate charge is insufficient to recover the higher costs of handling, transporting and disposing of large quantities of this material.

4.6. Staff consider that we have four options to deal with this situation.
4.7. **Option 1: Do Nothing.** There is a possibility that we would not receive commercial loads of EPS or other low density materials, but the outcomes mean that is the highest risk approach for the Council as outlined in 4.4 and 6.3. We don’t want to be in a position where we seem to encourage large volumes of this material to come to the site, therefore staff consider we cannot “do nothing” in this situation. **Option 1 is not recommended.**

4.8. **Option 2: Limit acceptance criteria of low density materials when the amended Solid Waste and Waste Handling Licensing Bylaw 2016 Terms & Conditions are adopted in October 2018.** Staff propose to take the amended bylaw Terms & Conditions to the Solid & Hazardous Waste Working Party in September, and from there to the Council for adoption on 2 October 2018.

The Terms and Conditions will include the changes necessary to manage the new kerbside collection bin services, and would formalise the Council’s position around only accepting domestic quantities of low density materials such as expended polystyrene. We would propose to include an upper limit for acceptance of EPS and other low density materials up to 1.7m3 and 40kg.

Option 2 would still put the Council at risk for a one-month period, and the potential mess both on-site and off-site as well as unbudgeted costs would adversely impact on the Council in a number of ways. **This option is less favoured than Option 3.**

4.9. **Option 3: Limit acceptance criteria of low density materials as from 8 September. This is the preferred option.** The Council could approve an upper limit for acceptance of EPS and other low density materials up to 1.7m3 and 40kg as from 8 September 2018. This date would allow for the change in acceptance criteria to be advertised in local papers after the Council meeting, and would mean the limit would be in place when the increased landfill charges come into effect on 10 September.

The amended bylaw Terms and Conditions will come to the Council for adoption on 2 October 2018, as per Option 2. The Terms and Conditions will include the changes necessary to manage the new kerbside collection bin services, and would formalise the Council’s position around only accepting domestic quantities of low density materials such as expended polystyrene.

4.10. **Option 4: Increase the gate charge for expanded polystyrene.** The Council set its gate charges for the 18/19 year when it adopted the Long Term Plan in June 2018. We are not in the position to increase the gate charges unless Council first undertakes some form of consultation, as required in the Local Government Act. At best, this would delay an increase to the gate charge by at least two months, or, if it is deemed more appropriate to undertake a special consultative procedure (SCP), the delay could be by up to four months.

As outlined in 4.5 and 6.3, the Southbrook RRP is not set up for processing commercial quantities of EPS, therefore we don’t want to be in a position where commercial loads are brought in to Southbrook RRP for disposal. An increased charge would also impact on customers who bring in smaller loads of EPS, and may result in a higher incidence of inappropriate disposal of this material. **Option 4 is not recommended.**

4.11. **Staff therefore recommend that Council approves Option 3 to limit the acceptance criteria of low density materials to a maximum of 1.7m3 and 40kg as from 8 September 2018.**

4.12. **The Management Team have reviewed this report and support the recommendations.**
5. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

5.1. **Groups and Organisations**

The gate charges were included in the Long Term Plan consultation, and we received no submissions about these.

5.2. **Wider Community**

The gate charges were included in the Long Term Plan consultation, and we received no submissions about these. This issue has only just arisen and we have not sought feedback from the wider community.

6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**

It is difficult to enumerate the additional operational costs that would be incurred if a large number of commercial loads (trucks or truck & trailer units) of EPS were to be disposed of at the site.

In order to avoid the higher charges, including the penalty charge of $500 per container load, the EPS would have to be stored on-site and gradually added to the general waste as it is fed into the compactor to keep below the specified limit. There is limited space on the site for storage of this material, and it would need to be contained to prevent the wind from uplifting the EPS and there are potential additional costs associated with storage of this material. It would take several days to load a single truck and trailer load of EPS into waste containers.

The table below shows the expected loss to Council if a 6m³ load of EPS was sent to landfill and attracted the penalty charge for excessive polystyrene, and the loss to Council of a full 30m³ load of EPS were to be sent to landfill. Weights are based on a density of 25kg/m³. The transportation cost for the 6m³ load is based on the percentage of volume taken up in one container.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volume (truck)</th>
<th>Weight of EPS</th>
<th>Income (excl.)</th>
<th>Transport cost</th>
<th>Charge at landfill</th>
<th>Total cost (excl.)</th>
<th>Loss income-cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6m³ load</td>
<td>150kg</td>
<td>$234</td>
<td>$57</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$557</td>
<td>($323)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30m³</td>
<td>750kg</td>
<td>$1,167</td>
<td>$283</td>
<td>$4,350</td>
<td>$4,633</td>
<td>($3,466)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While this is not excessive, a continuing high volume of EPS that is subsequently sent to landfill through Southbrook could result in a substantial loss to the Disposal Account.

6.2. **Community Implications**

EPS causes considerable ‘litter’ issues when broken up, and the light material is easily spread by wind out of the site, which would cause a nuisance issue to neighbours and the general public. Service to customers may be affected with staff put under pressure to manage the polystyrene and less space available in the pit for general waste.

The largest source of EPS from demolitions will be from Christchurch, not from the local community. All companies that carry out demolition work and that need to dispose of low-density materials such as ESP will face a level playing field in relation to disposal costs.
6.3. **Risk Management**

The site and compactor are not set up for processing large quantities of EPS through the refuse pit. Handling, storage and processing this waste material would incur extra costs and potentially impact on our service to other customers. It would also add to the risks of contamination of the kerbside recycling, which is processed through the refuse pit area and compactor.

Wind-blown EPS entering the "clean" stormwater system would breach our discharge consent with Environment Canterbury.

Small pieces of EPS would be washed from the pit into the site’s "contaminated" water drainage system from the rubbish pit. This system discharges into the Council's wastewater pump station, and is pumped to the Rangiora wastewater treatment plant. Polystyrene will cause issues in the site’s wastewater system as the beads tend to cling to the probes that indicate water levels in the pump stations: this interferes with the level-controls and an increased level of maintenance would be necessary to manage this. Large volumes of polystyrene beads have the potential cause problems at the wastewater treatment plant if they are not removed through the initial screening process.

We would be unable to achieve the desired compaction rates to maximise tonnage for transportation to the landfill, which would increase per-tonne transport costs to Kate Valley.

The current gate charge is insufficient to recover the higher costs of handling, transporting and disposing of this material, therefore we will not receive sufficient funding from gate fees to cover these increased costs.

Increasing our gate charges for all EPS could cause unintended consequences, such as inappropriate disposal of these materials.

These risks can be best managed by limiting accepting of EPS at the site to smaller, more easily managed loads, and barring acceptance of commercial quantities.

There is a risk that a larger load than the specified 40kg of EPS is brought to the site and allowed to be disposed of. This risk can be minimised by staff at the weighbridge being aware what the maximum acceptable volume looks like (e.g. a standard 'Briford'-style trailer loaded to the tops of the trailer sides) and advising any customer with larger loads that we cannot accept that quantity of EPS.

There is a risk that a larger load than the specified 40kg of EPS is brought to the site and is rejected, and the Council and contractor receives poor feedback from the customer. This is best managed through publically advising of the changed acceptance criteria and the reasons for the change through the usual media processes (including social media), through signage at Southbrook RRP kiosk and letters handed out to customers, once the upper limit has been approved by Council.

The weighbridge weighs in bands of 10kg, therefore there is a risk that a load of 44kg may be weighed in as 40kg. The effects of a slight under-charge is minor, and is generally compensated for by the usual overs and unders of weighbridge rounding.

6.4. **Health and Safety**

There are no direct Health & Safety risks from handling EPS. There would be more pressure on the site’s operators to ensure the general waste containers do not contain too much polystyrene and also to keep the site and surrounding areas clear of wind-blown EPS, which could affect staff wellbeing.
7. **CONTEXT**

7.1. **Policy**

This matter is not a matter of significance in terms of the Council's Significance and Engagement Policy. A change in gate charges may trigger the need to undertake a Special Consultative Procedure, which would raise this matter into a matter of significance in terms of the Council's Significance and Engagement Policy.

7.2. **Legislation**

Local Government Act 2002

S78: Requires local authorities to give due consideration to the views and preferences of persons likely to be affected by, or to have an interest in, the matter.

S79: Outlines the responsibility of local authorities to achieve compliance with (S77 and) S78 that is largely in proportion to the significance of the matters affected by the decision.

Waste Minimisation Act 2008

S42: Requires territorial authorities to promote effective and efficient waste management and minimisation within their districts.

7.3. **Community Outcomes**

**k. Core utility services are provided in a timely and sustainable manner**

- Council sewerage and water supply schemes, and drainage and waste collection services are provided to a high standard. ¹,⁴
- Waste recycling and re-use of solid waste is encouraged and residues are managed so that they minimise harm to the environment. ¹,³,⁴

7.4. **Delegations**

Council has delegated authority to set acceptance criteria at Council-owned sites.

Kitty Waghorn
Solid Waste Asset Manager
27 July 2018

Kitty Waghorn
Waimakariri District Council
Private Bag 1005
Rangiora 7440

By email: kitty.waghorn@wmk.govt.nz

Dear Kitty

Updated 2018/2019 Waste Disposal Charge for Expanded Polystyrene

We refer to our letter dated 18 May 2018 outlining the waste disposal charges for the year commencing 1 July 2018. In that letter we noted that, whilst the rate for expanded polystyrene had been updated in line with other disposal rates, it would be subject to a separate review process to determine if the charges should be further updated.

We have now completed a comprehensive review of the actual costs to dispose of expanded polystyrene and similarly low density materials at landfill. That review has resulted in the Transwaste Board approving a significant increase in the disposal costs for these materials to a maximum rate of $5,800 (excluding GST) per tonne.

The review was undertaken following an increase in the number of enquiries for the disposal of commercial volumes of both expanded polystyrene, and for another waste stream that has become more prevalent in recent times – expanded foam insulation materials (those injected into building wall cavities).

The new disposal rate has been calculated on the real (actual) volume of airspace consumed by the material, and derived by direct comparison to the charges currently levied for equivalent airspace of special waste.

The review was based on the average density of typical expanded polystyrene (25kg/m3), resulting in the updated charge of $5,600 per tonne. As the disposal rate for these lightweight materials is based on relative density, which can vary between materials, a sliding scale has been developed based on actual density of the particular waste being disposed of. Please contact the landfill (0800 66 44 33) to discuss the method to apply in these instances.

As required under the waste receipt agreement, the updated charge will apply from Monday 10 September 2018.

All other charges remain as advised for the year commencing 1 July 2018. An updated copy of the landfill charges schedule is attached.
Should you have any queries on the above, please contact Rangi Lord at Canterbury Waste Services in the first instance (phone 03 314 6917).

Yours faithfully

TRANSWASTE CANTERBURY LIMITED

Gill Cox
Chairman

Attachment: Transwaste Canterbury Ltd Kate Valley Landfill Charges for 1 July 2018 to 30 June 2019 (27 July 2018 version)
## Transwaste Canterbury Limited

**Kate Valley Landfill Charges**
*(including NZ Waste Levy at $10/tonne but exclusive of GST)*

1 July 2018 to 30 June 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Waste Disposal Charge for Containerised Transfer Station Waste</th>
<th>General Waste Disposal Charge ($/tonne)</th>
<th>$112.03</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Waste Disposal Charge for Expanded Polystyrene</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded polystyrene and Expanding Foam loads ($/tonne)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB. Rates for composite lightweight wastes by negotiation based on actual density – contact landfill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Charges for Non-Compliant Waste in General Waste</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car Tyres (each)</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck Tyres (each)</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPG and other Gas Cylinders (per cylinder)</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing Nets (each, greater than 20 square metres)</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wire Rope (each, greater than 100kg)</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empty sealed Drums (each, greater than 20 litres capacity)</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Waste material (greater than 5% by volume in General Waste)</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undeclared expanded polystyrene in general waste (per container)</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Special Waste Disposal Charges</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Waste Permit Application Fee (per Permit for each type of waste)</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Containerised Special Waste that does not require special handling</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Load size (tonnes)</td>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>10+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disposal Charge ($/tonne)</td>
<td>$187.05</td>
<td>$136.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Containerised Special Waste that requires special handling and disposal area</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Load size (tonnes)</td>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>10+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disposal Charge ($/tonne)</td>
<td>$312.00</td>
<td>$161.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other Charges**

| Additional charge for certified placement | $139.15 per load (any size) |

**Waste that is not containerised or has exceptional circumstances**
Charge to be determined upon application based on the specific site management requirements of the non-standard load

**Beneficial Waste**
Charges for waste that has a beneficial reuse capability at the Landfill will be determined on a case by case basis

**Waste testing costs**
Actual cost of testing samples will be recovered from the Permit Holder

Transwaste Centerbury Limited
27 July 2018
18 May 2018

Waimakariri District Council
Private Bag 1005
Rangiora 7440

Attention: K Waghorn

Dear Kitty

2018/2019 Waste Disposal and Transport Charges

We wrote on 4 December 2017 advising you of the indicative Transwaste waste disposal and transport charges for the year commencing 1 July 2018.

At the time of providing indicative pricing, it was estimated that disposal charges for general waste would increase to $111.88 per tonne (including waste levy but excluding GST). Special waste disposal charges were estimated to increase in line with general waste disposal charges.

As is normal practice in May of each year Transwaste has now reviewed this indicative pricing. Taking into account anticipated volumes of waste requiring disposal at Kate Valley landfill for the year ahead, the likely operating costs for that year, and the impact of costs of the Emissions Trading Scheme (ETS), Transwaste wishes to update the charges to be applied for the year commencing 1 July 2018.

Waste Disposal Charges

The waste disposal charge for general waste for the year commencing 1 July 2018 will be $112.03 per tonne, compared to the current price of $109.55 per tonne, an increase of $2.48 or 2.3%. This is an increase of $0.15 per tonne over the charge signalled in the indicative pricing advice provided to you in early December 2017.

The increase of $2.48 per tonne comprises:
- Increased costs of landfill operations $1.74
- Recovery of increased ETS costs $0.74

Increased costs of Landfill operations

We note that the increase of $1.74 in the cost of landfill operations is less than the level of increase that would be supported by the Transwaste customised index for landfill operations produced by Statistics New Zealand being applied to the 2017/18 charges currently in force.

Emissions Trading Scheme costs

Transwaste is exposed to the uncertainties of costs to comply with the Emissions Trading Scheme (ETS). ETS has applied to the waste sector since 1 January 2013, and the assessment of the landfill’s liability is assessed retrospectively by calendar year, which means actual costs are unknown when prices are set.
Transwaste has undertaken to only recover actual ETS costs from customers over time, which, due to the uncertainties in actual costs when prices are set, means that adjustments will be made to prices from year to year to deliver on this undertaking. Through a combination of recent significant increases in the purchase cost of carbon units and the phased removal by Government of concessions from 1 January 2017, the ETS component of the landfill disposal charge is increasing to levels more in line with those expected when the ETS was introduced.

The 2018/19 price increase includes $0.74 per tonne relating to the recovery of the estimated increase in ETS costs.

In summary the disposal charges for General Waste applicable to your organisation for the year commencing 1 July 2018 (compared with the current rate for 1 July 2017 to 30 June 2018) are as set out below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Waste Disposal Charges (In terms of Clause 10.1 of the Waste Receipt Agreement)</th>
<th>2017/2018 (including NZ Waste Levy but exclusive of GST) per tonne</th>
<th>2018/2019 (including NZ Waste Levy but exclusive of GST) per tonne</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waste disposal charge for containerised Transfer Station Waste</td>
<td>$109.55</td>
<td>$112.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The attached schedule details the charges for waste disposal and other related charges applicable for the period 1 July 2018 to 30 June 2019. We also wish to advise that the disposal rate for expanded polystyrene is subject to further review due to the extremely high costs of handling this material and the low rates of compaction achievable. Any further resultant increase in disposal rates for this material will be advised to customers on completion of that review.

2018/2019 Transport Charges

In common with the landfill disposal operations and as signalled in May last year, there are now ongoing cost pressures on transport operations. After two successive years of decreasing transport charges, the increased costs for transport as measured by the transport index specifically developed for Transwaste by Statistics New Zealand supports an increase of 3.2% in transport charges over the transport charges in force for the 2017/18 year.

We note that while there has been a trend of strong fuel price increases since the 31 March 2018 cut-off date for the pricing index, unless there is an extraordinary increase in the index over the ensuing months it is anticipated that transport charges will remain as advised in this letter for the ensuing year.

As Transwaste is not a participant in the ETS for transport activity there is no ETS adjustment required in respect of transport charges.

In summary the transport charges applicable to your organisation for the year commencing 1 July 2018 (compared with the current rate for 1 July 2017 to 30 June 2018) are as set out below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transport Charges for Containerised Transfer Station Waste to Kate Valley Landfill</th>
<th>2017/2018 (excluding GST) charge per trip</th>
<th>2018/2019 (excluding GST) charge per trip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transport charge from Southbrook (47 tonnes maximum load)</td>
<td>$547.70</td>
<td>$565.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Should you have any queries on the above, please contact Rangi Lord at Canterbury Waste Services in the first instance (phone 03 314 6917).

Yours faithfully

TRANSWASTE CANTERBURY LIMITED

Gill Cox
Chairman

Attachment: Transwaste Canterbury Ltd Kate Valley Landfill Charges for 1 July 2018 to 30 June 2019
## Transwaste Canterbury Limited

Kate Valley Landfill Charges  
(including NZ Waste Levy at $10/tonne but exclusive of GST)  
1 July 2018 to 30 June 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Waste Disposal Charge for Containerised Transfer Station Waste</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Waste Disposal Charge ($/tonne)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Waste Disposal Charge for Expanded Polystyrene</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expanded polystyrene loads ($/tonne)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Charges for Non-Compliant Waste in General Waste</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Car Tyres (each)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck Tyres (each)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPG and other Gas Cylinders (per cylinder)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing Nets (each, greater than 20 square metres)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wire Rope (each, greater than 100kg)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empty sealed Drums (each, greater than 20 litres capacity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Waste material (greater than 5% by volume in General Waste)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undeclared expanded polystyrene in general waste (per container)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special Waste Disposal Charges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special Waste Permit Application Fee (per Permit for each type of waste)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Containerised Special Waste that does not require special handling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Load size (tonnes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disposal Charge ($/tonne)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Containerised Special Waste that requires special handling and disposal area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Load size (tonnes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disposal Charge ($/tonne)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Charges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Additional charge for certified placement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Waste that is not containerised or has exceptional circumstances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charge to be determined upon application based on the specific site management requirements of the non-standard load</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beneficial Waste</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charges for waste that has a beneficial reuse capability at the Landfill will be determined on a case by case basis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Waste testing costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual cost of testing samples will be recovered from the Permit Holder</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. SUMMARY

1.1. This report informs the Council of the 2017/2018 annual dog control report that the Council is required to submit to Department of Internal Affairs (DIA). Pursuant to Section 10A Dog Control Act 1996 (The Act), reports from territorial authorities must be submitted to the Department of Internal Affairs (DIA) on an annual basis. These inform the DIA of the number of dogs registered, the number declared dangerous or menacing, and the number and nature of dog complaints received for each fiscal year. In summary for year ending 30 June 2018:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016/17</th>
<th>2017/18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The number of registered dogs</td>
<td>12030</td>
<td>12214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of registered owners</td>
<td>7762</td>
<td>8010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dangerous dogs</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menacing dogs</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaints</td>
<td>2309</td>
<td>2077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infringements issued</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.2. If the annual report is accepted by the Council, a copy will be submitted to the DIA. The statistics contained within the report will also be publicly notified.

Attachments:
(i) 2017–2018 Annual Report on Dog Control to DIA – Trim: 180704074143

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the District Planning and Regulation Committee recommends:

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180704074535.
(b) Approves the attached 2017/2018 Annual Report on Dog Control to the Department of Internal Affairs.
(c) Circulates a copy of this report to the Boards.
3. BACKGROUND

3.1 The DIA collates reports from Territorial Authorities on an annual basis. This enables the Department to maintain nationwide records and statistics in relation to dogs, dog numbers, the numbers of menacing and dangerous dogs, along with the number and type of complaints received by Councils in relation to dogs.

4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

4.1. This report is a statutory requirement under Section 10A Dog Control Act 1996. The report informs the community of a summary of dog statistics for the District. Section 4.2 of this report outlines the information required. The Committee has the option of approving the proposed annual report as fulfilling the requirement of the Act. If the Committee approves the annual report, the report will be forwarded to DIA and the information contained therein, will be publicly notified. No other action is required.

4.2. Section 10A of the Act is prescriptive and lists the matters on which the Council is to report. The following is an explanation of the requirements with previous year numbers in (brackets).

**Registered Dogs: 12214 (12030)**
This is the number of dogs registered with Waimakariri District Council for the 2017-2018 year. 8135 of the dogs are desexed and of the 12214 registered dogs there are 1076 working dogs.

**Registered Owners: 8010 (7762)**
**Probationary Owners: 0 (0)**
This classification enables the Council to place restrictions on an owner, such as barring ownership of a dog for a set period and to undergo suitable training. The probationary classification enables the Council to monitor compliance and dog control.

**Dangerous Dogs: 10 (14)**
These are animals deemed by the Council to be dangerous. They are classified because they have behaved aggressively to people and/or animals. A key criterion for this classification is that witnesses have made formal statements concerning the behaviour observed. Dangerous dogs are required to be de-sexed, as well as restrained and muzzled when in public. An owner can appeal a classification and the matter would be considered by the Council's Hearing Committee.

**Menacing Dogs: 60 (61)**
This classification has less restriction on the owner than the dangerous dog classification. Dogs can be classified as menacing if the Council considers they are a threat to people and/or stock or they are registered as a particular breed that Parliament has deemed to be menacing. These breeds include the American Pit Bull terrier, Brazilian Fila, Dogo Argentino and Japanese Tosa. Menacing dogs are also required to be desexed, restrained and muzzled in public.

**Complaints: 2077 (2309)**
These are grouped into complaint type and are managed by Council Animal Management staff during the week or through our after-hours contractors for complaints made after-hours.
Infringement Notices: 115 (86)

Infringements are issued for offences related to nuisances such as a dog not being under control or for having an unregistered dog. Seeking compliance is the primary focus followed by warnings. Infringements occur when owners continually fail to heed warnings.

Prosecutions: 1 (0).

One person was prosecuted, charged with an offence against Section 57 Dog Control Act 1996, in relation to a dog attack in the Good Street Reserve (Rangiora) in November 2017 where a 6 year old girl was bitten by the man’s dog. The child required surgery as a result of the attack. The defendant plead guilty and the Court decided that rather than fine the person, he was ordered to pay $500 to the victim.

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

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. Groups and Organisations: This report is a statutory requirement of the Council intended by the Act to provide a summary of dog control statistics to the public and the Department of Internal Affairs. The information is collected district-wide and is not broken down into wards. No comment or action is required.

5.2. Wider Community: As above.

6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1. Financial Implications: Dog Control is funded entirely by dog registration and licensing fees.

6.2. Community Implications: The Council employs three fulltime Animal Control Officers and a .3FTE animal shelter attendant/administration officer. This enables the Animal Control Unit to maintain levels of service in line with the district’s growing population. It has also increased registration compliance through providing adequate resources to follow up on unregistered dogs.

6.3. Risk Management: No policy development or animal control operational work is dependent on this report.

6.4. Health and Safety: This report has no impact on health and safety.

7. CONTEXT

7.1. Policy

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

7.2. Legislation

Section 10A Dog Control Act 1996, sets out the criteria that must be included in the report:

10A  Territorial authority must report on dog control policy and practices—

(1) A territorial authority must, in respect of each financial year, report on the administration of

(a) its dog control policy adopted under section 10; and

(b) its dog control practices.
(2) The report must include, in respect of each financial year, information relating to—
(a) the number of registered dogs in the territorial authority district:
(b) the number of probationary owners and disqualified owners in the territorial authority district:
(c) the number of dogs in the territorial authority district classified as dangerous under section 31 and the relevant provision under which the classification is made:
(d) the number of dogs in the territorial authority district classified as menacing under section 33A or section 33C and the relevant provision under which the classification is made:
(e) the number of infringement notices issued by the territorial authority:
(f) the number of dog related complaints received by the territorial authority in the previous year and the nature of those complaints:
(g) the number of prosecutions taken by the territorial authority under this Act.

(3) The territorial authority must give public notice of the report—
(a) by means of a notice published in—
   (i) 1 or more daily newspapers circulating in the territorial authority district; or
   (ii) 1 or more other newspapers that have at least an equivalent circulation in that district to the daily newspapers circulating in that district; and
(b) by any means that the territorial authority thinks desirable in the circumstances.

(4) The territorial authority must also, within 1 month after adopting the report, send a copy of the report to the Secretary for Local Government.

7.3. Community Outcomes

There is a safe environment for all
Harm to people from natural and man-made hazards is minimised.

7.4. Delegations

Delegation S-DM 1026:

The District Planning and Regulation Committee shall enjoy all the powers granted to a standing committee under this Manual and shall be responsible for determining policy within the following general jurisdiction:

- Dog registration and control
In accordance with the Dog Control Act 1996, Section 10A, the following is a copy of the annual report for Waimakariri District Council’s dog control policy and practices.

**Dog Control Policy**

Waimakariri District Council (The Council) adopted a Dog Control Policy in 2009. The objectives of the policy include:
- To encourage responsible dog ownership
- To provide for Dog Access to Public areas
- To enforce dog owner obligations

**Education**

Animal Control delivers education to schools in the District encouraging safe practices around dogs including bite prevention.

**Dog Parks**

The Council currently provide three dog parks.

**Southbrook Dog Park** - This 3-hectare dog park was established in Southbrook Park, Rangiora, in 2010. Access to the park is either from Coronation Street or the Southbrook Park car park. The park features a pleasant walking circuit leading to a large fenced area where dogs can run and exercise. Information signs and seating are provided.

**Milton Memorial Park Dog Park** - This dog park, at the corner of Millton Avenue and River Road, Rangiora, covers 2.6 hectares and was opened in 2015. The park features a ‘large dog area’ and ‘small dog area’.

**Gladstone Road Dog Park** – This park was opened in early 2018 and covers approximately 2 hectares.

A further dog park is planned for Kaiapoi shortly. The dog parks have a Facebook community page [www.facebook.com/RangioraDogParks/](http://www.facebook.com/RangioraDogParks/).

**Dog Control on parks and reserves**

To protect public safety and enjoyment, the Dog Control Bylaw 2009 classifies the district’s parks and reserves into three categories: Dog Prohibited Areas, Leash Control Areas and Under Control Areas. The First Schedule of the bylaw lists all the district’s reserves and their classifications. You can exercise your dog off the leash in Under Control Areas as long as you keep the dog under continuous supervision and control.
Table 1: Annual Report for 20017/18 (Dog Control Act 1996 s10A)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting Requirement</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>16/17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The number of registered dogs</td>
<td>12214</td>
<td>12030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of registered owners</td>
<td>8010</td>
<td>7762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of probationary owners and disqualified owners</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| The number of dogs classified as dangerous (section 31). Note these dogs were all classified under s31(1)(b)  
"Any dog which the territorial authority has, on the basis of sworn evidence attesting to aggressive behaviour by the dog on one or more occasions, reasonable grounds to believe constitutes a threat to the safety of any person, stock, poultry, domestic animal, or protected wildlife;" | 10    | 14    |
| The number of dogs classified as menacing (section 33). Note some of these dogs are required to be classified pursuant to Section 33E where the Act deems this type of dog (American Pit Bull Terrier) to be menacing. | 60    | 61    |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The total number of complaints received for each Category:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dog Attacks on People</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog Rushing People</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog Attacks on Stock</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog Attacks on Dogs</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barking Dogs</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roaming Dogs</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog Welfare Complaints</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unregistered Dogs resulting in infringements</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lost / Found</td>
<td>917</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Callers requesting advice</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2077</td>
<td>2309</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of prosecutions undertaken.                           | 1     | 0    |
The number of Infringement Notices issued.                       | 115   | 86   |

Yours faithfully

Malcolm Johnston  
ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES MANAGER
REPORT FOR DECISION

FILE NO and TRIM NO: WAT-03 / 180719080422
REPORT TO: Utilities and Roading Committee
DATE OF MEETING: 21st August 2018
FROM: Sophie Allen – Water Environment Advisor
Colin Roxburgh – Water Asset Manager
SUBJECT: Management of nitrate levels for WDC community water supplies
SIGNED BY: (for Reports to Council,
Committees or Boards)

1. SUMMARY

1.1 This report recommends the adoption by Council of a position on limits for nitrate levels in community water supplies in the Waimakariri Water Zone. Staff propose this limit should ensure that groundwater nitrate levels do not exceed more than 50% of the Maximum Allowable Value (MAV) in the Drinking Water Standards New Zealand (DWSNZ 2005, revised 2008).

1.2 The preferred approach for WDC staff is for nitrate level management at the catchment-level by regulation of nitrate leaching to groundwater.

1.3 Options are outlined for groundwater nitrate levels management by staff in relation to the Waimakariri District Council (WDC) community supply wells, such as integration into Activity Management Plans and Water Safety Plans, as well as support for Environment Canterbury work, such as groundwater modelling data input.

1.4 Treatment solutions exist for nitrate removal, such as reverse osmosis, ion exchange, and biological treatment. These are not considered as a desired approach for water supply management as they are expensive, and can create a waste product (a concentrated nitrate and mineral brine), that requires disposal. It is recommended that groundwater be managed in such a way that nitrate removal is not required.

1.5 Additional management options, such as well replacement, deepening of an existing well and/or blending of water supplies, are possible alternatives to nitrate removal treatments. These options are not required with current nitrate levels, and are not preferred options.

1.6 It is noted that the Waimakariri Water Zone committee will recommend a groundwater nitrate limit in the Zone Implementation Plan Addendum (ZIPA). Community feedback has been gathered by the Zone Committee at public meetings in July. The Council will be briefed on the proposed groundwater nitrate limit on the 11th September 2018.

Attachments:

i. Water Treatment Options for Nitrate Removal Beca (180806088157)
2. **RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Utilities and Roading Committee recommends:

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180719080422

(b) **Acknowledges** that 3 Waters staff, who are responsible for providing safe high quality drinking water, will advocate for the management of nitrate leaching to groundwater in the Waimakariri Water Zone to limit groundwater nitrate levels to not exceed more than 50% of the Maximum Allowable Value (MAV), as defined in the Drinking-Water Standards New Zealand, for community drinking water supplies.

(c) **Notes** that a groundwater nitrate limit will be proposed by the Waimakariri Water Zone Committee in the draft Zone Implementation Plan Addendum, to be presented to the Council on the 11th September 2018.

(d) **Notes** staff are integrating management and monitoring of nitrate levels into current WDC management practices i.e. Activity Management Plans, and Water Safety Plans under the Drinking-Water Standards New Zealand.

(e) **Notes** that staff are working with Environment Canterbury for increased data input into the nitrate groundwater model from WDC water supply wells, to reduce modelled uncertainty and allow for more informed management.

(f) **Notes** that water treatment for nitrate removal is not considered a preferred option with current technology, however options such as catchment management, and blending of water supplies are viable options.

3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1 The Utilities and Roading Committee received an update on nitrate levels measured and modelled for public water supply wells on 18th June 2018 (WAT-03 / 180601061125).

3.2 There is a growing interest in nitrate levels within groundwater in particular in the Canterbury region. This is partly in response to the release of groundwater modelling results by Environment Canterbury this year, and subsequent media stories.

3.3 Council has fifteen public drinking-water supply schemes, and monitors nitrate levels as part of demonstrating compliance of these schemes.

3.4 Under the DWSNZ, chemical tests are required to be carried out every five years as a minimum. This testing includes measuring nitrate levels.

3.5 If a value is measured at more than 50% of the MAV then it is assigned as a Priority 2 determinant, and additional monitoring is required. In the case of nitrate, in the event that it is detected at more than 50% of the MAV, monthly nitrate samples are required.

3.6 The MAV for Nitrate Nitrogen is 11.3 mg/L (g/m³). This gives the value of 50% of the MAV of 5.65 mg/L (g/m³).

3.7 Under the Canterbury Water Management Strategy (CWMS), first order priorities are stated to be community supplies, alongside the environment, customary use and stock water. Second order priorities are irrigation, renewable electricity generation, recreation and amenity.
3.8 The preferred approach for WDC staff is nitrate level management at a catchment-level by Environment Canterbury regulation of land uses. The Waimakariri Water Zone Committee is currently assembling a draft ZIPA; a set of recommendations that will feed into a Plan Change of the Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan (LWRP). The Plan Change will set limits for nitrates in the District's groundwater aquifers.

3.9 A draft ZIPA will be presented to the Council on the 11th September 2018, during a period of public consultation. The indicative limit in the current draft version of the ZIPA is a median of 5.65 mg/L Nitrate-Nitrogen (50% of the MAV). For context, a water supply managed at this limit would have a 50% chance that future values would exceed 50% of the MAV (5.65 mg/L). Therefore, WDC staff endorse the setting of a lower median nitrate limit, where 5.65 mg/L (50% of the MAV) is not exceeded, and would not trigger additional monitoring or the need to upgrade supplies. Staff suggest that the nitrate limit could be set at the 95% percentile to not exceed 5.65 mg/L Nitrate-Nitrogen, i.e. only 5% chance that future values would exceed 50% of the MAV.

3.10 Community public meetings were held by the Waimakariri Zone Committee in Kaiapoi, Oxford and Rangiora in July 2018 to discuss possible nitrate leaching reduction targets for the northern tributaries of the Waimakariri River, and discuss possible nitrate limits. Waimakariri District Councillors were in attendance. Environment Canterbury and WDC staff also attended these community meetings, and supported with a presentation of the science, particular regarding the groundwater model and water supply well predictions.

4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

4.1. A selection of issues identified at the July public meetings included:

4.1.1. Nitrates are an issue for the wider community to respond to, both rural and urban i.e. ‘we are all in this together’.

4.1.2. Questioning of where responsibility lies between the private landowner, Community Public Health, Environment Canterbury and WDC regarding testing of nitrate levels in private well supplies, and collection of private well data for management.

4.1.3. Questioning of the validity of the groundwater model by community members, particularly by the rural sector. Robustness of the nitrate groundwater model is critical to reviewing and regulating nitrate reductions on-farm. The model is the best information available and is the result of a detailed scientific process. Environment Canterbury groundwater modellers agreed there is scope to improve the model, in order to reduce the high level of uncertainty in predicted values. Reducing uncertainty in the data will allow more informed management of public water supplies.

4.2. WDC staff will advocate to Environment Canterbury for management of nitrate leaching to groundwater, particularly in public supply recharge zones. In addition, WDC staff also intend to advocate for collection of land use change data over time, calculations of nitrate time lags in aquifers (based on mean residence times of water), and an examination of including nitrate attenuation factors into the groundwater modelling.

4.3. Recommended management options for staff


4.3.2. Assist in increased nitrate monitoring of selected WDC groundwater wells, particularly for deeper wells, where data could significantly improve the groundwater model range of uncertainty. Increased sampling is proposed by staff to be a shared responsibility; wells would be sampled by WDC under current
sampling protocols, with database maintenance and analysis of results undertaken by Environment Canterbury.

4.3.3. Adapt for example, replacement of the water source is planned for the Poyntzs Road supply well, primarily for protozoal compliance with the DWSNZ, but also partially due to nitrate levels.

4.3.4. Review selective private well data held by WDC that could be useful for validation of the Environment Canterbury groundwater model. These records currently lack information of exact location and well depth. A future project for WDC staff could be to source this information, if valuable to the groundwater model.

4.3.5. Collaborate closely with Environment Canterbury and other territorial authorities via the Canterbury Drinking-Water Reference Group (CDWRG) to understand and manage the risk of nitrate levels potentially increasing in the future. Nitrate levels in water supply wells was discussed at a meeting on the 10th of August 2018.

4.3.6. Communicate. WDC staff to work with Community Public Health and Environment Canterbury on a communications strategy to sufficiently inform the public of issues, risks, and action.

4.3.7. Evolve using informed management. Staff to continue to update their knowledge of potential treatment options and advances in water treatment technology.

4.4. Management options that are not recommended

4.4.1. Nitrate removal options of reverse osmosis, ion exchange and biological treatment were costed in a letter by Beca in July 2018. These options are not required with current nitrate levels, however were scoped to an initial stage to inform future management possibilities.

4.4.2. Table 1 shows estimated CAPEX and OPEX costings for examples of smaller (i.e. Mandeville) and larger (i.e. Rangiora) water supplies. These options are not considered as economically, socially and environmentally acceptable for water supply management with the available technology.

4.4.3. Reverse osmosis and ion exchange create a waste product (a concentrated nitrate and mineral brine) that would require careful disposal.

4.4.4. Biological treatment can be unreliable, as treatment is reliant on the health of a living biofilm and is therefore not recommended.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water supply</th>
<th>CAPEX (2018 costs, ±35%, excl. GST)</th>
<th>OPEX (2018 costs, ±35%, excl. GST)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smaller i.e. Mandeville</td>
<td>$1-2 million</td>
<td>$30-50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larger i.e. Rangiora</td>
<td>$6-11 million</td>
<td>$90-160,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All WDC supplies</td>
<td>$30-57 million</td>
<td>$630-1,080,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Estimated CAPEX and OPEX costings for nitrate removal treatment of smaller (i.e. Mandeville) and larger (i.e. Rangiora) water supplies. Costs are indicative estimates
only, not based on actual quotes or site specific considerations, and exclude many items such as possible land purchases, treatment and/or discharge of waste stream.

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

5. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

5.1. **Groups and Organisations**

5.1.1. Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga, through the Waimakariri Water Zone process and COMAR report (Tipa and Associates Ltd), has indicated a cultural limit for nitrates set at 1 mg/L nitrate-nitrogen for surface water. Environment Canterbury has modelled the extent of nitrate load reductions required to achieve this concentration, at present there is no clear and feasible pathway to achieve this limit for most waterbodies in the Northern Waimakariri Area. That could change over time particularly if other methods (such as managed aquifer recharge) prove themselves to be feasible, in combination with land use controls to reduce loadings.

5.1.2. Organisations such as Fish and Game, Beef and Lamb, Dairy NZ, Waimakariri Irrigation Ltd and others are actively following and advocating to the Water Zone Committee during the creation of the ZIPA and nitrate limit-setting. Forest and Bird has formally withdrawn from the Canterbury Water Management Strategy Zone Committee process.

5.1.3. The rural sector was well-represented to give feedback at the July public meetings, as well as a collection of feedback from the wider community. These views have been collated by Environment Canterbury.

5.2. **Wider Community**

5.2.1. There are many differing views within the community on the balance between many values such as land uses, environmental values, and water source protection. The ZIPA drafted by the Waimakariri Water Zone Committee is the process established to discuss and respond to this wide range of views.

5.2.2. Drinking water from private wells was raised more frequently at the public meetings compared to community water supply wells. Although the percentage of the population serviced by private wells is low, there are many shallow private wells that will see nitrate levels increase in the short term, as compared to longer time lags predicted for public supply wells. This difference in timeframes could explain the community’s focus. For example, in the Mandeville area, a few shallow private wells have been measured to be currently approaching or at the MAV.

6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**

6.1.1. There are limited financial implications in the short term. There are increased costs proposed for nitrate testing (above current requirements under the DWSNZ) at some selected WDC wells, for the purpose of refining the Environment Canterbury groundwater model. The cost of increased monitoring is expected to be minor and able to be accommodated within existing budgets.

6.1.2. There are potential future costs of well replacement, pumping from deeper wells, and/or installation of water ‘blending’ infrastructure that would be required if nitrate levels in public water supply wells increased significantly (i.e.: consistently beyond 50% MAV). Current nitrate removal treatment options are a considerable.
additional cost, and are not allowed for within existing budgets (see Table 1 for costings).

6.2. **Community Implications**

6.2.1. Staff are working to ensure continued reliability of public water supply wells.

6.2.2. There will be an increased cost to the rural community to reduce nitrate leaching from farming practices. Economic modelling of this cost has been carried out by Environment Canterbury.

6.2.3. Community feedback and economic modelling of community implications will be discussed as part of the draft ZIPA briefing with Councillors on the 11th September.

6.3. **Risk Management**

6.3.1. Staff are working with Environment Canterbury to reduce the wide range of uncertainty in Environment Canterbury's modelled nitrate groundwater values. This refinement of the groundwater model will reduce risk with more informed and adaptive management of community water supply wells. Reducing uncertainty in groundwater modelling may also reduce risk and increase security for the rural community around what on-farm investments and nitrate leaching targets are required to stay below groundwater nitrate limits.

6.4. **Health and Safety**

6.4.1. High levels of nitrate can pose a risk to babies less than six months who are formula fed and the unborn foetus of pregnant women. Adults with specific rare metabolic disorders (deficiency of glucose-6-phosphate dehydrogenase or methaemoglobin reductase) may also be at risk.

7. **CONTEXT**

7.1. **Policy**

7.1.1. This matter is of significance in terms of the Council's Significance and Engagement Policy due to economic, cultural, environmental, and social impacts of setting nitrate limits for groundwater. Community engagement currently being undertaken by the Waimakariri Water Zone Committee, and though a plan change of the LWRP undertaken by Environment Canterbury.

7.2. **Legislation**

7.2.1. National Environmental Standard- Protection of Human Drinking Water Sources (2008): This is currently under evaluation by the Ministry for the Environment. This NES aids catchment-scale management, with restrictions able to be applied by regional councils on land uses for drinking-water protection.

7.2.2. Resource Management Act (1991): The Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan (LWRP) under the RMA (1991) will set nitrate limits within the District's groundwater aquifers in Plan Change 8 (Waimakariri Water Zone). There are no current nitrate limits, with the exception of the region-wide groundwater quality limits (included in Schedule 8 of the LWRP), set for groundwater in the Waimakariri Zone under the currently operative LWRP and Waimakariri River Regional Plan (WRRP).

7.2.3. The Canterbury Water Management Strategy: The CWMS sets the protection of community drinking water supplies as a first order priority.

7.2.4. The Health (Drinking-water) Amendment Act (2007) is relevant in this matter in terms of the need to comply with the DWSNZ.
7.3. **Community Outcomes**

7.3.1. The following community outcomes are relevant in this matter:

- Core utility services are provided in a timely and sustainable manner
- There is a safe environment for all
- Harm to people from natural and man-made hazards is minimised.
- There is a healthy and sustainable environment for all
- Harm to the environment from the impacts of land use, use of water resources and air emissions is minimised.
- Cultural values relating to water are acknowledged and respected.
- Harm to the environment from the spread of contaminants into ground water and surface water is minimised.

7.4. **Delegations**

No delegations are required to receive this report.
Waimakariri District Council
Private Bag 1005
Rangiora 7440
New Zealand

Attention: Colin Roxburgh

Dear Colin

Water Treatment Options for Nitrate Removal

1 Introduction

Nitrates in drinking-water is an issue that is gaining focus in the Canterbury region. Waimakariri District Council (WDC) would like to understand the options and costs for treatment if further degradation of water quality means that treatment is required in the future. Nitrate levels above the maximum acceptable value (MAV) set in the Drinking Water Standards for New Zealand (DWSNZ) pose a public health risk especially to babies and pregnant women.

This letter includes information on the three most likely treatment options as well as order-of-magnitude costs for the most likely solution. This will help inform decisions for catchment protection requirements.

2 Assumptions

WDC would like to consider a theoretical scenario where nitrate concentrations in the current groundwater sources have exceeded the MAV of 50 mg/L (11.3 mg/L as N). Therefore, it has been assumed that the raw water has 12 mg/L of nitrate-N and that treatment is required to reduce this level to 70% of the MAV (7.91 mg/L).

WDC have selected Rangiora and Mandeville water supply schemes for this case study. These schemes were selected as they provide an indication of cost for a large treatment plant, and a smaller treatment plant. Table 2-1 lists the assumed flow rates for these schemes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2-1: Rangiora and Mandeville Total Peak Flow Rates from Bores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rangiora</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current flow rate (L/s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future 50 year flow rate (L/s)*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Design has been based on future flows as nitrate treatment is not expected in the near future

3 Nitrate Reduction Options

The three possible nitrate treatment options are summarised in Table 3-1.
### Table 3-1: Nitrate Treatment Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Advantage</th>
<th>Disadvantage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Reverse osmosis| Reverse osmosis is a pressure driven membrane process that uses the finest pores of all types of membranes. This means that a large range of materials are removed including solids, bacteria, viruses, dissolved organics, nutrients (nitrates) and salts. 80% nitrate removal can be achieved (Water Treatment Guide, 2007). This produces a high-volume waste stream (potentially 20 – 25% of the raw water volume) and a product stream called the permeate. Reverse osmosis often requires post-treatment for corrosion control and palatability which might include pH adjustment, adding an anti-scalant and adding minerals. | Would likely mean that no other treatment is required  
Can be switched on and off as required | Requires very fine membrane pore sizes which means that the water is demineralised  
Addition of minerals may be required to make water palatable and prevent corrosion  
High volume of waste stream for disposal that is high in nutrients and salts  
Removal depends on low turbidity feedwater  
Much more expensive than ion exchange, only cost effective when other water quality issues are present such as high solids |
| Ion exchange   | Ion exchange is the removal of an ionic substance by exchanging positively charged ions (cations) for hydrogen ions and negatively charged ions (anions) for hydroxide ions. Hydrogen and hydroxide then react to form water.  
Ion exchange resins are used to remove nitrates. They are regenerated through use of a regenerant (generally of high salt concentration, approximately 10%). This strips nitrates (and any other substances on the resin) and produces a high concentrated saline waste stream. The waste volume will be relatively small, 1.5 – 2 % of the raw water volume. | Considered the most effective nitrate treatment method (Faust & Aly, p.1198)  
Reliable nitrate removal if designed carefully and operated properly  
Much lower cost than RO treatment  
Used in the dairy industry  
Can be switched on and off as required | Waste streams including spent regenerator (highly saline), rinse water, backwash water and potentially various cleaning and disinfecting solutions. This stream can be very difficult to dispose of.  
Nitrate may leak once the resin is saturated causing the treated water to have a higher nitrate concentration than |
It is possible to purchase resins that selectively remove nitrates while other resins remove sulphates before nitrates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biological treatment</th>
<th>Waste streams are less of an issue (smaller volumes/lower concentrations) than reverse osmosis or ion exchange</th>
<th>Challenging to achieve consistent performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For biological treatment, bacteria are used to oxidise nitrate. A biofilm containing denitrifying bacteria is formed on a media within a reactor. Nitrate acts as an electron acceptor and so addition of an electron donor such as methanol, ethanol, acetate or hydrogen is required. In some cases, nutrient addition and pH control is also required. ARoNite is a new technology that use autotrophic bacteria in a membrane biofilm reactor to reduce nitrates using hydrogen (generated onsite or delivered) and carbon dioxide (delivered). Its advantage over ion exchange is that brine disposal is not required. Biological processes are commonly used for nitrate removal in Europe. This technology has been used for tertiary wastewater and water reuse for many years.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Generally requires a pilot test to verify performance with particular water source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Must run continuously, cannot be switched on and off if not required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>May require downstream processing of residual electron donor (biological oxidation and GAC)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reverse osmosis and ion exchange have significant waste disposal issues while minimal waste is produced with biological treatment. Discharge to waterways would not be an acceptable situation because of the concentrated nature of these waste streams. Discharge to an injection well may be possible however this is unlikely to be an acceptable solution because of the risks of contaminating the supply or other water supplies. Discharge to a lined evaporation lagoon with ultimate disposal of the dried salt to landfill, or discharge to the sewage network are the most likely methods. For the purposes of this high level study, it has been assumed that the waste stream will be discharged to the existing sewage network. In reality, this may not be the preferred method of disposal as WDC operate wastewater treatment ponds which are reliant on biological processes to provide treatment. Varying the quality of wastewater in the ponds could mean that the treatment capacity is reduced. In addition, the sewage network may not have the capacity to cope with the additional wastewater flows (this is particularly an issue for reverse osmosis as the volumes are higher. The increased salinity of the final effluent discharge to the environment is assumed to be acceptable as an ocean discharge is used.
As high nitrate concentrations in groundwater is an issue that is increasing in prevalence around the world, there is significant research going on into new treatment technologies for its removal. There are numerous hybrid treatment methods being developed that have the potential to reduce the waste stream concentrations and volumes as well as the overall cost. One example is Microvi MNE™ which uses engineered polymer-microorganism composites containing a single species of microorganism for denitrification. This process does not produce sludge, brine or wastewater. This process is currently at a demonstration scale.

The main purpose of this letter is to identify nitrate treatment options; however, a number of other nitrate reduction options exist. These include:

- **Deeper bores** – Nitrates are more likely to occur at shallower bores and those fed from areas with high agricultural land use rather than the Waimakariri River. Therefore, it may be possible to drill deeper bores to avoid nitrates in some cases. Groundwater modelling may be required. Groundwater from deeper bores may require other treatment.

- **Identifying a new source** – It may be less expensive to treat another water source previously considered to be of poor quality, than it would be to treat the existing source with high nitrates.

- **Source blending** – It may be possible to blend a high nitrate source with a low nitrate source if the low nitrate source cannot provide enough capacity alone.

- **Catchment protection** – This would involve regulating the bore’s catchment to restrict activities within it. It should be noted that catchment protection requires a much larger area of land to be regulated than commonly thought. Best practice is to develop a groundwater model so that the recharge area can be identified. This is not a straight-forward process, but is consistent with the recommendations of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry and could, in the first instance, be raised within the Canterbury Drinking Water Reference Group.

### 4 Estimated Costs

To accurately estimate the cost of nitrate treatment, detailed design of the water treatment plant would be required, which is beyond the time and budget available at this point in time.

Ion exchange is the most likely treatment process at present. There are a number of technologies that may become more competitive in the future, however for the purposes of this study, ion exchange has been assumed.

---

1 Refer for example to Garbett, M “First barrier water supply protection and the RMA”, IPWEA NZ Conference, 2018.
It is important to note that given the limited information available and the time restrictions, suppliers were unable to provide quotes in the time available. It is possible that further information from suppliers may be received after the issue of this letter, in which case the cost estimates could be adjusted to reflect this more accurate information. The estimates presented in Table 4-1 were made by scaling textbook values and making allowances for ancillary infrastructure and other auxiliary items. A range of values is shown as this reflects the uncertainties in the estimate.

Table 4-1: High Level Order-of-Magnitude Cost Estimate (2018 dollars, ±35% excluding GST)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CAPEX</th>
<th>OPEX (annual)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mandeville</td>
<td>$1.5 – 2 million</td>
<td>$30 – 50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>$6 – 11 million</td>
<td>$90 – 160,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inclusions
- Process equipment including controls and treatment vessel
- Ion exchange resin
- Piping and valves
- Instrumentation
- Storage and containment of saline solution and other chemicals
- Chemical feed equipment
- Installation
- An allowance for civil works such as stormwater, access road etc
- An allowance for electrical upgrades
- A new building
- A connection to the existing wastewater network
- P&G margin
- Contingency
- Design

Saline solution for resin regeneration
- Equipment maintenance
- Operator time
- An allowance for power

The following items have been excluded:
- Wastewater network or treatment plant upgrades
  - There is a risk that this will harm the wastewater treatment process, there will be consent breeches and that the network will require an upgrade to cope with the additional flow.
- Replacement resin
  - Regeneration will occur with saline solution, replacement may be required as frequently as every 5 years.
- Land procurement
- Modifications to the existing wells
- Treated water storage
- WDC project costs
- Network power upgrades
Ground improvement or piling
Escalation and inflation past 2018

5 Conclusion

Nitrates in groundwater is an emerging issue for areas with farming in the catchment. This analysis shows that there are a number of methods for treating nitrates although they each have substantial issues including high cost.

It is recommended that WDC carefully track nitrate levels in groundwater and consider methods for reduction (such as catchment protection and deeper bores). The high cost of nitrate treatment means that treatment is likely to be a last resort.

Yours faithfully

Lisa Mace
Process Engineer
on behalf of
CH2M Beca Ltd

Copy
Paul Reed, CH2M Beca
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WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE COMMUNITY AND RECREATION COMMITTEE
HELD IN THE WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA ON TUESDAY 24 JULY 2018 AT 1.00PM.

PRESENT

Councillor A Blackie (Chairperson), Mayor D Ayers, Councillors K Barnett, R Brine, W Doody and D Gordon.

IN ATTENDANCE

Councillors K Felstead and J Meyer
Messrs C Sargison (Manager Community and Recreation), J Palmer (Chief Executive), C Brown (Community Green Space Manager), S Kong (Community Facilities Coordinator), M Greenwood (Aquatic Facilities Manager), Mrs P Ashbey (District Libraries Manager) and Mrs E Stubbs (Minute Secretary).

1 APOLOGIES

Nil.

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Nil.

3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

3.1 Minutes of a meeting of the Community and Recreation Committee held on Tuesday 22 May 2018

 Moved Councillor Barnett seconded Councillor Doody

 THAT the Community and Recreation committee:

 (a) Confirms the circulated minutes of a meeting of the Community and Recreation Committee, held on Tuesday 22 May 2018, as a true and accurate record.

 CARRIED

4 MATTERS ARISING

There were no matters arising.

5 DEPUTATION

5.1 Simon Kong, Community Facilities Coordinator

Mr Brown introduced the Community Facilities online booking system noting that Mr Kong had completed a huge amount of work to make it possible. The project to implement the online booking system had been underway for twelve months and involved Greenspace and Customer Service working alongside Datacom, the Information Technology consulting company which had worked with Council for some time. The system replaced the previous manual system which was logistically difficult to administer and did not suit the modern customer.
Mr Brown commented that the new system provided a better customer experience than any other in the country and already Dunedin City Council had asked for a demonstration of the system. The system provided the customer with more information, more control and the ability to pay online, and it streamlined the administration process. Currently Rangiora and Oxford Town Halls and the Woodend Community Centre were in the system but following the successful pilot, other community facilities would be added.

In order to show the usability of the system Mr Kong went through the website and made a ‘dummy’ booking of the Rangiora Town hall to demonstrate the process and highlight features of the system. He noted that the system was now active on the Council website in the location where information on facilities was found.

While Mr Kong made the booking he highlighted the great photos and ‘pannable view’ of the facilities which had been professionally taken. There was an updated description of facilities, links to external documents, and the available rooms were listed separately with details including rate and capacity. The information available on the system was based on questions asked by customers. Customers could step through a calendar to see when rooms were available. Rooms could be booked in 15 minute increments.

When a booking was made a number of questions were asked and Mr Kong noted that information could be assessed over time. Questions asked included type of event, setup requirements and catering requirements. Through the booking system an automated process started in the background to notify staff. Mr Kong went through the payment section advising payments could be made via a credit card or at a service centre. All existing customers who had accounts had been loaded into the system and would be issued a statement at the end of the month.

Councillor Felstead noted that Councillors when making a public booking did not pay, and asked how this was handled. Mr Kong advised that Councillors could be set up to go through as a staff booking, the same public interface would be used.

Councillor Barnett asked how events that went over one day were handled. Mr Kong advised that situation would require follow-up by customer service, it was difficult to programme the system for all situations. In the situation of an event such as a wedding there was an automated process that requested staff to pay attention to that booking.

Councillor Barnett asked if it were possible to get a quote. Mr Kong advised that could be achieved through making a ‘tentative’ booking at which time a booking summary was produced that could be used when requesting funding. The tentative booking had an expiry date. The cost could also be viewed before confirmation of the booking.

Mayor Ayers asked if possible venues could also be extended to parks, for example for weddings. Mr Brown commented that was possible, and that Mr Kong had worked with Datacom to help ensure that modifications to the system could be completed by staff.

Councillor Doody asked if there would be advertising to show the venues were available for weddings. Mr Kong advised there had been press releases of the new booking system. Under the new system, the venues were much more visible and better presented. It meant that customers would not need to drive to Oxford to look around. Mr Brown noted that there had been a couple of bookings and payments that had come through the system. There had been no questions.

Councillor Doody and Councillor Barnett asked about holding workshops with community groups to show how to use the system. Mr Kong noted that the
system had been designed to be naturally useable which meant there had not been a lot of feedback, in saying that, he was open to assisting the community with the system. Mr Brown noted that customers could still go into a service centre to book.

Councillor Barnett asked if there was a possibility to automate the key system. Mr Brown replied not at this time, it could be looked at in the future.

Councillor Barnett asked if the two rooms at the Woodend Community Centre could be named rather than called meeting room 1 and 2. Mr Brown advised it would be possible to work with the local Board to name those two rooms.

Mayor Ayers asked if it would be possible to build into the system a reference to possible other venues in the case a Council venue was not available. Mr Sargison replied yes, in the pilot not all Council venues were on the system. The pilot evaluation report would look at how the system could be enhanced and extended. That report would be in October/November 2018.

Councillor Gordon congratulated the team noting the system made it easier for groups to book facilities and the partnering with Datacom made sense.

6 REPORTS

6.1 Community Team Update – Tessa Sturley (Community Team Manager)

Mr Sargison noted he would speak to the report in the absence of Mrs Sturley. He highlighted the $11,997 grant received to support a Seniors Plan for the District, the Community House Steering Group feasibility study and the Youth Development grant.

Moved Councillor Gordon seconded Councillor Barnett

THAT the Community and Recreation Committee:

(a) Receives report No. 180705074843

(b) Notes that we have been granted $11,997 from the Office of Seniors for to support the development of an Age Friendly Community plan for our District.

(c) Notes the receipt of $25,000 in funding from Department of Internal Affairs on behalf of the Community House Steering Group. This will be used for a feasibility study.

(d) Notes that Youth Council extend their appreciation for Council’s approval of an annual $4,000 Youth Development Grant.

CARRIED

6.2 Aquatic Facilities Update – Matthew Greenwood (Aquatic Facilities Manager)

Mr Greenwood spoke to the report which was to provide a summary of the Aquatic Facilities year to date performance. He noted the September report would include the full year-end financial report. Financials were largely positive with prepaid and recreational income meeting end of year targets with a month to go. Water quality met or exceeded the standards required.

Mr Greenwood advised that the SwimDesk implementation continued. Feedback was largely positive. Minor issues had been addressed as they arose. In Term three the SwimDesk schools application was being rolled out. Mr Greenwood advised that survey of Aquarobics showed 100% and 98%
satisfaction across the different facilities. There was mixed feedback about music and volume.

Questions

Councillor Barnett noted the ‘hole’ in Kaiapoi statistics and commented that she had received complaints regarding the after school availability at Kaiapoi.

Mr Greenwood advised that the local Board had approved recreational swimming for Friday and lessons on the other days. They had pushed Friday recreational initiatives however the pool was not well populated on Fridays. They would continue to track numbers. The issues with $20,000 down on actual budget for Kaiapoi programmes had been identified previously and was related to schools. Mr Sargison advised that forecasting for schools had been problematic in the past and the SwimDesk module for schools would help by improving planning ability.

Councillor Doody asked if the issues with View Hill School not being able to use the Oxford Pool had been resolved. Mr Greenwood advised the SwimDesk software would assist with a time-slot, in addition there had been issues identified with staffing handover.

Moved Councillor Doody seconded Councillor Barnett

THAT the Community and Recreation Committee:

(a) Receives report No. 180704074390

(b) Notes Aquatic Facilities achievement against key performance indicators including Water Quality and Facility Attendance.

(c) Notes that the September report will include a full year-end financial report.

CARRIED

Councillor Doody thanked Mr Greenwood for the report.

Councillor Barnett noted the report showed the pools were tracking well. She commented that she had tried out the new QEII facility and had been disappointed with the experience there.

6.3 Library Update – Philippa Ashbey (District Libraries Manager)

Mrs Ashbey spoke to the report which was to provide an update on customer service improvements, customer feedback and activities offered. Mrs Ashbey advised that there had been 27 sessions in the first 12 weeks of the Book a Librarian Service. It was a one on one personalised session with diverse requests including family history databases, accessing ebooks and backing up images into new formats.

Mrs Ashbey advised that another customer service improvement was the North Canterbury Gazette from 1932-1939 now available on Papers Past. In partnership with Rangiora Museum, the newspapers had been digitised and uploaded.

Mrs Ashbey highlighted the benefits of reading for pleasure outlined in the report including reduced stress, reduced risk of dementia, increased general knowledge, increased awareness of other cultures and a wider vocabulary. She noted that for many people reading material such as Training or Health and Safety manuals were beyond their reach. Waimakariri Libraries facilitated reading for pleasure by providing a wide range of books for every level of reader. There were well subscribed reading programmes for children.
Mrs Ashbey advised that the Library and Information Association of New Zealand (LIANZA) supported the Local Government Amendment Bill. Local authorities would be better placed to support the value of public libraries which had a vital role and were not a ‘nice to have’.

Mrs Ashbey noted the extremely entertaining performance of Stig Wemyss and the milestone of 1000 likes on Facebook.

Questions

Councillor Blackie referred to the $55,000 reallocation from ‘Capital’ budget to ‘Operational’ budget and asked what it would have been spent on had it not been reallocated. Mrs Ashbey commented it was exactly the same spend, however as ownership of electronic content had changed to a licensing model rather than directly owned by the library it needed to be purchased from the Operations budget. Staff had not been aware of the change at the time of LTP preparation.

Councillor Doody commented on the difficulty of viewing electronic resources for some users and asked if options that assisted with viewing had been included. Mrs Ashbey replied that it had been considered. Different platforms could be adjusted to assist with reading difficulties and it was often based on personal preference.

Moved Councillor Doody seconded Councillor Blackie

THAT the Community and Recreation Committee:

(a) Receives report No. 180706075217
(b) Notes the customer service improvements, customer feedback, and activities offered by the Waimakariri Libraries in May and June 2018.
(c) Notes the benefits of reading for pleasure and the initiatives of the Waimakariri Libraries towards the development of a culture of reading in our community.
(d) Notes the position of the Library and Information Association of New Zealand on the Local Government (Community Well-being) Amendment Bill and reintroduction of the well-beings to the local government legislation.
(e) Approves the re-allocation of $55,000 from the previously approved 2018/2019 Library Resources ‘Capital’ budget to the Library eResources ‘Operations’ budget.
(f) Circulates the report to the Boards for their information.

CARRIED

7 PORTFOLIO UPDATES

7.1 Greenspace (Parks Reserves and Sports Grounds) – Councillor Robbie Brine

- Councillor Blackie advised that a second RSA Matariki planting was to be held at Silverstream Reserve.
7.2 **Community Facilities (including Aquatic Centres, Halls, Libraries and Museums) – Councillor Wendy Doody**

- Councillor Doody advised that the Oxford Winter Festival of Light had been well attended.
- The Ashley Gorge Reynolds Heritage Pavilion was well underway.

7.3 **Community Development and Wellbeing – Councillor Kirstyn Barnett and Councillor Wendy Doody**

- Councillor Doody advised that she attended the Social Services Waimakariri meeting and noted that Wellbeing North Canterbury was in a good position.
- Highlighted the available funding for emergency housing following extreme weather events.
- Commented on the outstanding work of the Migrants and Newcomers group. Mr Palmer advised staff had been canvassed to find those with a second or third language who were willing to volunteer time to assist with interpretation. The interpretation would assist with customer service however would not extend to providing advice due to the translation risk. The service was related to Council customer service.

8 **QUESTIONS**

There were no questions.

9 **URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS**

There was no urgent general business.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE MEETING WAS CLOSED AT 1.57pm.

CONFIRMED

___________________________
Chairperson

___________________________
Date

**BRIEFING**

*At the conclusion of the meeting, a briefing was held to provide an Airfield update.*
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF THE AUDIT AND RISK COMMITTEE HELD IN THE WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA ON TUESDAY 24 JULY 2018 COMMENCING AT 3.30PM.

PRESENT

Councillor N Atkinson (Chairperson), Deputy Mayor K Felstead, Mayor D Ayers, Councillors A Blackie and K Barnett

IN ATTENDANCE

Councillors D Gordon, W Doody, J Meyer
Messrs J Palmer (Chief Executive), J Millward (Manager Finance and Business Support), S Markham (Manager Strategy and Engagement), Ms C Brown (Health, Safety and Quality Manager), Messrs S Hart (Business and Centres Manager), G Meadows (Policy Manager), Ms M Harris (Customer Services Manager), Ms J Simon (CIO) and Mrs A Smith (Committee Advisor)

1 APOLOGIES

Moved Deputy Mayor Felstead Seconded Councillor Barnett

THAT an apology for absence be received and sustained from Cr P Williams.

CARRIED

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

There were no conflicts of interest noted

3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

3.1 Minutes of a meeting of the Audit and Risk Committee held on Tuesday 22 May 2018

Moved Councillor Barnett seconded Deputy Mayor Felstead

THAT the Audit Committee

(a) Confirms the circulated minutes of a meeting of the Audit and Risk Committee, held on the 22 May 2018, as a true and accurate record.

CARRIED

4 MATTERS ARISING

There were no matters arising.
5 PRESENTATION/DEPUTATION

There were no presentations or deputations.

6 REPORTS


Ms C Brown spoke to this report on behalf of L Ashton, presenting the achievements against the agreed Health and Safety 2017/18 Annual Plan (work plan) and presented the 2018/19 Annual Plan (work plan) for review.

The proposed Annual Work Plan for the 2018/19 year, has five key Actions and these will be reported on monthly to both the Management Team and Council.

Councillor Doody asked about Safeplus. Ms Brown noted that this is the form of accreditation which the Council now aligns itself to, which replaces the ACC.

Information on any incidences involving contractors is not consistent at the moment. At the moment there are 127 assessed and current preferred contractors that the Council uses, which are Sitewise accredited. Health and safety measures are assessed for each individual contract. Councillor Barnett asked if smoking was allowed on sites where contractors are working. C Brown said it is the expectation of Council that each contractor would set up designated areas for smoking in a site specific safety plan. Council staff can do random site audits.

Mayor Ayers asked on the difference between an accident or an incident. C Brown said Council endeavour not to use the word accident when there is no injury involved. It was suggested there could be a change in wording to replace the word accident with injury. Staff will look at this suggestion.

Moved Deputy Mayor Felstead seconded Councillor Atkinson

THAT the Audit and Risk Committee

(a) Receives report No. 180702073233.

(b) Reviews the progress against the 2017/18 Health and Safety Work plan (Annual Plan).

(c) Notes the additional Health and Safety activities that have been achieved during this period.

(d) Reviews and Acknowledges the Health and Safety Work plan (Annual Plan) for 2018/19

CARRIED

Councillor Atkinson commended the culture in the organisation at the moment and is impressed with the improved reporting of near misses which allow potential issues to be resolved.
6.2 **Cyber Security – Jolanda Simon (CIO)**

Ms J Simon presented this report to discuss Cyber security work that has been undertaken at the Council over the last year. Cyber security has been identified in the Council’s Risk Register and the threats are becoming more prevalent.

Every quarter a report will come back to this committee on items of high risk. 70 – 80 % of issues are the result of incoming emails with links which are scams.

Deloitte has undertaken a Cyber Security Review for a number of Canterbury Councils, including Waimakariri (as part of the Canterbury Shared Services). A report will be brought back to the November meeting of the Audit and Risk Committee.

Staff are also investigating Cyber insurance cover. This would not stop any cyber security breaches happening but would help to cover any costs incurred.

Mayor Ayers asked about security risks for on-line voting. J Simon said it would depend on what platform was used for this. If there was an online system there would be many facets of it that would need to be looked at.

J Simon confirmed that currently staff cannot download anything from the internet, but do still use USB sticks.

The report noted that staff had been offered Phriendly Phishing Training and Councillor Barnett said it would be useful for elected members to have the phishing training as well. J Simon said this could be made available.

Moved Councillor K Barnett seconded Councillor A Blackie

**THAT** the Audit and Risk Committee

(a) **Receives** report No. 180711077023.
(b) **Notes** the cyber security work undertaken so far which includes training, cyber response plan, and implementation of various security recommendations.
(c) **Notes** that (Cyber) Security and other ‘High’ IT Risks will be reported quarterly to the Audit and Risk Committee.
(d) **Notes** that the Deloitte Cyber Security assessment report and recommendations will be reported back to the Audit and Risk Committee in November.
(e) **Notes** that work is being undertaken to finalise Cyber Insurance and this will be reported back to the Audit and Risk Committee in November.

Councillor Barnett said it is very important for everyone to have information on how to protect the Council’s system against scammers and fraud.
6.3 *Local Government Act 2002 Section 17A Cost Effectiveness of Service Delivery Reviews for Security Services and Solid Waste Education Services – Veronica Spittal (Senior Policy Analyst)*

Mr G Meadows presented this report, in the absence of V Spittal. There are three Section 17A reviews that have been recommended to be deferred, being:

**Campgrounds** – J Millward advised that this is to be discussed at the next staff briefing and the S17 review will be undertaken following this.

**Airfield Management** Review was previously deferred to 18 July 2017. There is a consultation process being undertaken regarding a plan change and designation for the Rangiora Airfield and surrounding land. This process involves both the operative plan and also needs to be factored into the District Plan review. It is anticipated this is likely to attract a number of submissions and mean that the whole process could take up to two years or more to complete.

**Community Housing and Housing for the Elderly** - Following options being considered at Council workshops, there is still a significant amount of information being processed to form a view and have a final position regarding Community Housing and Housing for the Elderly.

Moved Deputy Mayor Felstead seconded Councillor Barnett

**THAT** the Audit and Risk Committee

(a) **Receives** report No.180628071950.

(b) **Approves** the attached S17A Reviews for Security Services-After Hours, Cash Transportation Security and Educational Services-Waste Minimisation and 3 Waters.

(c) **Agrees** that no further review of Security Services-After Hours is needed until 2024 prior to contract renewal in 2025, subject to successful completion of the contract.

(d) **Agrees** that the need for and/or nature of the Cash Transportation Security Contract be reviewed prior to 30 June 2020, subject to successful completion of the current contract.

(e) **Agrees** that no further review of Educational Services-Waste Minimisation and 3 Waters is needed until 2024 prior to contract renewal in 2025, subject to successful completion of the contract.

(f) **Agrees** to defer the S17A Review for Airfield Management until the outcome of the proposed Rangiora Airfield Plan Change and associated designation is known.

(g) **Agrees** to re-programme the S17A Reviews of Community Housing and Housing for the Elderly to the 20 November 2018 Audit and Risk Committee meeting.

**CARRIED**
6.4 **Standard and Poors Crediting Rating Report – Jeff Millward (Manager Finance and Business Support)**

Mr J Millward presented this report to provide an update of the Standard and Poors credit rating received last April, noting the conditions that were surrounding the rating. The Council got a negative outlook, due to the significant increase to the capital expenditure programme that takes loan funding near to some of the policy limits. If the Council operates to the budget a couple of actions can happen, the negative rating will come off, and if it doesn't, it could get a further negative outlook or it could be degraded to AA or AA-.

J Millward advised that a number of additional actions are being taken. For example a contracts register has been develop to track capital projects. An Asset Management Steering group has been established to assess and monitor capital projects and programmes. This will provide some greater assurance and control of projects reported to the Council.

Question from Councillor Gordon, asked what is being done to make sure the Council maintains the budget levels and controlling Council expenditure. J Millward noted there are some further internal controls being set up, to give more assurance to both the Council and staff. An Asset Steering Group has been set up and the scope of that group has been increased to include the monitoring of the capital works programme. This group will make recommendations to Management Team and to Council. They will look at the capital programme and for any new capital works and they will look at ways to find additional funding, or offset that capital against current or future works, or if there is any savings to be made, they will review the whole programme. Another area where additional controls are being established is with Procurement and Contract management maturity assessment. This will identify the whole procurement from the planning stage right through to the post review stage of the project. There will be a Contracts Register which will have the complete oversee of capital works, and gives a greater overview of contracts. This is something that the Asset Steering Group will be looking at.

Councillor Gordon asked what processes are in place to ensure that the Council is getting best value? J Millward advised that the Procurement and Contract Management Assessment looks at documentation and tendering information that is being sent out. project contract management to give assurance of the programme. Preliminary information for those doing the assessment is that the Council has a very good culture and a good organisation which a review has been conducted on. Mr Palmer added that it is the “big stuff” that the Council does well, with a robust systems in place, but with the smaller jobs there is sometimes an impression that the Council is not good procurers of services and goods. The Council needs to increase its awareness of this and there is some work to be done to improve this. There are good purchase arrangements for many items that the Council purchases, but it is a matter of making sure that this applies to both operational expenditure and capital expenditure.

Moved Deputy Mayor Felstead seconded Councillor Blackie

**THAT** the Audit and Risk Committee

(a) **Receives** report TRIM 180713078284

(b) **Notes** that as a result of the Credit Rating review undertaken by Standard and Poors the Council has retained a Credit Rating of AA / A-1+, with a negative outlook;
(c) **Notes** that where the Council can contain its expenditure within the limits of the policy and financial forecasts provided within the 2018-28 Long Term Plan, it would be expected that the Council would retain the AA / A-1+ credit rating with a stable outlook being issued;

(d) **Notes** that the next credit rating review is programmed to be undertaken in April 2019;

(e) **Notes** that additional actions are being undertaken to ensure capital programmes are being monitored and improving efficiencies.

CARRIED

6.5 **Oxford Bulletin – Maree Harris (Customer Services Manager)**

Ms M Harris presented this report to provide an update on arrangements for the Oxford Bulletin. The Council has agreed with Bruce and Emily Chapman that they will take over the Bulletin as from next month. They have undertaken to keep the advertising rates as what the Council set until the end of this calendar year.

Moved Councillor Barnett seconded Deputy Mayor Felstead

**THAT** the Audit and Risk Committee

(a) **Receives** report No. 180704074184.

(b) **Agrees** that the Council will cease producing the Oxford Bulletin from the 3 August 2018 issue and that from this date responsibility for publication of the Bulletin will transfer to Bruce and Emily Chapman.

CARRIED

6.6 **Enterprise North Canterbury Statement of Intent and Business Plan for year beginning 1 July 2018; and Proposed District Promotions Plan for 2018/19 – Simon Markham (Manager Strategy and Engagement)**

Mrs H Warwick and C Watton were present during consideration of this report.

Simon Markham presented a Powerpoint presentation on the district event funding process which had previously been requested by the committee. Previously, in 2013 the amount in the fund was increased to $45,000 as a result of a review then. This was segmented to provide potentially multi-year funding up to five years, that is non-contestable for a small number of events to assist in growing those events. That period is over and the panel is now considering their way of managing the fund, and the feedback from applicants is that they would prefer that the whole sum is contestable on an annual basis.

The Panel acts as an independent panel who make the decisions, but they do source advice from Heather Warwick. This fund is to be used for event promotion or event coordination, or both. It was noted that funds are not able to be used by the local Promotions Groups for coordinator costs. The majority of the funding will go to events that has the potential to, or does attract visitors. There is a robust process of application, with reporting required, and an audit trail through the work of Audit NZ on ENC’s activities as well.

The review process included an independent event specialist. S Markham pointed out that from the Council’s point of view the fund does not allow for meaningful contributions to large budget events and this is the reality. There
is a $5,000 maximum which typically means an event budget of less than $100,000. There were presentations from organisers of large scale events who believe there is potential to hold events up to $250,000. These are not being considered at this stage.

Mr Markham said there was discussion by the panel on what can be done to stimulate large events in the district, looking at the potential to underwrite events and to get them to come and stay how. The amounts discussed was $15,000 to underwrite, to begin to grow. The financial risk needs to be considered.

There is 800 events in the calendar in a year which is impressive for the district, and this is steadily growing. It is finding the right balance between being open to all but ultimately there are a few fairly average quality events and how does the Council balance this to get the best events for the district.

H Warwick noted this is been done by ENC for over ten years and is one of the most contentious issues that ENC deals with. It is a balancing act and to be fair, equitable and accessible. ENC is an enabler not a regulator and help get the applications to be the best they can be for the panel of Robin Brown, Clare Gifford and Christine Watton can gauge it as the best application that is presented on the day.

Cr Gordon, as part of the panel, has great confidence in the process that was undertaken, and with the independent report. Important to see the enabling of flexibility, for instances with events that are established. There is the potential to de-risk large events, and these offer huge potential for the district. Was a worthwhile exercise and enjoyed being part of it.

Deputy Mayor Felstead, noted that the Oxford Menz Shed puts on the “Spring into Oxford” function, and asked was there any availability for organisations being able to have an ongoing funding source to be available. As this event is dependent on a day with good weather, what would the situation be if it rained on the planned day of an event and the Menz Shed could have funding. Councillor Atkinson asked is there the possibility of insuring an outdoor event from the fund and this question will be followed up.

Mayor Ayers noted that there has been discussion on growing events, but is there potential that an event may get too big to be held in towns in this district? Some events put the town under a lot of pressure and there could be other events that could potentially put similar pressure in other areas of the district.

Regarding the Statement of Intent: ENC Strategic Planning session was held at the end of March, following which the vision has changed slightly and now reads:

“To inspire, attract and retain individuals, businesses and social enterprises to invest in our region:

and there has been a new strategic objective added, being

“Attract and inspire businesses, Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu and Government to invest in our region.

These two changes were unanimously agreed by the ENC Board on the 31st May 2018.

Councillor Barnett asked about the Christchurch friends and family market and attracting day visitors from Christchurch. H Warwick noted this is not a specific
item in the business plan but relates to events and friends and family coming north to participate in our district. There are two new members of the team Elizabeth Pitcorn, who specialises in marketing (social media) and Janine Rogers, around Product Development.

Councillor Barnett asked about visitor promotions in the area – in relating to the sister city in China. H Warwick showed a PowerPoint presentation which related to this.

The presentation highlighted activities of ENC:

Development of a Walking and Cycling Guide as part of the Official Visitor Guide – 30,000 guides were printed, self funded, sent to I-Sites and to many locations throughout Christchurch.
I-Site had a good year – sales up 31% on last year
Events – down to 550, this figures is due to not profiling all farmers markets or craft days and keeping it for larger events, 52,000 distributed over 16 events this past year.
Business Support is continued to be given for any potential investors for the district. Reports can be available for any type of industry.
New Activity – Wheels to Waipara – new cycle track, completely off road between Christchurch and Waipara.
Janine is working on the Loop track, which is about 90 kms in our district, into Silverstream that is being developed there.
Developing a product to take to TRENZ. This is a trade show to be held in Christchurch in May 2019 and ENC are getting ready for this.
ENC are seeking out new business partners and being pro active
Developing tourism specific training workshops.
Developing a portfolio of photos, videos and Waimakariri image story. This story is going to be based on biodiversity, culture and history.

Moved Councillor Atkinson seconded Councillor Barnett

THAT the Audit and Risk Committee

(a) Receives report No. 180708075704
(b) Approves ENC’s Statement of Intent for the Financial Year beginning 1 July 2018
(c) Receives ENC’s 2018/19 Business Plan
(d) Approves ENC’s Draft District Promotions Business Plan for 2018/19

CARRIED

Councillor Atkinson welcomes this report and is supportive of the continued work of ENC. Looks forward to continued enabling that ENC does, for people who have good ideas. Councillor Atkinson encourages the continued success of the bigger events that are currently held in the district. ENC is moving forward and looking forward but also would like to see the continuing of the smaller events that are well supported in the district. The word “enabling” needs to be continued, and encourage as many people as we can to come to this district.

Councillor Barnett found this report inspiring, with the potential for Waimakariri to have a key product that gives us an edge over some other places, who may have greater infrastructure and greater marketing. This Committee has to make sure the questions are asked, and they have been and answers have been found and now moving forward. Councillor Barnett questions the comments earlier of natural cycle of events – some people support repeat events over a long period of time, noting some local events (being the
Woodend Flower Show running 86 years), and the Kaiapoi Art Expo. Important that these events continue as they provide value. Need to enable the district to support growth in events and would like to see support for the ‘bread and butter market’ (visitors coming from across the bridge to enjoy the Waimakariri district from Christchurch). Would like to see some innovation in that space and welcome this from the new staff members.

Councillor Gordon noted the positive work of ENC and the high calibre staff that are working for the organisation. Like Councillor Barnett, Councillor Gordon feels inspired by this report. Enjoyed the work with the review of the event funding programme. Would like to see the de-risking of events explored and to explore guarantees against loss. This should be looked at and to see if it is worth having this available for groups. Noted the Kaiapoi Art Expo has now been running for 13 years. There is a role for all types of events in this district and the Council needs to support these. Councillor Gordon supports this report and the Statement of Intent.

Mayor Ayers noted that part of event management is to have appropriate advertising of the ways to drive into Rangiora and using all three ways, not just the one way which is signposted on the motorway.

Mayor Ayers also mentioned the spaces that are available here, and the wide open spaces that are available to spend time in. Suggested it needs to be looked at what we are promoting about our district. Noted that the visitor numbers to our district are significant. Also noted that there are several long running annual events held in the district and a lot of these are self promoting and encourage a lot of visitors from outside the district.

Councillor Doody noted that putting on events is a lot of hard work and there is always just a few people involved in organising these. Regarding the event funding, supports the application process now in place.

6.7 Non-Financial Performance Measures 3rd Quarter Results as at 31 March 2018 – Maria Edgar (Corporate Planner)

Mr J Millward spoke to this report

Councillor Barnett questioned the resolution to wondering stock complaints, which is just 55%. M Harris noted that sometimes the conclusion often comes in late and these often happen out of hours. Information entered in after hours is improving now, though there is still room for improvement.

Councillor Barnett also questioned re measure (top of page 8) and that this is noted as almost met, when it is well outside the criteria. There is some anomalies in the figures provided in this report.

Moved Deputy Mayor Felstead seconded Councillor Atkinson

THAT the Audit and Risk Committee

(a) Receives the report Non-Financial Performance Measures 3rd Quarter Results as at 31 March 2018, Trim No. 180625070106.

CARRIED

Deputy Mayor Felstead noted the concerns of Councillor Barnett and these will be followed up by Mr Palmer for the next update to be provided to the committee.

Councillor Barnett suggested that this is a public report and doesn’t make the Council look particularly good. The expectations of this audit don’t provide a
good commentary in this report. Councillor Barnett would like to see some of these measures expanded out. Has been raising this issue for five years and believes this hasn’t changed. Councillor Barnett will leave this in staff’s hands for this report to actually advise what is happening in the community.

7 PORTFOLIO UPDATES

7.1 Audit, Risk, Long Term Plan and Excellence Programme – Deputy Mayor Kevin Felstead

LTP document has been entered into a SOLGM competition.

7.2 Communications – Councillor Neville Atkinson

Councillor Atkinson advised be through the employment process by mid to end of August for a Communications Team Leader.

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 Councillor Blackie seconded Mayor Ayers

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Minutes/Report of:</th>
<th>General subject of each matter to be considered</th>
<th>Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter</th>
<th>Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>Minutes of the Public Excluded Portion of the Audit and Risk Committee meeting of 22 May 2018</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>10.2</td>
<td>Report of Maree Harris (Customer Service Manager)</td>
<td>Request to Remit Rates</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>Report of Sarah Nichols (Governance Manager)</td>
<td>Insurance Renewal Update for 2018/19</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This resolution is made in reliance on section 48(1)(a) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987, and the particular interest or interests protected by section 6 or section 7 of that Act which would be prejudiced by the holding of the whole or relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Nº</th>
<th>Reason for protection of interests</th>
<th>Ref NZS 9202:2003 Appendix A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.1 – 10.3</td>
<td>Protection of privacy of natural persons</td>
<td>A2(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To carry out commercial activities without prejudice</td>
<td>A2(b)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CARRIED

CLOSED MEETING

Resolution to resume in Open Meeting

Moved Councillor Atkinson seconded Councillor Barnett

THAT open meeting resumes and the business discussed with the public excluded remains public excluded and the recommendations be made public.

CARRIED

OPEN MEETING

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 5.40pm.

CONFIRMED

_________________________
Chairperson

__________________________
Date
**MINUTES OF YOUTH COUNCIL (YC) MEETING**  
Held in the Committee Rooms, Rangiora Service Centre, WDC,  
High Street, Rangiora at 7pm Tuesday 31st July 2018

| 1. | **Present:**  
| | Sam Redman (WDC), Andrew Besuyen (Co-Chair), Arabella Jarman (Co-Chair), Stella Graydon, Ellie Tizzard, Katie Lange, Caitlin Tipping, Aurora Melville, Jacob Harford, Olivia Silby, Alex Jackson, Benya Ickenroth, David Ayers (WDC - Mayor), Dan Gordon (WDC - Councillor), Kirstyn Barnett (WDC - Councillor)  
| 2. | **In Attendance:** Grant Stephens (WDC)  
| 3. | **Apologies:**  
| 4. | **Rangiora Skate Park**  
Grant Stephens  
Grant talked about some of the practicalities and processes of putting together a development plan for the Rangiora Skate Park/Dudley Park area including; planning, presenting to the community boards and going to the community for consultation. He also asked the group to think about their goals and aims, and the following discussion identified that the main aim would be to create a community area where everyone wants to go. The group had a look at some skate park maps and there was a discussion about equipment including; swings, usb tables, speakers, “activating” the space and putting on events.  
After some discussion, David suggested it might be useful to look at the park as a whole and think about how any changes might work in with the bigger picture of Dudley Park itself.  
**ACTIONS:**  
Grant to put together a plan based on the discussion.  
| 5. | **Reports for Discussion**  
**Mayor David Ayers & Councillor Dan Gordon:**  
David informed the youth council about the draft Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan which is currently in progress covering the regeneration zones and buildings in Kaiapoi, as well as the imminent re-opening of Feldwick Drive.  
There was some discussion around water treatment, refuse collection options which are currently out to the public, and the multi-court centre which has some preliminary work underway and a concept plan completed. Work will be started in early 2019 with an estimated finish of 2020.  
David also talked about the student visitors from Hamasaka currently visiting the district.  
Dan mentioned the Waimakariri Winter Festival, and what a great community event it had been. He commended WaiYouth for their presence and participation in the clean-up crew.  
**ACTIONS:**  
-
## 8. Youth Development Strategy

Andrew Besuyen

Andrew presented some key stats from the survey through a powerpoint. The group were interested in the results and look forward to how they might shape the final strategy document.

Sam presented some of the early design documents to the group and there was some discussion about layout with Andrew explaining what had been decided in the strategy meeting earlier that month.

**ACTIONS:**
- Sam to talk to the Typing team to get a template designed.
- Each youth councillor to write a short vision statement for youth development in the Waimakariri.

## 10. General Business

**Hoodies**

Stella provided details on pricing for hoodies including with/without names. The prices came out to approximately $50 per hoodie with an extra $10 per hoodie for a name.

**Youth Awards**

Andrew informed the team about the upcoming youth awards night happening on 31st August.

**WHAG Representative**

Sam explained that the Waimakariri Health Advisory Group had requested a youth representative and asked for volunteers. Benya, Katie and Caitlin all expressed interest.

**Skate Park**

Aurora had an idea at the end of the meeting for a creative area in the skate park which could include paints, crayons and a chalkboard wall.

**ACTIONS:**
- Youth Councillors to tell Sam if they would like a name or not
- Andrew to post in Facebook group chat about attendance.
- Sam to follow up with WHAG and with those who expressed interest.

---

**Meeting closed at 8.30 pm**

**Next meeting** on Tuesday 28 August 2018 at 7pm in the Rakahuri Room, at the Rangiora Service Centre.

_____________________________   _______________________
Chair Date
MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE REGENERATION STEERING GROUP HELD IN THE RUATANIWHA KAIAPOI CIVIC CENTRE ON MONDAY 6 AUGUST 2018 AT 4.00PM

PRESENT:

A Blackie, P Redmond, S Stewart, C Greengrass, J Meyer, M Pinkham, N Atkinson.

Environment Canterbury representative C McKay, J Palmer (Chief Executive), C Sargison (Manager Community and Recreation), D Roxborough (Implementation Project Manager - District Regeneration).

IN ATTENDANCE:

M Flanagan, WDC, K Dwyer, WDC, C Batchelor, WDC.

1. APOLOGIES

An apology was received and sustained from D Ayers, B Blair and J Watson for absence.

Moved: J Meyer Seconded: C Greengrass

CARRIED

2. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Moved: A Blackie Seconded: P Redmond

THAT the Regeneration Steering Group:

Confirms as a true and correct record the minutes of a meeting held on Monday 2 July 2018.

CARRIED

3. MATTERS ARISING

There were no matters arising.

4. DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

4.1 Food Forest Update – Brent Cairns

B Cairns gave a presentation on the Food Forest following from the report that was provided to Council in June. The presentation provided an update on what has taken place in the last nine to ten months.

• 31 August – Treetech Tree removal system was used to relocate 17 fruit trees from the Regeneration area into the Food Forest.
• 16 September – First planting day - Connect Opening Planting Day – 170 trees to plant with a further 80 trees being donated by the community on that day. Around 250 people attended.
• The Corrections Department teams have spent a total of 1100 hours on site which has consisted of the construction of boundaries, spreading of mulch and weeding.
• You, We, Me, Us are now holding events in the Food Forest. There are people donating tools and other equipment, and every week someone would like to donate a tree.
• A Mother’s Day promotion has been held.
• The Christchurch East Community Watch came out and moved 40 cubic metres of mulch.

B Cairns noted one of the most valuable elements of the food forest is education and inspiring our youth to be more involved with growing their own food and learning how to grow food.
There have been over 800 trees and plants donated to the Kaiapoi Food Forest. B Cairns noted the idea is to have an education programme which is a growing element of the Food Forest. It is not just about growing food but also educating. B Cairns noted the first creative seat has been installed to encourage visitors to come in, rest, relax and recharge. There is a solar panel on the roof that provides free power to charge phones.

B Cairns noted You, Me, We, Us have donated raised planter boxes which will be filled with food to make it more accessible for elderly etc.

B Cairns advised there are 71 schools they can target within the Waimakariri district and over 200 in Christchurch that they are proposing to bring to Kaiapoi to explain how the food is grown.

B Cairns commented the Trust is currently planning, in partnership with local iwi, a Rongoa area. The Food Forest would like to set up in time a Pataka, setting up a traditional walkway with punga and are proposing to put in a Pou. This has been all passed through the local Runanga to get their permission.

B Cairns said the Food Forest Trust would like to seek permission from the council at some stage to look at setting up an education centre.

B Cairns advised that the Food Forest report and video will be available on the Food Forest website.

C Sargison noted the report will be formally received at the next month’s meeting in September and after that a link for the report and video can be linked to the council’s website page.

5. **TE KŌHAKA O TŪHAITARA TRUST UPDATE**

N Atkinson advised the Trust are working on the finalisation of some documentation and are currently advertising for staff.

6. **REPORTS**

6.1 **District Regeneration Communications Report – July 2018**

D Roxborough referred to Clause 4.1 on the Feldwick Drive construction. The road opened today for the through traffic. The official opening is scheduled for Saturday 18 August at 10am.

D Roxborough commented that Cathy Batchelor is leaving at the end of August and we are currently recruiting for a new Communications Advisor for the District Regeneration team.

Moved: A Blackie  
Seconded:  C Greengrass  

THAT the Regeneration Steering Group  
(a) Receives report No. 180726083765.  

CARRIED

7. **MINUTES FROM PCG MEETINGS**

7.1 **Kaiapoi River Marine Precinct Project Control Group (PCG) Meeting Minutes – Thursday 5 July 2018**

Received for information.
7.2 District Regeneration Project Control Group (PCG) Meeting Minutes – Thursday 19 July 2018

Received for information.

Moved:  P Redmond       Seconded:  N Atkinson

THAT the Regeneration Steering Group receives the information in items 7.1 – 7.2.

CARRIED

N Atkinson asked if it is necessary to have the word “control” in the name of the meetings and suggested they could be call a Project Group.  N Atkinson said that the name Project Control Group gives an automatic negative message, (to be controlling), and suggested that they just be called “groups”.

8. CORRESPONDENCE

There was no correspondence.

9. GENERAL

There was no general business.

10. NEXT MEETING

The next scheduled meeting of the Regeneration Steering Group commences at 4.00pm on Monday 3 September 2018 at the Ruataniwha Centre, Kaiapoi.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS THE MEETING CLOSED AT 4.26PM.
Minutes: Solid and Hazardous Waste Working Party Meeting held 15 August 2018 in Tawera Room (Farmers Room 9)


**ITEM 1 - Apologies**

Apologies for lateness from Mayor David Ayers and Clr. Dan Gordon.

**ITEM 2 - Confirmation of Minutes**

- **Corrections:**
  - Change from: “This should not only be a staff group but could include, amongst others, the Solid Waste Portfolio Holder” to “This should not only be a staff group but would include, amongst others, the Solid Waste Portfolio Holder”.
  - It was not clear in the minutes that the grace period will be as following: beginning of the contract with a 3 months period with no swap, then a 3 months grace period.

  **Moved as true and correct:** Clr. Doody – Seconded Clr. Brine

**ITEM 3 - Matters arising**

- Email received re: schools allocation of Council recycling bins.
- Clr. Brine met with Gerard and Kitty to discuss KPIs.

  **Probity Officer**

  - Simon informed that the preferred probity auditor is not available to assist with the evaluation of the tenders. Simon is not aware of any other local probity officer. He is consulting with a company from Wellington that has been recommended, and that can supply an independent auditor to certify the integrity of the solid waste tender process. The company initially quoted $25,000 to assist with the whole tender process. A second quote was requested for restricted involvement around the evaluation process only, as Morrison Low is involved with developing the content of the document and Council lawyers are reviewing the document. The second quote came at about $12,000, although a few details remain to be clarified. Staff are asking for the SHWWP for their preference.
  
  Clr. Williams supports the involvement of the probity officer in the evaluation process. Seconded by Clr. Doody.

  **Green waste**

  - Email received re: reducing transportation costs for green waste disposal.
o Clr. Brine asked about the option to chip green waste at the Southbrook resource recovery park (SRRP) prior to transporting the loads to the composting facility. He does not anticipate any space issue with a chipper on site.

o Kitty informed that the Council would need to discuss this option with the contractor operating the site, as there are some health and safety considerations to take into account. Kitty to ask the contractor to discuss an option to chip green waste at the SRRP, to confirm if this could be done safely and cost effectively.

4.15 pm: Mayor arrived.

**Allowing a grace period for bin swaps**

o Clr. Williams would like to clarify from the previous minutes that residents can still opt in during the grace period.

o Kitty confirmed that residents in the collection area can join at any time. If customers decided that they do no longer want the service, they cannot receive any money back for not using the service. This is because the charge is set through targeted rates. The change of service can be actioned at the next financial year. These customers would also need to pay for bins removal that are carried out by the contractor.

o Clr. Brine believed that the Solid and Hazardous Waste Working Party agreed that households would be locked in with the service if they requested rubbish and/or organics bins collections and would not be able to opt out. The reasoning behind this decision/option is that it will ultimately result in a decreased use of rubbish bags, which have been identified and reported as a significant health and safety risk by the waste industry. The “no opt out” option will also provide more certainty to the contractor and Council on risks taking and pricing.

o Gerard said that no information has been released to residents informing them that they would be locked in the service. Simon advised that there is a significant risk associated with locking in residents as they are unaware of the decision. The communication could also be seen as misleading as the slogan is: “Your Choice”.

o The Mayor does not anticipate any change in the number of customers for rentals as usually landlords include the waste disposal costs in the rent, whether there is a change of tenant or not. Elodie said that, during the community engagement process, a number of residents who had previously been using the bins showed eagerness to using bins again, which suggests a commitment to the service.

**ITEM 4 - Report 180802086601: Increase in Transwaste Disposal Charges for Expanded Polystyrene Report**

- Kitty explained that with this report she is safeguarding the Council by banning commercial disposal of non-recyclable polystyrene at the SRRP. This is an interim measure to be enforced before the reviewed bylaw terms and conditions are adopted by Council. Previously a local builder who demolished a building brought a truck and trailer load of non-recyclable polystyrene. It required a significant period of time to dispose of the material by drip feeding it in with other general waste, as density criteria are set for landfill waste disposal. The current disposal rate for non-recyclable polystyrene is $1,556.52 per tonne (excluding GST). Domestic disposal of polystyrene has no impact on waste density and will still be allowed.

- Gerard said that the disposal costs seems excessive, however polystyrene density is very low. Volumes can be significant for a low weight.

**RECOMMENDATION THAT** the Solid & Hazardous Waste Working Party recommends:

**THAT** the Council:
(a) **Receives** report No. 180802086601.

(b) **Approves** limiting acceptance at Southbrook resource recovery park of low density materials such as expanded polystyrene to a “domestic load” which is equivalent to a standard trailer holding up to a volume of 1.7m³ or up to a maximum weight of 40kg as from 8 September 2018.

(c) **Notes** that changing a gate fee after the fee has been adopted through the Long Term Plan process would require Council to undertake some form of consultation which would delay the implementation of such an increase.

(d) **Notes** that expanded polystyrene is not accepted separately at Oxford transfer station and that general waste is charged by volume at this site.

(e) **Notes** that staff will bring a report to Council in October to request approval of changes to the Terms and Conditions of the Solid Waste and Waste Handling Licensing Bylaw 2016, and that maximum limits on acceptance of low density materials will be included in those proposed changes.

"Cler. Doody moved; Cr. (?) Seconded
The recommendation was passed"

**ITEM 5 - Update on engagement**

- Kitty informed that a significant amount of people have informed that the Your Choice communication has been very effective. Council has received 8,940 responses, which is over 50% response yet. Half of responses came via mail and the other half came online. Responses for 7,548 properties haven’t been received yet. 58% want an organics bin, 70% want a rubbish bin and 30% want to retain rubbish bags. Overall, 29% of properties in the collection area have selected an organics collection and 35% selected a rubbish bin collection service.

- A text / email will be sent to those who haven’t replied yet to ask for their feedback. There will also be ads on the usual media and a stand at the Rangiora A&P show.

- Council will put their best guess in for the tender document. There will be bands of bin numbers to be collected that the tenderer will be required to price.

- Kitty has done a sensitivity analysis. If we have a low percentage of customers wanting the service, we may need one truck for each waste stream. In this case, the cost will be reasonable. If two trucks are required for collections, the cost will be more significant. With a 35% intake, the annual cost is $143.50, $18.50 more than our advertised rate.

- Gerard informed that there are still some uncertainties until the successful tenderer is awarded the contract. If there was a significant difference with costs that have been estimated by Council, the Council would have to consider whether:
  1. the services are too expensive for Council and as a result Council decides that they do no longer want to offer the service
  2. Council accept the price, update residents and ask them if they still want to opt in.

**ITEM 6 - Update on contract**

- Kitty informed that the second draft of the contract document is being reviewed by Simon and herself. They are also reviewing the payment schedule and will provide feedback to Morrison Low by the end of next week. The RFP will be loaded on Tenderlink by 30 August 2018. Morrison Low have informed that a number of solid waste contracts are out at the moment.
(i.e. Queenstown Lakes, Hastings and Napier) and that contractors may request extensions to submit their tender.

- Gerard informed that there were no concerns about timeframes during the contractor briefing sessions.

**ITEM 7 - Key points from contract document**

- There will be a reference to Tā Mātou Mauri in the contract document, as Council highly values a great customer service.
- Probity auditor: see discussion earlier. It is agreed that they will be involved at a targeted level / reduced scope.

**New Vehicles**

- Clr. Williams asked the reason for the need of new vehicles. He had concerns about excluding some contractors from tendering due to the new trucks clause. He believes this could impact on the overall contract costs and will not result in an optimised cost-effective service for Council. Clr. Williams informed that older trucks do not necessarily result in more maintenance as new trucks can be faulty (e.g. FENZ’s vehicles). He recommends that the contract requires a contingency plan and stipulates that the contractor needs to collect bins regardless of truck break downs.
  - Kitty replied that tenderers can submit alternative bids. The reasoning is based on maintenance. Clr. Brine informed that the contract is based on 7 years (+1+1+1) based on assets and trucks’ lifespan.
  - Clr. Meyer said that cost will be identical whether the truck is purchased at the beginning of the contract or later on, as contractors price the running of the trucks. A new truck that breaks down will be under warranty and will not affect the cost of the contract. Trucks would have to be purchased during the contract if not new at the start of the contract. Depreciation would then be over a limited number of years.
  - The Mayor recommends to wait until submission of the tenders. Rubbish trucks will be somewhat complex as they will require hoists to lift bags. However, these trucks are used in Selwyn, maybe elsewhere. There may be trucks available.
  - Gerard said that Council wants smart looking trucks as they hold our branding, and also wants reliability. The industry usually requires new trucks. Questions were asked around trucks lifespan and life of contract during the briefing sessions. No contractor raised this as an issue during the briefings.

4.55 pm: Clr. Dan Gordon arrived.

- Clrs. Stewart, Doody and Gordon agree with the requirement of new trucks. Clr. Gordon said that the depreciation of vehicle would be based over a 7 year period.
- The Mayor said that part of the tendering process is to assess the capacity of the tenderers to meet the contract requirements. Some contractors are just too small to bid.
- Gerard suggested to gain feedback from contractors on this issue as we are still currently in an interactive stage.
- Clrs. Brine and Meyer want presentable trucks.
- Clr. Brine summarised that the majority approves the new trucks.
- The Mayor said that if trucks were not new, a process (i.e. independent assessment) would be needed to assess their condition. Kitty to send an email asking contractors: “We are looking at new kerbside collection vehicles. Is this an issue?”
Gerard informed that depending on the number of bins serviced, there might need additional trucks at some stage. Do they need to be new? Kitty to discuss the wording with Morrison Low.

Kitty said that currently collections in the district are made by a driver-owned vehicle, kept to a high standard.

Clr. Brine recommended a penalty/bonus system related to vehicle break down.

KPIs

Simon informed the contract will include short-term KPIs such as customer satisfaction and long-term KPIs (reviewed quarterly or annually) that will be the base for contract renewal decisions.

Gerard said that contractors were informed that Council wants a smooth implementation of the services. Internal discussions have suggested the provision of incentives to the contractor to encourage this. KPIs are developed to hold the contractor all over the contract and will be finalised with the successful contractor.

Clr. Doody supported this.

Kitty informed that the KPIs for missed bins will be changed to “no more than 10 missed bins per year”. The contract will include clauses for early start areas, such as CBD, commuter routes, schools areas.

Clr. Meyer asked if Council could revise their communications as part of the new contract and require service users to have their bins out by 6.30 am for collections starting at 7 am. Kitty replied that Council probably needs to communicate more on this issue.

Simon informed that KPIs will be reviewed in relation to vehicles reliability, although the Table on Page 3 of the Contract Key Points document includes a reference to bins/bags not being collected on collection day. Kitty said that the contractor will submit a contingency plan to ensure collection gets done as part of the contract requirements.

Gerard advised to review the document to ensure we have provisions for a consistent underperformance, e.g. truck breaking down every month.

Proposed assessment criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Definition (not limited to the following)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Health and Safety 15 | Health and Safety Management Systems  
Health and Safety Track Record  
Methodology for completing the project safely. |
| Capacity 15 | Company structure  
Insurance  
Resources  
Key personnel  
Management systems |
| Capability 25 | Experience with:  
Kerbside collection of refuse, recyclables and organics (although not all Proposers are expected to have had prior experience collecting organics) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solution 15</th>
<th>Operation of transfer stations, resource recovery centres or other similar waste facilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kerbside collections – methodologies for:</td>
<td>- Bins manufacture, delivery, maintenance. Management of bin stocks, RFID.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Planning of kerbside collection services, including assisted services, early starts, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Requests management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Transport of waste to disposal facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility operations – methodologies for:</td>
<td>- Facilities running</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Service users education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Diversion of materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Receipt and processing of scrap metal, tyres, child car seats and LPG bottles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Handling money</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Risk sharing for recyclables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Key access to cleanfill pit management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Reuse Shop operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Community Group involvement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Price 30</th>
<th>Schedule of price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- Gerard informed that attributes are limited to 30% for price as price always drive the outcome otherwise. Gerard also said that there is a high bar on health and safety, similar to Council construction contracts. He asked for Council’s feedback: is Council prepared to pay a bit more for a great service?

Everyone agrees with the overall attributes weighing.

- **Risk share**

- Kitty explained that there are still some uncertainties with bag collections payments. The payment schedule could be service per property or per sold bag sold, although none will reflect the collected number of bags. At this stage, Council is not sure it can completely rely on the contractor to supply the number of collected bags as this is more difficult to record and report on compared to bin-lifts.

- Simon informed that some risks exist with bin supply. At the beginning of the contract, it is expected that some residents will request the service. A bin stock is necessary; the initial risk currently sits with the Council. Later on, this risk will transfer to the contractor. Kitty explained that the contractor needs to keep a certain stock for growth in the district, which is based on previous experience and district growth projections. When a certain level is reached, the contractor will need to order more bins.

- Clr. Williams expressed concerns about underestimated tonnages from kerbside collections, the subsequent impact on service costs and the risk ownership for this. He does not want ratepayers to end up partially paying for a service they do not use. Gerard replied that the risk is for both parties. The contractor would be impacted as a higher tonnage would result in more frequent trips to empty the trucks. Council would pay higher disposal/processing costs due to greater than expected tonnages. Gerard explained that these figures have been evaluated based on other councils’ experience – the best information we have available. If such an issue arose, staff would go back to the Solid and Hazardous Waste Working Party and to Council. This would be reviewed as part of Council process (e.g. annual plan).
There will be a risk share on recyclables to incentivise the contractor to divert recyclables, as discussed at the previous meeting.

A contractor’s risk lies with the number of properties and number of bins to collect. Kitty informed that we could include a map of the potential collection areas. Tenderers could provide rates for extension to new areas. For example, collecting in Ashley may be easy but collecting in more remote areas may cost more. The pricing schedule is being prepared with different bands (of number of bins, e.g. less than 10,000; 10,000 to 15,000; over 15,000 bins) for the contractor to provide a rate for each band. Gerard explained that the contractor may reach a new band as the number of properties with bins increases over time or when a new area is added. More bins means more economies of scale but up to an optimised level. After this, additional trucks will be needed. The band structure gives both parties more certainty on future payments. Simon referred to the need of an explicit mechanism in the contract to identify these new areas. The Mayor referred to some major growth area in Woodend and Clr. Gordon referred to Mandeville, which are natural extension areas.

The draft contract currently allows for the contractor to lease some of the transfer stations area for commercial use. Clr. Williams recommends some provision that Council allows lease of space as long as Council does not need the space. Clr. Brine expressed concerns about the contractor maintaining the site up to a standard (e.g. appearance) that is acceptable to the Council. Gerard advised that the contract should include a clause that refers to no negative impact on Council services, at the discretion of the Council.

5.50 pm: Clr. Brine leaves.

The draft document currently provides a list of minimal level of technology required. Kitty suggests to change this to the outcomes that Council is seeking with the contract, e.g. contractor to be able to provide information on where trucks are and have been, where bags/bins are not out, monitors bins that have been emptied with contamination. Clr. Gordon asked about the numbers of requests for missed bags/bins. Elodie to ask Customer Service whether all calls are recorded, e.g. bin not out.

The draft contract allows for more education from the contractor, in support of Council’s education.

Only one community group has expressed some interest in being involved with reuse at the Southbrook ReUse shop, and this was Wanaka Wastebusters who would support a local group. Gerard informed that the contract would be written along the lines that the contractor will run the shop and there will be a provision in the contract for the contractor to be able to work with a group in the future.

ITEM 8 - General business

MP Angie Warren-Clark is proposing a select committee hearing on food waste in New Zealand and a private members bill around food waste which may include a national strategy with targets. The MP is proposing a private members bill around food waste, may be similar to what is happening in France where supermarkets are no longer allowed to throw away food.

Clr. Doody recommends that no bags be allowed for collections in new subdivisions, only bins. The Mayor disagrees with this as some new subdivision residents may come from within the district and want to keep on using bags. Clr. Gordon believes new subdivisions property owners should have similar rights to those in the rest of the district and be able to opt in. Clr. Williams believes that bag collections allow for local competition.

Meeting closed at 6.05 pm
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES OF THE DISTRICT PLANNING AND REGULATION COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA ON TUESDAY 21
AUGUST 2018 1.00PM.

PRESENT
Councillor D Gordon (Chair), Mayor D Ayers, Councillors N Atkinson, W Doody, J Meyer
and S Stewart.

IN ATTENDANCE
Councillors A Blackie, P Williams, K Barnett and K Felstead.
J Palmer (Chief Executive), N Harrison (Manager Regulation), M Bacon (Team Leader
Resource Consents), W Taylor (Building Unit Manager), B Wiremu (Emergency
Management Advisor), S Stevenson (ESU Acting Manager), S Markham (Manager Strategy
and Engagement), T Ellis (Development Planning Manager), B Bray (Principal Policy
Planner) A Benbrook (Development Planning Administrator), C Wood (Senior Policy
Planner), A Willis (Planner), J Manhire (Policy Planner), P Kloosterman (Senior Policy
Planner), K Pierson (Communications Consultant) and E Stubbs (Minute Secretary).

1. APOLOGIES
There were no apologies.

2. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
There were no conflicts of interest.

3. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES
3.1 Minutes of a meeting of the District Planning and Regulation
Committee held on 19 June 2018
Moved J Meyer seconded W Doody

THAT the District Planning and Regulation Committee:

(a) Confirms as a true and correct record the minutes of a meeting of
the District Planning and Regulation Committee held on 19 June
2018.

CARRIED

4. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES
There were no matters arising.

5. DEPUTATION
There was no deputation.
6. REPORTS

6.1 Annual Report to the Alcohol Regulatory and Licensing Authority 2018 – Malcolm Johnston (Environmental Services Manager)

N Harrison spoke to the report noting that the statistics from the previous year to this year were similar, which reflected reasonably mature business across the district. The report reported on the activity of the District Licencing Committee (DLC) and the performance of the Local Alcohol Policy (LAP). N Harrison noted that there was currently a review of the LAP and that would be brought back to Council in the future.

N Harrison noted there was an increasing trend in the number of DLC hearings which he suggested was a reflection of the community’s acceptance of the wider alcohol policy, and growing confidence in the DLC as a means for matters to be heard.

There was a recommendation for change to Section 25 of the Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act where it related to Special Licence events. It was believed the restrictions were unworkable for low risk events such as fairs and fetes.

Regarding the recent review of the Local Alcohol Policy and Alcohol Control Bylaw, it has been established that there was no conflict of interest for those Councillors on the hearing panel that are also members of the District Licencing committee. N Atkinson advised that when the review of the LAP report is considered by Council, these members would be able to take part in the discussion, however they would abstain from voting. In addition there was no conflict of interest in today’s report as the recommendation was to approve an activity report.

N Atkinson agreed that the DLC process was starting to work. People were aware they had powers around the control of alcohol and he raised the Silverstream off-licence application as an example. Community input to the development of the LAP provided a guide for where the district wanted premises selling alcohol to be.

N Atkinson commented that he was interested in feedback from ARLA to see what the rest of the country was doing and whether the process was working for them, he believed that in the Waimakariri District, the legislation was working.

K Barnett noted the reference to ‘mums and dads’ in the report and suggested that should be generalised. N Harrison agreed.

Moved N Atkinson seconded W Doody

THAT the District Planning and Regulation Committee

(a) Receives report No. 180731085418.
(b) Approves the attached 2017 2018 Report to ARLA.
(c) Circulates a copy of this report to the Boards.

CARRIED

N Atkinson acknowledged the help of staff who were extremely active with the DLC and ARLA in this role. There was great liaison between ARLA, DLC and public inspectors.
W Doody concurred and appreciated the help of staff.

D Gordon agreed with the comments made, and supported the report. In addition he believed that they were well served by the District Licencing Committee. Feedback from the community was that N Atkinson as Chair had a good common sense approach.

K Barnett was pleased that the comments related to Section 25 and low risk community fundraisers had been included.

D Ayers commented that at a recent opening of a licensed facility he had received positive feedback regarding the assistance of Council staff.

6.2 Annual Report: Dog Control 2017/2018 – Malcolm Johnston (Environmental Services Manager)

N Harrison advised that the Dog Control report was an annual statutory requirement and summarised statistics regarding animal control officer’s work through the year. The report would be forwarded to the Department of Internal Affairs (DIA).

There was an increasing trend in the number of dogs and dog owners which reflected district growth. The number of complaints for barking and roaming dogs was the same as previous years. There had been one prosecution relating to a dog attack on a girl in the Good Street Reserve.

K Barnett noted that there had been a decrease in the reports of roaming and barking dogs and asked as dog numbers had been increasing would it not be expected those numbers stay the same and was it a reflection of the public having lost faith in reporting? N Harrison did not think so. There had been a decreasing trend since microchipping was introduced in 2005 and it had become easier to identify a dog’s owner and address so matters could be addressed quickly. K Barnett commented that would still involve reporting a dog and N Harrison replied that it was the same message about increasing responsible dog ownership.

W Doody referred to messaging regarding lost dogs on Facebook and once dog owners were located were they asked to pay for microchipping? N Harrison replied yes, dog owners were required to pay for the microchip. In addition, where dog owners could not be located, Facebook was a successful means of rehoming dogs.

S Stewart asked if there were issues with dual microchip databases in particular in the case of injured animals that needed vet attention. N Harrison advised that they did not have direct access to secondary databases, however they could call a vet clinic to access. In the case of an injured animal staff would not wait and seek vet assistance immediately.

Mayor Ayers asked if it were possible to drill down into the statistics to see how many complaints were related to individual dogs. N Harrison was not sure how easy it was to extract that figure. The focus should be on recidivist owners.
Moved N Atkinson seconded J Meyer

THAT the District Planning and Regulation Committee recommends:

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180704074535.

(b) Approves the attached 2017/2018 Annual Report on Dog Control to the Department of Internal Affairs.

(c) Circulates a copy of this report to the Boards.

CARRIED

N Atkinson believed from feedback from the community and from viewing the work of the three animal controllers in the district that there was no question that there had been in an improvement in animal control. In the past he had been critical of the work that was being done however there had been significant improvements and he congratulated staff on those improvements and the care they took of animals.

J Meyer agreed with N Atkinson, he had had experience with the staff as a dog owner. The statistics showed animal control was improving.

7. PORTFOLIO UPDATES

7.1 District Planning Development - Councillor Neville Atkinson

N Atkinson commented that updates would be covered by the team in the upcoming briefing.

7.2 Regulation and Civil Defence – Councillor John Meyer

Councillor John Meyer noted the reports related to regulation covered in the meeting.

Councillor John Meyer referred to the recent Civil Defence exercise and the challenges that were involved. He commented that addressing those issues that arose, and how they were handled, was the purpose of the exercise.

Mayor Ayers advised that Les Pester was in the process of retiring. He acknowledged the service of Les Pester in Civil Defence in the district over many years and noted that he had been the Regulatory Manager at Waimakariri District Council also. Civil Defence had been taken to a new level when he had taken on the role and he was recognised throughout the community as one of the leaders. During the earthquakes he had played an important role in checking buildings. D Gordon suggested that Les Pester be invited to a District Planning and Regulation Committee in order that his service to the district be formally acknowledged.

7.3 Business, Promotion and Town Centres – Councillor Dan Gordon

D Gordon advised that all Service Level Agreements with Promotions Associations had been signed and returned. He had attended a number of Promotions Association meetings as well as meeting the previous week to explore the possibility of a Promotions Association for Ravenswood/Pegasus/Woodend. The idea was in its early stages. D Gordon had advised that existing groups including community associations should be respected and involved.
D Gordon noted there had been a number of recent successful events highlighting The Kaiapoi Art Expo, Blackwell’s Fire and Ice, Waimakariri Winter Festival and Oxford Light Festival. He noted the recent appointment of Vanessa Thompson as Business and Centres Advisor, working with Simon Hart.

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 1.31pm.

CONFIRMED

______________________
Chairperson

______________________
Date

- **Briefing**
  - *At the conclusion of the meeting there was a briefing to the Committee. A separate agenda was circulated for this. Speakers were:*
    - W Taylor (Building Unit Manager)
    - M Bacon (Team Leader Resource Consents)
    - B Wiremu (Emergency Management Advisor)
    - S Stevenson (ESU Acting Manager)
    - B Bray (Principal Policy Planner)
    - A Willis (Planner)
    - C Wood (Senior Policy Planner)
    - P Kloosterman (Senior Policy Planner)
MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF THE RANGIORA-ASHLEY COMMUNITY BOARD
HELD IN THE WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL CHAMBERS, RANGIORA SERVICE CENTRE, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA ON WEDNESDAY 8 AUGUST 2018 AT 7PM.

PRESENT
J Gerard QSO (Chair), D Lundy (Deputy Chair), K Barnett, R Brine, M Clarke, K Galloway, D Gordon, J Hoult, S Lewis, G Miller, C Prickett and P Williams.

IN ATTENDANCE
J Millward (Manager Finance and Business Support), J Palmer (Chief Executive), G Cleary (Manager Utilities and Roading), Joanne McBride (Roading and Transport Manager), Kalley Simpson (3Waters Manager), C Brown (Greenspace Manager), E Cordwell (Governance Adviser) and Emma Stubbs (Minutes Secretary).

1 APOLOGIES
There were no apologies.

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
There were no conflicts of interest.

3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES
3.1 Minutes of the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board – 11 July 2018
Moved K Galloway seconded D Gordon
THAT the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board:
(a) Confirms the circulated minutes of the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board meeting, held on 11 July 2018, as a true and accurate record.

CARRIED

4 MATTERS ARISING
There were no matters arising.

5 DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS
There were no deputations.

6 ADJOURNED BUSINESS
There was no adjourned business.

7 REPORTS
7.1 Application to the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board's Discretionary Grant Fund 2018/2019 – Edwina Cordwell (Governance Adviser)
E Cordwell spoke to the report commenting that she had continued to seek further information and clarification including financial information, Expo details, group status and membership information for All About Bees. The application had been in process for a considerable amount of time and it was not appropriate to delay further given that the proposed event was due to take place on 2 September.
Initially the group advised that they were a new group and did not appear to meet the Grant Eligibility Criteria. A letter was sent advising of this. Following emails and queries, staff met with the group member making the application and the club president to help with clarification of a range of matters. Time was spent talking through the application and the grant criteria.

The group submitted a further application but this was still limited in the information provided regarding membership and also on the Expo itself as well as the status of the group. Financial information was limited and extremely informal. E Cordwell advised that a range of other projects had been mentioned which could result in further applications for Community Board grants, subject to the eligibility of the group itself. For example a project associated with the Kaiapoi Food Forest. The group was based in Kaiapoi and had now advised that they had been active for two years and that the majority of the group members were based in the Rangiora Ashley ward, hence this application.

From discussions it emerged that The Bee Expo would have eight speakers whose expenses would be paid in some way. The entrance fee was $50 per person. The following year the intention was to hold an international event.

A copy of the group’s constitution had not been received, however the group said that it had a President, Secretary and Treasurer. It was not apparent how those outside the bee community would benefit from the Expo. The financial spreadsheet provided was basic.

G Miller suggested the nature of the event was a Seminar not an Expo. E Cordwell noted that it was now being marketed as a Conference. C Prickett advised there was further information regarding the event on Facebook.

D Gordon suggested that it was possible for a new group to partner with another organisation (umbrella) in order to be eligible for a grant. E Cordwell advised that she had included this in her letter at the outset to assist the group in achieving eligibility for grant funding. The group was not affiliated with the North Canterbury Bee Club which is based in Hurunui. E Cordwell had also spoken to C Brown (Greenspace Manager) and H Warwick (CEO Enterprise North Canterbury) regarding options and other avenues that could be available to the group.

Moved K Galloway seconded J Gerard

**THAT** the Rangiora–Ashley Community Board:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180726083751.

(b) **Declines** the application from All About Bees.

**CARRIED**

K Galloway believed that the Expo was a commercial operation. The $50 charge per head would limit the number of people who could attend. He did not believe the application met the criteria.

J Gerard did not see the benefit to the community as stated in the criteria other than to those who would participate. The average member of the community would not participate at $50 per head. The criteria did not allow for commercial applications or the funding of speakers. Declining the application would not prohibit the group from coming back at another time for a genuine purpose.

C Prickett believed the application was disorganised, however an increase in the number of bees would have a positive effect and suggested that was beneficial. He would cautiously support.

D Lundy commented that the environmental aspect of the application ticked boxes especially considering the number of lifestyle blocks in the Ward. The Board should be supportive of bee keeping as a hobby. He suggested that
spending $50 on a key interest was modest in comparison with other events, and disagreed with the argument that it was prohibitive.

D Gordon concurred with D Lundy. He understood the concerns regarding the application however the partnering with an umbrella organisation would alleviate those issues. He believed the Expo was worth supporting and commented that $50 was not a lot for those participating. The group was only asking for $500. He was very supportive of the concept and believed it was a shame there was not another group as an umbrella organisation. He would encourage the group to return.

K Barnett referred to the Facebook page which advertised the South Island Bee Conference on 2 September 2018. Whilst the application was for a good cause, and she recognised the importance of bees, there were concerns around the application. The reason for declining was that there needed to be a certain level of accountability in order to be able to grant funds. She would welcome future applications from the group and continued staff advice to the group on how they get help for their applications.

G Miller was in favour of the cause and would like to support, however he noted the concerns regarding the application.

J Millward commented that the group had not provided enough information for the Board to be comfortable that the grant was safeguarded. He understood the application was for a good cause but the group had provided no constitution nor financial statement of accounts. The use of public money could not be assured.

K Galloway highlighted the comments of J Millward. As the application did not meet the Grant Criteria the Board had no choice but to decline.

8 CORRESPONDENCE

The letter regarding the Council’s decisions in relation to the Board’s submission to the Draft Long Term Plan 2018-2028 (Trim 180806088270), as previously circulated, was noted and tabled.

9 CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT

9.1 Chair’s Diary for July 2018

Moved J Gerard seconded P Williams

THAT the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 180730084872.

CARRIED

J Gerard advised that he had attended the Winter Festival and commented that it had been an outstanding and well run event that was good for the community.

K Galloway suggested the Board write to the Festival organisers to acknowledge and compliment them on the success of the event.

J Gerard suggested that the Board also write to the Rangiora High School’s Rugby team to congratulate them on their first win against Christchurch Boys’ High.

10 MATTERS FOR INFORMATION

10.1 Oxford-Ohoka Community Board meeting minutes – 5 July 2018 (Trim No. 180628071750).
10.2 **Woodend-Sefton Community Board meeting minutes – 9 July 2018** (Trim No. 180703073671).

10.3 **Library Update – Report to Community and Recreation Committee 24 July 2018** (Trim No 180706075217).

Moved D Lundy seconded J Hoult

**THAT** the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board receives the information in items 10.1-10.3.

**CARRIED**

11 **MEMBERS’ INFORMATION EXCHANGE**

11.1 **M Clarke**

- Referred to the Flaxton Road upgrade and suggested the path should go to the west not the east side due to the location of the ditch and businesses. This had been referred to staff as part of the submission process.
- Attended Waimakariri Health Advisory Group meeting. They were still sorting out structure. Looking at improving point of contact for school students to access services more easily including mental health services. There were some issues with current access methods.

11.2 **J Hoult**

- Was attending upcoming LGNZ Zone 5 Community Board meeting on Friday 31 August 2018. She had been asked to present on the work of the Board with regard to Hegan Reserve and the LGNZ Excellence Awards’ submission.
- Timebank - provided a reminder of what Timebank was. The group organising was a volunteer committee and in the past 18 months had created a policy document, Facebook Page, website, applied to be an Incorporated Society, had a bank account, sought legal advice and investigated funding applications. COGs had funded $8,000 for a pilot project of how Timebank could work in the wider district. Presbyterian Support were providing positive support including a mentor and office space as they believed in investing in social capital.
- Neighbourhood Support - Working with Civil Defence regarding the response to flood exercise. Noted the importance of ‘Get Ready’ to help in an emergency.
- Te Reo – was now able to recite her whakapapa correctly in a formal setting and recommended that others take the opportunities offered to learn.

11.3 **S Lewis**

- Attended Kaiapoi Art Expo where there was a great turnout.
- Attended Kaiapoi Winter Dance – good fundraiser.
- Attended Mainpower Hockey Turf naming afternoon.
- The second learner driver mentoring course had started with 15 students. The first course had been a great success

11.4 **G Miller**
- Attended Waimakariri Zone Committee (WZC) meeting. Disappointed with how the meeting was conducted, there did not seem to be full support from the farming community.
- Attracted debate on Neighbourly with comments defending rates increase.
- Flaxton Road consultation process – working with Keep Rangiora Beautiful to improve the whole area of Flaxton Road through to Fernside Road.

11.5 **C Prickett**
- Noted positive feedback for new carpark at Milton Dog Park.

11.6 **P Williams**
- Congratulated organisers of Kaiapoi Art Expo, it was a good event for the community.

11.7 **K Barnett**
- Provided update on report to Council regarding speed limit reduction for Rangiora-Woodend Road and feeder roads. The Council agreed to refer the report firstly to the community boards for feedback before going to consultation.
- Attended Hope Community Trust information evening. Encouraged board members to view their website, foh.org.nz, which explained the work of the trust. They had recently opened an Op shop.

11.8 **D Gordon**
- Attended a number of events noted by other members.
- Attended Chamber Gallery presentation of Write On Magazine to young writers in the district who had contributed poems to the magazine through a young writers’ event. Commented that it was great to see that recognition.
- Attended meeting with artist Joel Hart and FOD building owner in Conway Lane regarding a mural for the lane sponsored by Waimakariri Arts Trust. The artist was the one who completed the work on Rangiora EyeCare.
  J Hoult queried if the Public Art Trust had been established and would the mural need to go through that process? D Gordon advised that it had been discussed with C Sargison (Community and Recreation Manager) who had advised that only the building owner’s consent was required. The trust was not yet legally established. If the Board wished to see the design he was happy to bring the proposal to the Board. A number of board members noted that would like to see the proposal.
- Attended WZC meeting and commented that there were big challenges ahead that required common sense and negotiated outcomes. The round the table discussion had been more positive.
- Advised that the Friends of the Town Hall AGM was Thursday 9 August.

11.9 **D Lundy**
- Attended Civil Defence exercise.
- Attended WZC meeting and noted there was tension between parties around the issues.
- Attended Rangiora Airfield meeting.
17.9 **K Galloway**
- Attended WZC meeting and believed it was unprofessionally led.
- Noted injury at Milton Dog Park. There was an upcoming meeting of Friends of Rangiora Dog Park.
- Attended Rangiora Winter Festival.

17.10 **R Brine**
- Solid and Hazardous Waste Working Party – the Waste Management and Minimisation Plan had been approved by Council. It was a six yearly document that linked in with the Long Term Plan.

12 **CONSULTATION PROJECTS**

**Flaxton Road**
Consultation closes Monday 20 August 2018.
https://www.waimakariri.govt.nz/have-a-say/lets-talk/consultations/flaxton-road

E Cordwell noted the Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan was now out for consultation.

13 **BOARD FUNDING UPDATE**

13.1 **Board Discretionary Grant**
Balance as at 1 August 2018: $9,990 plus estimated carry forward of $1,917.

13.2 **General Landscaping Fund**
Balance as at 1 August 2018: $26,160 (including carry forward).

14 **MEDIA ITEMS**

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

*Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987*

Moved J Gerard, seconded D Gordon

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

**CARRIED**

The general subject of each matter to be considered while the public is excluded, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter and the specific grounds under section 48(1) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution, are as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Minutes/Report of:</th>
<th>General subject of each matter to be considered</th>
<th>Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter</th>
<th>Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>Minutes of the Public excluded portion of the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board meeting of 11 July 2018.</td>
<td>Confirmation of Minutes</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Reason for protection of interests</th>
<th>Ref NZS 9202:2003 Appendix A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>To carry out commercial activities without prejudice</td>
<td>A2(b)ii</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CLOSE MEETING**

See Public Excluded Agenda (blue papers)

**OPEN MEETING**

16 **QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS**

There were no questions under standing orders.

17 **URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDERS**

There was no general business.

**NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting of the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board is scheduled for 7pm, Wednesday 12 September 2018 in the Council Chambers at the Rangiora Service Centre.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 7.47pm.
Briefing

- Jim Palmer (Chief Executive) and Joanne McBride (Roading and Transport Manager) – Festive Lights.

  A briefing is not open to the Public.

Workshop

- Chris Brown (Community and Greenspace Manager) – General Landscaping Fund.

  The workshop was postponed to September.

- Members Forum
MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF THE OXFORD-OHOKA COMMUNITY BOARD HELD IN THE OHOKA COMMUNITY HALL, MILL ROAD, OHOKA ON THURSDAY 9 AUGUST 2018 AT 7.05PM.

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

IN ATTENDANCE
S Nichols (Governance Manager), S Markham (Manager Strategy & Engagement), K Simpson (3Waters Manager) and Mayor Ayers.

Four members of the public were present in the gallery.

1 APOLOGIES
Moved J Ensor seconded T Robson
An apology was received and sustained from Mark Brown for absence.
CARRIED

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
Nil.

3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES
3.1 Minutes of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board – 5 July 2018
Moved K Felstead seconded J Ensor
THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:
(a) Confirms the circulated minutes of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board meeting, held 5 July 2018, as a true and accurate record.
CARRIED

4 MATTERS ARISING
S Nichols confirmed that Canterbury Landscape Supplies had withdrawn their original consent application with the Council related to their Diversion Road operation. The Environment Canterbury consent matter was before the Environment Court.

5 DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS
Nil.

6 ADJOURNED BUSINESS
Nil.
7 REPORTS
7.1 Mandeville Flood Works Update – Kalley Simpson (3 Waters Manager)

K Simpson spoke to the report, providing an overview of the various areas and explained several peer reviewed reports had been combined. The proposals were currently at a high level and the end solutions may be a combination of identified options and these would be clarified during the detailed investigation phase.

K Simpson provided an update to the proposed timetable of works.

Sillano Place works were budgeted for the current financial year (2018/19) and staff were currently in the planning phase, with works likely to start in the new year.

Wetherfield Lane / Roscrea Place had stage two works programmed for 2019/20. Stage one work occurred shortly after the last flood occurrence. The report identified a number of maintenance areas were required to be attended to, however the undercurrent is flowing and the undercurrent level needs to drop and the area dry before further works can occur. Some maintenance works were programmed for the current financial year.

Three options were outlined for Wetherfield Lane / Roscrea Place / McHughs Road and the timelines will be investigation in 2020/21, design during 2021/22 and construction during 2022/23 financial years.

D Nicholl referred to figure 3 of the report and queried the Eyre River diversion. K Simpson explained the investigation options considered to date and commented on the No.10 Road diversions may involve work as a result of investigation so more investment may be required.

J Lynn referred to figure 3 of the report (No.10/Tram Road diversion) querying water flow. K Simpson explained the capacity and flow of the water, commenting on the advantages the proposed works would have on No.10 Road. It was explained the information is at a high level, acknowledging Mandeville Road is the first 'choke' point. It was explained the works would be staged over three years, involving detailed planning, investment and implementation. Staff would be ensuring through the planning phase that issues were not shifted to another area and would be working to mitigate the flood impact to the overall area.

D Nicholl commented that the system can cope with stormwater or the high undercurrent, but it cannot currently cope with both water flows at the same time. He reflected on past water flows and flooding history of various pockets of the area, past ideas and the reasons for the review process going forward.

J Ensor offered some suggestions for No.10/Tram Road area, which were noted by staff. K Simpson referred to figure 2 of the report and the proposal of a primary flow path and overflow for high capacity. The culvert depth on No.10 Road was discussed and would be reviewed as it its suitability to handle water flow.

J Ensor commented on the Eyre River Channel and peak loading, offering suggestions for consideration. Staff acknowledged the area has some challenges, including some property owners possibly undertaking work without consultation with the Regional Council. K Simpson commented on areas that had been drained swamps and diversions into larger rivers, however the cost and land owner negotiations may be required going forward.
 THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 180727084111.

(b) Notes that improvement works will be undertaken in the Siena Place / Sillano Place area and Red Fern Lane area in the 2018/19 financial year.

(c) Notes that improvement works are proposed for the Wetherfield Lane / Roscrea Place area and Whites Road area in the 2019/20 and 2020/21 financial years.

(d) Notes that investigation on a diversion of the resurgent flow path will commence in 2020/21, with design in 2021/22 and construction in 2022/23.

(e) Circulates this report to the Utilities and Roading Committee.

CARRIED

J Ensor stated that this year the undercurrent had high water levels and cautioned diverting too much water into the Eyre Cut because of wider impacts when higher rainfall or larger weather event occurs. He held some concern on the timetabling of future works, but acknowledged a programme of serious works needed to move forward.

D Nicholl commented on any Mandeville overflow moving to the Ohoka area and the importance of mitigation to be looked at in a wider context of diversion options. He acknowledged the flood mitigation work had been brought forward several years in the Council Long Term Plan.

J Lynn said that it was best to take some time in the planning phase to do the project once, but to do it right.

8 CORRESPONDENCE

 Moved S Farrell seconded J Lynn

 THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) Receives the tabled letter from the Council on the Board’s submission to the Long Term Plan.

CARRIED

S Farrell queried the Christmas flags and the traffic management and the Pearson Park entranceway sealing. It was suggested a memo from staff would respond to the queries raised.

9 CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT

9.1 Chairperson’s Report for July 2018

 Moved K Felstead seconded S Farrell

 THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) Receives report No 180730084838.

CARRIED
10 MATTERS FOR INFORMATION

10.1 Rangiora-Ashley Community Board meeting minutes – 11 July 2018 (Trim No. 180628071844).

10.2 Kaiapoi Tuahiwi Community Board meeting minutes – 18 June 2018 (Trim No. 180618067116).

10.3 Woodend-Sefton Community Board meeting minutes – 9 July 2018 (Trim No. 180703073671).

10.4 Library Update – report to Community and Recreation Committee 24 July 2018 (Trim No 180706075217).


10.7 Adoption of Stormwater Drainage and Watercourse Protection Bylaw 2018 – report to Council 1 May 2018 (Trim No 180329034013).


Moved T Robson  seconed D Nicholl

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

CARRIED

11 MEMBERS’ INFORMATION EXCHANGE

The purpose of this exchange is to provide a short update to other members in relation to activities/meetings that have been attended or to provide general Board related information.

J Ensor  Conveyed observations from attending Waimakariri Water Zone Committee meetings.
Concern at nitrate levels, particularly in Eyre Forest area
Three public meetings recently held
Impact on farming practices, Mandeville water scheme
District Development Strategy

J Lynn  Reported on North Canterbury Neighbourhood Support and the “Get Ready” scheme operating in Hurunui and Kaikoura.
Updated changes to the Ohoka Residents Association Committee following recent AGM.
Supporters of the Gate Keepers Lodge are currently working through Health and Safety plans

T Robson  Provided an update on the Ashley Gorge Advisory Group and development of the Reynolds Heritage Pavilion.
Attended the Pearson Park Advisory Group meeting and advised new heaters were installed in the scout den.

S Farrell  Attended the Oxford and Surrounding Area Health Services Development Group, explaining group purpose and technological benefits to the community.
Commented on public meeting related to Harewood Road, Oxford and heavy vehicle use.
Pearson Park grass mounds
Oxford Museum meeting
Ashley Gorge to Oxford cycleways
Future mural on Oxford public toilets

Councillor Felstead
Provided a summary of decisions at the Council meeting from the previous day.
Provided an update on a meeting held with concerned resident of Harewood Road.

Councillor Doody
Reflected on attendance at the Local Government NZ Conference
Upcoming newcomer’s careers expo
Road Safety Committee
North Canterbury Neighbourhood Support
Waimakariri suicide prevention group
Visit with Mayor and Councillor Felstead to the Wharfdale Track area and Perhams Road in relation to damaged fords and road condition.
Commented on Bennetts Road with tree root issues similar to German Road.

12 CONSULTATION PROJECTS
Flaxton Road
Consultation closes Monday 20 August 2018.
https://www.waimakariri.govt.nz/have-a-say/lets-talk/consultations/flaxton-road

The Board noted the consultation.

13 BOARD FUNDING UPDATE
13.1 Board Discretionary Grant
Balance as at 2 August 2018: $6,020.

13.2 General Landscaping Fund
Balance as at 2 August 2018 – 12,160.

The Board noted the balances.

14 MEDIA ITEMS
Nil.

15 QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS
Nil.

16 URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDERS
Nil.
NEXT MEETING
The next meeting of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board is scheduled for Thursday 6 September 2018 commencing at 7.00pm, in the Oxford Town Hall.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE MEETING WAS CLOSED AT 8.41pm.

CONFIRMED

__________________________
                     Chairperson

__________________________
                     Date

A discussion followed after the meeting with the residents present, concerned about damage to road verges and potholes in the area. Staff to follow up with the residents.
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE WOODEND-SEFTON COMMUNITY BOARD
HELD IN PEGASUS COMMUNITY CENTRE, MAIN STREET, PEGASUS ON MONDAY
13 AUGUST 2018 AT 7.00PM.

PRESENT
S Powell (Chairperson), A Thompson (Deputy Chair), A Allen, J Archer, A Blackie, R Mather and J Meyer.

IN ATTENDANCE
C Sargison (Community and Recreation Manager), G Byrnes (Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust), Mayor D Ayers and E Stubbs (Minutes Secretary).

1 APOLOGIES
There were no apologies.

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
There were no conflicts of interest.

S Powell acknowledged the passing of Ken Stevenson, Roading Manager.

3 CONFIRMATION MINUTES
3.1 Minutes of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board – 9 July 2018

Section 5.1 Initial sentence.
A Allen requested that ‘several’ be replaced with ‘four’ lakeside trees.

Moved R Mather seconded J Archer

THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:

(a) Confirms the circulated minutes, including the amendment, of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board meeting, held 9 July 2018, as a true and accurate record.

CARRIED

4 MATTERS ARISING
There were no matters arising.

5 DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS FROM THE COMMUNITY

5.1 Greg Byrnes acknowledged the passing of Ken Stevenson. He also noted the upcoming retirement of C Sargison and acknowledged his connection with many projects in the district.

G Byrnes provided an update on the work of Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust. He noted the work being undertaken at Te Kohanga wetlands and Kaitiritiri Ridge which are recreation areas of Pegasus. So far $35-40,000 had been spent including willow weed control, Te Kohanga trail maintenance and tree guards. Corporates, the Runanga and local community were assisting with
the work. There was a robust animal pest control process in these areas undertaken with the assistance of local residents.

A Pegasus student had recently received the Bruce Banks Environmental Education Award for her project on Canterbury mudfish. While nationally there was concern about their future, there had been successful translocating of mudfish in the Tuhaitara Coastal Park including in five biota nodes. The Trust was working alongside the University of Canterbury on the translocation project.

Another project was establishing a Kaki/Black Stilt release programme for the Ashley-Rakahuri River and the Tuhaitara Coastal Park and the Trust was working alongside the Ashley-Rakahuri River Care group. There was a lot of work to be done and they were planning over the next 3-5 years for that.

G Byrnes noted the planting work on Kaitiritiri Ridge. 1500 trees would be planted in an upcoming community event. Mulch had started to be dumped which was being used to tidy up areas.

Fencing work to alleviate trail bike issues had been completed at the end of Gladstone Road.

G Byrnes noted that there had been a lot of progress on the Forestry Harvest. A drone took images every Saturday to assist with providing community updates. He acknowledged the concern of local residents with the significant change to the visual landscape, however he was excited by the opportunities to open up areas of the park that were previously too dangerous. There was now more room for horse trails, Peninsula and Plains Orienteers (PAPO) events and trails in general. The Woodend / Waikuku Beach corridor would be replanted in natives, although it was not aimed to be ‘wooded’ as the corridor would be used by school children. The drone footage also revealed back dune freshwater sites with potential for half a dozen sites for new biota nodes. Although there was a dramatic change there was a lot of gain.

G Byrnes advised that they would be interviewing for two permanent roles with the Trust – a ranger / ecologist / operations responsible for natural resources and an education and visitor services role. There had been a number of very good candidates apply. The roles were essential for the intergenerational project.

There had been a recent visit from Hawaii University researchers who were looking at the park as part of a larger project that was investigating the meeting of indigenous knowledge and western science in relation to ecology. Some members of the Trust would be reciprocating the visit.

Another project underway was sonar mapping of the dune system to determine whether the dunes were compact resilient or ephemeral in nature. This was critical knowledge for the dune restoration project and provided answers regarding coastline retreat and emergency situations. It was a $5-7 million project. Another large project being undertaken with Ngai Tahu looking at giving the Ashley-Rakahuri Estuary the same ‘status’ as a human.

G Byrnes advised he was looking for a shipping container to be used as equipment storage. The Trust had managed to get funding for a bird hide for Tutaepatu Lagoon. With donated labour there was potential for another hide. It was significant that a rare bittern had been sighted in the Park recently.

R Mather thanked G Byrnes for his work. She asked if there was any progress with the wetland area behind houses in the Eastern Conservation Management Area (ECMA). G Byrnes had advised that work requiring a large amount of fill material had been undertaken valued at $5-6000. They were now looking at using agricultural lines to drain to the wetland rather than use fill.

J Archer asked about the potential to establish a nursery. G Byrnes advised that it was an idea in the strategic plan. They would look to propagate the remnant material on the park – this would be specialised small quantity
propagation. There had been conversations with someone who saw the opportunity for satellite nurseries.

S Powell asked what trails would be open when the logging was completed for the year. G Byrnes advised that Tiritiri Moana south to Woodend Beach Road would be open. It would be wider with an improved base. Also an additional trail could be added for horses and better cycle loops. There would be engagement with the community on those trails including horse riders.

5.2 Craig Sargison (Community and Recreation Manager) provided an update on Community Facilities noting that there was funding for further assessment and feasibility studies included in the Council’s Long Term Plan. There were various proposals including the potential to increase the space at Rangiora Library and consideration of local facilities including meeting space. The Pegasus Residents’ Group was keen to explore these issues and seeking further community meeting space.

A survey of Pegasus and Woodend communities would be carried out related to usage of library services and the sort of community facilities they would like to see, when they would use facilities and what facilities in the district they were using at the moment. The survey would be by letter mailed out to all ratepayers, and there would be the option to log on to Survey Monkey. The survey would be out for September with a final report for the end of the calendar year in order to be considered as part of a further budget round/Annual Plan in February 2019.

C Sargison advised that there would be a new Community and Recreation Manager in December who would take over the project at that time. C Sargison would be leading on the development of the Multi-Use Sports Stadium, Rangiora Airfield and Regeneration projects.

A Thompson asked about the new Oxford Library and Service Centre and if the community was happy and what were the pros and cons. C Sargison advised that the Service Centre was busier than expected. With regard to shopping patterns, residents used more than one library. When the Oxford library had been in the temporary building usage had dropped. The children’s section of the library was very successful.

S Powell asked what the process was going forward. C Sargison replied that the survey would go out in September and the results would be collated in early October. He anticipated an interim update report following that. The final report would be taken to Council by the incoming Community and Recreation Manager.

S Powell asked who Sue Sutherland (the consultant conducting the review) had met with and C Sargison replied that it included the Pegasus Residents’ Group, Pegasus Bay School Principal, Ravenswood developer and Woodend Community Association. The list was not exhaustive. There had been a lot of dialogue with Woodend School when the Kaiapoi Library was built and the school cluster group including Woodend and Waikuku were very helpful. A smaller library would not be able to host school groups.

S Powell asked if Waikuku was included in the survey. C Sargison replied they would go back to Waikuku separately after the initial results. In the past Waikuku library use was split between the centres.

A Allen asked if there would be consultation with Sefton. C Sargison replied no. The question of mobile services had been raised in the past however it was costly and did not deliver user satisfaction.
7 REPORTS
None

8 CORRESPONDENCE
Moved J Archer seconded A Thompson
THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:
(a) Receives the letter advising of the Council’s decisions in relation to the Woodend-Sefton Community Board submission to the Draft Long Term Plan 2018-2028 (Trim 180806088251).
CARRIED

9 CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT
9.1 Chairperson’s Report for July 2018
S Powell commented that the Forestry meetings were working well and that there would be a further update following the meeting.
S Powell noted that the Youth Development Grant had been launched and encouraged members to promote the grant in the community.
Moved S Powell seconded J Meyer
THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:
(a) Receives report No. 180806088191.
CARRIED

10 MATTERS FOR INFORMATION
10.1 Oxford-Ohoka Community Board meeting minutes – 5 July 2018 (Trim No. 180628071750).
10.2 Rangiora-Ashley Community Board meeting minutes – 11 July 2018 (Trim No. 180628071844).
10.3 Kaiapoi Tuahiwi Community Board meeting minutes – 16 July 2018 (Trim No.180713078003).
10.4 Library Update – Report to Community and Recreation Committee 24 July 2018 (Trim No 180706075217).
10.5 Adoption of Stormwater Drainage and Watercourse Protection Bylaw 2018 – report to Council 1 May 2018 (Trim No 180329034013).
Moved J Meyer seconded A Blackie
THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board receives the information in items 10.1-10.5.
CARRIED

11 MEMBERS’ INFORMATION EXCHANGE
11.1 July Diary for A Allen, J Archer, A Thompson and R Mather (Trim No. 180802087161)
A Allen
- Assisted with Civil Defence exercise alongside other Board members. Commented that there were extensive learnings for North Canterbury Neighbourhood Support out of the exercise.
A Blackie

- Assisted with Matariki plantings at Silverstream Reserve.
- Noted upcoming opening of Feldwick Drive in Kaiapoi which was an important milestone as the first big project completed in the Regeneration area.

J Meyer

- Noted a lengthy discussion at the August Council meeting on consultation regarding speed limits change on Rangiora Woodend Road and feeder roads. The report would come back to Boards before going to consultation. There was an era of change regarding speed limits nationwide.

R Mather

- Pegasus Residents Group Inc. - advocating for improvements to the Pegasus Community Centre and assisting with review of community facilities.
- Advised that the trees at Gladstone Park had mostly been felled. The playground upgrade and additional work on the fields was to follow.

J Archer

- Woodend Community Association – webpage development was pushing ahead. Were in a membership drive. Had been advised to lift annual subscription as a reflection of value.

12 CONSULTATION PROJECTS

Flaxton Road
Consultation closes Monday 20 August 2018.
https://www.waimakariri.govt.nz/have-a-say/lets-talk/consultations/flaxton-road

Draft Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan
Consultation closes Monday 3 September 2018.

13 FOSTERING COMMUNITIES

14 BOARD FUNDING UPDATE

14.1 Board Discretionary Grant
Balance as at 8 August 2018: $4000.

14.2 General Landscaping Fund
Balance as at 8 August 2018 $12,160.

15 MEDIA ITEMS

Upcoming Woodend Community Association AGM.
16 **QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS**
None

17 **URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDERS**
None

**NEXT MEETING**
The next meeting of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board is scheduled for 7pm, Monday 10 September 2018 at the Woodend Community Centre.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE MEETING WAS CLOSED AT 8.00pm
CONFIRMED

______________________
Chairperson

______________________
Date

A *staff briefing occurred from 8.00pm to 8.30pm*
- Rob Hawthorne (Property Manager) provided an update on the Coastal Forestry project.
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE KAIAPOI-TUAHIWI COMMUNITY BOARD
HELD IN MEETING ROOM 1 (UPSTAIRS), RUATANIWHA KAIAPOI CIVIC CENTRE,
176 WILLIAMS STREET, KAIAPOI ON MONDAY 20 AUGUST 2018 COMMENCING
AT 4.00PM.

PRESENT
J Watson (Chairperson), C Greengrass, N Atkinson, M Pinkham, P Redmond

IN ATTENDANCE
Councillor A Blackie
J Palmer (Chief Executive), C Brown (Community Greenspace Manager), E Cordwell
(Governance Advisor)

1 APOLOGIES
Apologies were received and sustained from R Blair and S Stewart.

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
C Greengrass for Item 7.1d being the Board’s appointee to the Pines Kairaki Beach
Association.

3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES
3.1 Minutes of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board – 16 July 2018
Moved J Watson seconded P Redmond

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:
(a) Confirms the circulated minutes of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community
Board meeting, held 16 July 2018, as a true and accurate record.

CARRIED

4 MATTERS ARISING
Nil

5 DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS
None

6 ADJOURNED BUSINESS
None
7 REPORTS

7.1 Applications to the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board’s Discretionary Grant Fund 2018/2019 - Edwina Cordwell (Governance Adviser)

C Greengrass sat back from the table and took no part in the voting thereon.

The report was taken as read.

Moved J Watson seconded P Redmond

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 180807088710.
(b) Approves a grant of $475 to Reflections Community Trust towards the hire costs of a bouncy castle for the Waimakariri Light Party 2018.
(c) Approves a grant of $477.25 to Pines and Kairaki Beach Association towards the cost of promotional material, signage and advertising to encourage greater community use of the new hall facility.

CARRIED

8 CORRESPONDENCE

Moved J Watson seconded C Greengrass

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:

(a) Receives the decision letter regarding the Board’s submission to the Draft Long Term Plan 2018-2028. (Trim 180806088275).
(b) Receives the memo regarding Cherry Tree Removals – Mansfield Subdivision from Greg Barnard (Parks Community Asset Officer). (Trim 180706075110).

CARRIED

9 CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT

9.1 Chair’s Diary for July - August 2018

Moved J Watson seconded N Atkinson

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 180813090640.

CARRIED

10 MATTERS REFERRED FOR INFORMATION

10.1 Oxford-Ohoka Community Board meeting minutes – 5 July 2018 (Trim No. 180628071750).
10.2 Woodend-Sefton Community Board meeting minutes – 9 July 2018 (Trim No. 180703073671).
10.3 Rangiora-Ashley Community Board meeting minutes – 11 July 2018
(Trim No. 180628071844).

10.4 Library Update – report to Community and Recreation Committee 24 July 2018
(Trim No 180706075217).

10.5 Airfield Plan Change and Designation – report to Council 7 August 2018
(Trim No 180730084697).

10.6 Rangiora-Woodend Road, Gressons Road, Boys Road and Northbrook
Road Speed Limit Review – report to Council 7 August 2018 (Trim No
180706075194).

10.7 Final Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018 – report to Solid
and Hazardous Waste Working Party 19 July 2018 (Trim No
180710076344).

10.8 Report to Council 3 July 2018 (Trim No 180620068685) (PX).

Moved J Watson seconded P Redmond

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board receives the information in items
10.1-10.8.

CARRIED

11 MEMBERS’ INFORMATION EXCHANGE

P Redmond

2 July - Water Zone public meeting re nitrates.

Also attended WDC session on the interactive District Plan and ENC Networking
event at Rossburn which was well attended.

27 July - LAP and Alcohol Control Bylaw Deliberations Meeting.

Council Social Club outing to Willowbank was very enjoyable with reminder that
elected members may also join the Social Club.

Social Club Quiz was postponed to enable staff and elected members to pay their
respects at the funeral of recently retired WDC Roading Manager Ken Stevenson.

30 July – Kaiapoi Promotions Association Mix n Mingle and attended the AGM, Scott
Murray elected as Chairperson.

6 August – Regeneration Steering Group.

7 August – Waimakariri Health Advisory Group. Tessa Sturley, WDC Community
Development Manager, is supporting the group to redefine its Terms of Reference.

Interviewed as part of the Canterbury and Lincoln University post-earthquake review
project. Positive feedback on the WDC approach and the collaborative culture of the
authority.

8 August – Staff Briefing.

17 August – attended K Stevenson’s funeral

18 August – Opening of new Feldwick Drive.

20 August – Draft Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan Board Submission workshop.

P Redmond queried progress on strengthening of the BNZ building and J Palmer
confirmed that this was in hand and should enable the re-instatement of the footpath.

Ruts had also been noted in the Baker Park BMX track and C Brown undertook to
follow this up.
M Pinkham
Had also attended the Water Zone public meeting on nitrates. Silt and concentration of faecal matter potentially had a shorter timeframe for remedial action rather than nitrates which posed a more complex and longer term issue.
26 July - ENC Networking Meeting was well attended.
Attended Wellbeing North Canterbury meeting.
Also attended the KPA AGM noting that there was to be a stakeholder meeting prior to Christmas.
2 August – Cam River Working Party meeting. Concrete actions were being undertaken but there was still some confusion over relative roles and responsibilities of ECAN and WDC for maintenance of some of the tributaries.
6 August
- made a personal Submission to the CCC Hearing Panel regarding the proposed changes to Cranford Street.
- open day at Karanga Mai Young Parents College.
- Regeneration Steering Group meeting.
8 August - Staff Briefing.

A Blackie
Had participated in the Matariki planting project. There had been two phases at the western end of Silverstream and one further planting to go.
Attended the Northern Pegasus Bay Advisory Group meeting and noted the co-operation of horse trainers in working with staff to address any issues.
Had met with C Brown and C Sargison (Community and Recreation Manager) regarding the 17 February 2019 River Carnival.

C Greengrass
Had attended the Kaiapoi Town Centre public Drop in sessions.
Also attended the KPA AGM and noted the proposed KPA stakeholder meeting.
Attended Landmarks meeting and a Museum meeting.
Noted that a review of community housing was taking place.
Advised that the Waimakariri Access Group AGM is on 11 September.
You Me We Us had been invited to meet Silverstream developers to consider ways of encouraging community cohesion in the new sub division. It was also important to ensure that there was also a sense of belonging to Kaiapoi.

N Atkinson
Attended a range of Council and other meetings.
Met with Bulldogs League Club on a couple of occasions and was pleased to note that crowds in excess of 2,000 were attending home matches.
N Atkinson provided a short overview of key elements of submissions to the LAP and Alcohol Control Bylaw Hearing and advised that the WDC proposals will now be considered by the Alcohol Regulatory and Licensing Authority (ARLA).
12 CONSULTATION PROJECTS

Flaxton Road
Consultation closes Monday 20 August 2018.
https://www.waimakariri.govt.nz/have-a-say/lets-talk/consultations/flaxton-road

Draft Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan
Consultation closes Monday 3 September 2018.

13 REGENERATION PROJECTS

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

13.2 Kaiapoi Regeneration Steering Group
The next meeting of the Kaiapoi Regeneration Steering Group will be held in Meeting Room 1, Ruataniwha Kaiapoi Civic Centre, 4pm on Monday 3 September 2018. This meeting is open to the public.

14 BOARD FUNDING UPDATE

14.1 Board Discretionary Grant

14.2 General Landscaping Budget
Balance as at 16 July 2018: $84,400 (including carry forward).

15 MEDIA ITEMS

16 QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS

17 URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDERS

J Watson acknowledged the passing of Ken Stevenson noting his commitment, expertise and personal attributes that had made such a tangible and long lasting contribution to Kaiapoi and surrounding areas before, during and after the earthquakes. He would be sadly missed.
NEXT MEETING
The next meeting of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board is scheduled for 4pm, Monday 17 September 2018 at the Ruataniwha Kaiapoi Civic Centre.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 4.30 pm.

CONFIRMED

_________________________
Chairperson

_________________________
Date

Workshop

- General Landscaping 4.30pm to 5.10pm – Chris Brown (Community and Greenspace Manager)

  Members discussed a number of projects for further assessment. A report will be provided in due course (potentially October 2018).

- Members Forum

  There were no matters for discussion.

Briefing

Festive Lights 5.10pm to 5.30pm – Jim Palmer (Chief Executive)

Briefing is not open to the public
**WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**REPORT FOR INFORMATION**

**FILE NO:** GOV-18 / 180827096666  
**REPORT TO:** Council  
**DATE OF MEETING:** 4 September 2018  
**FROM:** David Ayers, Mayor  
**SUBJECT:** Mayor’s Diary 31 July – 27 August

### 1. SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 31 July</td>
<td>Compass FM Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Transport meeting with Peter Winder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Met residents of Quigleys Road, Oxford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Youth Council Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 1 August</td>
<td>Met Richard Stalker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hamasaka Junior High School Visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waimakariri-Passchendaele Trust Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kaiapoi Promotions AGM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 2 August</td>
<td>CREDS Education and Training Governance Group meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Buddle Finlay NZ Film Week Launch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 3 August</td>
<td>Interview with David Hill, North Canterbury News</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Met Ian Lennie: Cenotaph Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Write on Event for Primary School Writers, Rangiora Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday 4 August</td>
<td>Welcome address to Lions NZ Secondary School Speech Finals, Rangiora High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday 5 August</td>
<td>Attended Crusaders V Lions Super Rugby Final as guest of Stadium Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday 5 August</td>
<td>Oxford Town-wide Garage Sale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 6 August</td>
<td>Met Richard Stalker re water management on his farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 6 August</td>
<td>LGNZ Governance and Strategy Advisory Group meeting, Wellington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 7 August</td>
<td>Greater Christchurch Partnership Breakfast: Lucy Saunders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 7 August</td>
<td>Compass FM Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 8 August</td>
<td>Waimakariri Road Safety Coordinating Committee Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 8 August</td>
<td>Waimakariri Water Zone Committee Hui at Tuahiwi Marae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 9 August</td>
<td>Regional Road Safety Working Group meeting, Rolleston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 9 August</td>
<td>24-7 Youthwork Luncheon, Upper Riccarton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 9 August</td>
<td>CE Review Committee Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 10 August</td>
<td>Oxford-Ohoka Community Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 10 August</td>
<td>Greater Christchurch Partnership Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday 11 August</td>
<td>Interview with David Hill, North Canterbury News</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 13 August</td>
<td>Life Education Trust 30th Anniversary Dinner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 13 August</td>
<td>Rangiora High School: Welcome to students from Wuhan Jianghan High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 13 August</td>
<td>Beef and Lamb NZ Discussion before Water Zone Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 13 August</td>
<td>Waimakariri Water Zone Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 14 August</td>
<td>Woodend Sefton Community Board meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 15 August</td>
<td>Solid &amp; Hazardous Waste Working Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 16 August</td>
<td>St Patricks School Kaiapoi – talking to student leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Citizenship Ceremony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kaiapoi Town Centre Draft Plan, Business Drop-In, Kaiapoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good Home Opening, Pegasus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 17 August</td>
<td>Talked to Japanese delegation at Selwyn District Council, Reolleston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview with David Hill, North Canterbury News</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attended funeral of Ken Stevenson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday 18 August</td>
<td>Opening of Feldwick Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 20 August</td>
<td>Waimakariri Water Zone Committee Briefing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 21 August</td>
<td>Compass FM Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housing New Zealand site inspection, Rangiora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Youth Futures Group Discussion with Ara and RHS, Rangiora High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 22 August</td>
<td>Hon Meka Whaitiri, Associate Minister of Forestry Visit to Tuhaitara Coastal Reserve, Pegasus and Kaiapoi - and dinner in Christchurch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 23 August</td>
<td>Spoke to Waimakariri Combined Friendship Group re Passchendaele</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canterbury Museum Employment Committee and Farewell to staff member Roger Fyffe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 24 August</td>
<td>Interview with David Hill, North Canterbury News</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Poetry Day: Rangiora Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday 25 August</td>
<td>Meeting of Waimakariri Art Collection Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Landmarks Plaque Unveiling, Victoria Park Rangiora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kaiapoi Volunteer Fire Brigade Honours Night</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 27 August</td>
<td>Darnley Club AGM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waimakariri Water Zone Committee Briefing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**THAT** the Council:

a) **Receives** report No. 180827096666.

David Ayers  
MAYOR