

# Waimakariri District Council

## Utilities and Roading Committee

# Agenda

Tuesday 9 June 2026

9am

Council Chambers  
215 High Street  
Rangiora

**Members:**

Deputy Mayor Philip Redmond (Chairperson)

Cr Tim Bartle

Cr Tim Fulton

Cr Niki Mealings

Cr Joan Ward

Mayor Dan Gordon (ex officio)

<b>AGENDA CONTENTS – UTILITIES AND ROADING COMMITTEE MEETING 12 MAY 2026</b>		
<b><u>Item Number</u></b>	<b><u>Item Topic</u></b>	<b><u>Pages</u></b>
<b>Confirmation of Minutes</b>		
3.1	Minutes of the Utilities and Roading Committee Meeting 12 May 2026	5 – 21
<b>Report for Information</b>		
7.1	Request to Approve a Change of Intersection Controls on Heywards Road and Baynons Road	22 – 27



**A MEETING OF THE UTILITIES AND ROADING COMMITTEE WILL BE HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, RANGIORA SERVICE CENTRE, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA, ON TUESDAY 9 JUNE 2026 AT 9AM.**

Sarah Nichols  
GOVERNANCE MANAGER

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

## **BUSINESS**

Page No

### **1 APOLOGIES**

### **2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST**

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

### **3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES**

#### **3.1 Minutes of the meeting of the Utilities and Roading Committee held on Tuesday, 12 May 2026**

5 – 21

*RECOMMENDATION*

**THAT** the Utilities and Roading Committee:

- (a) **Confirms** the circulated Minutes of the meeting of the Utilities and Roading Committee held on 12 May 2026 as a true and accurate record.

#### **3.2 Matters Arising (From Minutes)**

### **4 DEPUTATION/PRESENTATIONS**

Nil.

### **5 REPORTS**

Nil.

### **6 PORTFOLIO UPDATES**

#### **6.1 Roading – Deputy Mayor Philip Redmond**

#### **6.2 Drainage, Stockwater and Three Waters (Drinking Water, Sewer and Stormwater) – Councillor Tim Fulton**

#### **6.3 Solid Waste– Councillor Niki Mealings**

#### **6.4 Transport – Mayor Dan Gordon**

## 7 REPORT FOR INFORMATION

### 7.1 Request to Approve a Change of Intersection Controls on Heywards Road and Baynons Road

22 – 27

#### RECOMMENDATION

**THAT** the Utilities and Recreation Committee:

- (a) **Receives** the information in item 7.1.

## 8 QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS

## 9 URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS

## 10 MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED WITH THE PUBLIC EXCLUDED

In accordance with section 48(1) 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 (or sections 6, 7 or 9 of the Official Information Act 1982, as the case may be), it is moved:

That the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting:

- 10.1 Middlebrook Culvert Remediation Options.
- 10.2 Denchs Road Footpath Request.
- 10.3 Contract 25/91 Bridge Maintenance – Scour Remediation – Makerikeri River Scope Addition Variation Report

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:

Item No.	Subject	Reason for excluding the public	Grounds for excluding the public.
<b>REPORTS</b>			
10.1	Middlebrook Culvert Remediation Options	Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7	To protect the privacy of natural persons and enabling the local authority to carry on without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations (including commercial and industrial) negotiations and maintain legal professional privilege. <b>LGOIMA Section 7 (2)(a), (g) and (i).</b>
10.2	Denchs Road Footpath Request	Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7	To enable the local authority to carry out, without prejudice or disadvantage, commercial activities and enable the local authority to carry on, without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations (including commercial and industrial negotiations). <b>LGOIMA Section 7(2)(h) and (i).</b>
10.3	Assessment of Drinking Water Services	Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7	To enable the local authority to carry out, without prejudice or disadvantage, commercial activities and enable the local authority to carry on, without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations (including commercial and industrial negotiations). <b>LGOIMA Section 7(2)(h) and (i).</b>

**CLOSED MEETING**

*Refer to Public Excluded Agenda (Separate Document).*

**OPEN MEETING****NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting of the Utilities and Roading Committee is scheduled for Tuesday 14 July 2026 at 9am in the Council Chamber, Rangiora Service Centre, 215 High Street, Rangiora.

**Workshop**

- *Water Service Transition Overview – Kalley Simpson (3 Waters Manager), Paul Christensen (Finance Manager) and Jane Eggleton (Project Planning and Quality Team Leader) 45 mins*

**Briefing**

- *Chlorine Free Drinking Water Station – Caroline Fahey (Water and Wastewater Asset Manager) and Kalley Simpson (3 Waters Manager) 30mins*

**WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE UTILITIES AND ROADING COMMITTEE HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, RANGIORA SERVICE CENTRE, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA, ON TUESDAY, 12 MAY 2026 AT 9 AM.**

**PRESENT:**

Deputy Mayor P Redmond (Chairperson), Councillors T Bartle, T Fulton, N Mealings, and J Ward.

**IN ATTENDANCE:**

Councillors B Cairns and B McLaren

J Millward (Chief Executive), G Cleary (General Manager Utilities and Roading), K Simpson (Three Waters Manager), C Fahey (Water and Wastewater Assets Manager), J McBride (Roading and Transport Manager), J Recker (Stormwater and Waterways Manager), S Allen (Water Environment Advisor), H Wilson (Project Engineer), P O'Loughlin (Temporary Governance Officer)

**1. APOLOGIES**

Moved: Deputy Mayor Redmond

Seconded: Councillor T Bartle

**THAT** the Utilities and Roading Committee:

- (a) **Received** and **sustained** an apology for leave of absence from Mayor D Gordon.

**CARRIED**

**2. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST**

No conflicts of interest were declared.

**3. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES**

**3.1 Minutes of the meeting of the Utilities and Roading Committee held on Tuesday, 14 April 2026**

G. Cleary provided revised wording based on the discussion between Deputy Mayor Redmond and C Fahey. It was agreed that the circulated minutes be amended to read as follows:

***Item 5.1, paragraph 3: "Deputy Mayor Redmond queried the contractor's experience in the local area. C Fahey noted that the bore was originally drilled by Clements Drilling but unfinished as it wasn't required for capacity at the time. McMillan's had continued drilling and developed this bore as a variation to the existing contract for Mandeville".***

Moved: Deputy Mayor Redmond

Seconded: Councillor Bartle

**THAT** the Utilities and Roading Committee:

- (a) **Confirms** the amended Minutes of the meeting of the Utilities and Roading Committee held on 14 April 2026 as a true and accurate record.

**CARRIED**

**3.2 Matters Arising (From Minutes)**

There were no matters arising.

3.3 **Notes of a Workshop of the Utilities and Roothing Committee held on Tuesday, 10 March 2026**

Moved: Councillor Bartle

Seconded: Councillor Fulton

**THAT** the Utilities and Roothing Committee:

- (a) **Receive** the circulated Notes of the Workshop of the Utilities and Roothing Committee, 10 March 2026.

**CARRIED**

4. **DEPUTATION/PRESENTATIONS**

Nil.

5. **REPORTS**

5.1 **Zone Implementation Programme Addendum (ZIPA) Budget Reallocation in 2025/26**  
– S Allen (Water Environment Advisor)

S Allen presented the report seeking approval to reallocate projects within the existing 2025-26 budget for the Zone Implementation Programme Agenda (ZIPA). Reallocation of some of the budget was proposed due to forecast underspends resulting from project delays, budgets no longer being required, and opportunities that arose throughout the financial year. S Allen advised that, as a result of these underspends, funding remained available and suitable projects had been identified that would still meet the original ZIPA recommendations.

S Allen noted that the proposed NOAIA Trust projects aimed to support traditional scientific knowledge; however, discussions on how this partnership would operate were still at a policy level, and no formal agreement had yet been reached. She further advised that funding agreements for the proposed projects would be put in place over the coming weeks, with invoices to be received before the end of the financial year and the work to be completed in the next financial year.

Deputy Mayor Redmond asked whether the Council had an obligation to spend the funds or if the funding could be carried forward. S Allen confirmed that there was no obligation to spend the money.

In response to a question from Deputy Mayor Redmond about the consequences of an underspend, S Allen noted that the recommendations in the ZIPA were still being pursued and that the proposed projects would also achieve those outcomes. The situation presented an opportunity for the Council to consider whether it wished to accept the year's underspend or continue working to meet the intended outcomes.

Deputy Mayor Redmond questioned whether the ZIPA outlived the Waimakariri Water Zone Committee and continued in effect. S Allen confirmed this was correct, noting that the Council had adopted the Capital Management Strategy in 2010 and then moved to the ZIPA in 2019. She advised that these documents were still managed by the Council rather than the Zone Committee.

Councillor Mealings enquired whether the Northbrook Trail project was still proceeding and whether new funding would be required if the ZIPA funding was reallocated. S Allen confirmed that a budget would be available in the next financial year and could be allocated to the same work on the Trail project. She advised that no funding had been removed from the project, but that the work would shift to the next financial year.

Councillor Mealings asked about the Wakefield Wetland Project, which had been expected to start in late April 2026 and finish in late May 2026. She enquired whether the project was underway and whether the proposed funding reallocation would jeopardise it. S Allen explained that the project timeline had changed and confirmed that the Funding Agreements were in place through 30 June 2026. She noted that the work was typically carried out in winter (drilling and filling) and then left through to spring, and that the update was simply a timing correction.

Deputy Mayor Redmond sought clarification about the allocation of \$5,000 to the NOAIA Trust. S Allen advised that discussions were underway regarding the NOAIA Trust contribution. The matter was being considered alongside the Greenspace Team's work and funding for the Natural Environment Strategy. She noted that the Greenspace Team had taken the lead and that the \$5,000 allocation enabled the Trust to assemble sufficient funding to progress the work. It was also noted that a further \$5,000 from the Natural Environment Strategy had been combined with it, bringing the total to \$10,000.

Deputy Mayor Redmond observed that the Mātauranga Māori-focused education was already heavily funded by other agencies. He asked how the \$5,000 amount to the NOAIA Trust had been determined and whether the Trust had requested funding. S Allen noted that the Trust had delivered programmes such as the Waiōmio Tool Kata Akatanga initiative, which trained young Māori in Makarōku Māori. The intention was that participants would then come to Council reserves, where Council staff would work alongside them, with a shared learning and cultural exchange process. She advised that this was an area where the Council could strengthen partnership discussions on how the two organisations might work together.

Councillor Fulton noted his previous visit to the Wakeman Project site with the Waimakariri Water Zone Committee and recalled that it had been described as a multi-year project requiring sustained effort once underway. He commented that the site had been heavily overgrown and required significant work and asked whether the project would need to continue over several years to be effective. S Allen confirmed that the project was a multi-year initiative and that the proposed funding would effectively accelerate the next stage of work. She noted that the project had previously received funding through the Biodiversity Contestable Fund, including support in the current year for follow-up work to ensure regrowth had not occurred. The proposed allocation would bring forward work that would otherwise have taken place in the next financial year.

In response to a question about whether the project was expected to reach a stable point at which the vegetation would be largely under control, S Allen advised that the site consisted of multiple areas of infestation, each at a different stage of treatment. Some areas had already reached the point where only follow-up maintenance was required, while others, such as the headwaters, still required initial and repeated treatment. She noted that ongoing follow-up would remain necessary in some sections.

Councillor Bartle sought confirmation that the funding was not additional money but rather funding that would have been allocated next year and was being brought forward. G Cleary clarified that the Council operated on an annual budget that was not carried over between financial years. The budget was either spent or recorded as a saving. Some projects originally planned for the year had not proceeded, and staff had therefore identified alternative projects for Council approval. He advised that, if approved, the proposal would utilise this year's allocation, which Council had already set aside for this type of work and which met the criteria previously set by Council. If the proposal was not approved, the unspent amount would be recorded as a saving for the current year, and a new budget would be allocated in the next financial year.

Councillor Fulton asked for clarification on the education remit for the Mātauranga Māori Project and whether it was linked to the ability to fund knowledge sharing and educational consultation. S Allen explained that there were two relevant actions within the ZIPA. One related to promoting Ngāi Tahu cultural values, particularly in the Northern Waimakariri tributaries, which included reserves owned by the Council. This was the recommendation under which the original budget had been allocated. She further noted that another ZIPA recommendation related to recreational uses, which was the basis for the funding previously intended for the Northbrook Trail. In addition, under the Natural Environment Strategy, there was a specific recommendation to promote cultural values, which the proposed project also aligned with. The Greenspace Team had therefore considered how the \$5,000 allocation could best be used and identified that it could fall under both the ZIPA and Natural Environment Strategy recommendations. Staff confirmed that, while there was no single explicit recommendation naming this project, it was consistent with the intent of the relevant ZIPA and strategy actions.

Moved: Councillor Fulton

Seconded: Councillor Mealings

**THAT** the Utilities and Roading Committee:

- (a) **Receives** Report No. 260422101664.
- (b) **Approves** the reallocation of the existing Zone Implementation Programme Agenda (ZIPA) budget 2025-26 to Recommendations as proposed in:

ZIPA Recommendation	Current allocation	Proposed reallocation	Rationale for reallocation
1.25 <i>Initiate public education and awareness campaigns aimed at improving the water quality and health of urban waterways.</i>	\$10,000 to Enviroschools programme in the District – funding usually invoiced by Environment Canterbury.	\$10,000 to the Christchurch Envirohub Trust for Stormwater Superhero Trailer educational events in the district via a funding agreement before 30 June 2026.	Budget is unable to be used by Enviroschools, as Environment Canterbury has indicated they will not invoice WDC for this in 2025-26. Budget is able to be successfully spent on public education for urban waterway education.
1.26 <i>Improved stream health, Ngāi Tūāhuriri values, and improved recreational amenity in the North Waimakariri River tributaries.</i>	\$35,000 For North Brook trail fencing, planting and/or culvert installation.	\$30,000 Woody weed control in the Wakeman wetlands (McIntosh catchment) via a funding agreement before 30 June 2026.  \$5,000 Mātauranga Māori project support with NOAIA Trust via a funding agreement before 30 June 2026.	Budget is unable to be spent in 2025-26 as the North Brook Trail project has not commenced as planned. Budget is able to be spent on projects within the North Waimakariri River tributaries that support improved stream and wetland health and Ngāi Tūāhuriri values.
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$45,000</b>	<b>\$45,000</b>	

- (c) **Note** that a review of ZIPA budget allocation to ZIPA Recommendations is intended to be carried out again within three years, on an as-required basis.
- (d) **Note** that the reallocation is within the existing budget, reducing the risk of an underspend in this area.
- (e) **Note** that this report be circulated to Community Boards and Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga at a WDC-Rūnanga meeting for information.

**CARRIED**

Councillor Fulton confirmed his support for the motion, noting that there had been a good round of questions and that the proposed reallocation directed funding toward worthwhile causes and areas that expanded knowledge. He highlighted that the Wakeman Wetland Project required ongoing work and recalled earlier discussions with the Waimakariri Water Zone Committee about the importance of stabilising this significant wetland.

Councillor Mealings also supported the motion, agreeing with the continued investment in the Wakeman Wetlands, biodiversity improvements, waterway enhancement, and the NOAIA Trust, which she noted aligned with ZIPA ideals and values.

Deputy Mayor Redmond expressed his disappointment that Environment Canterbury had not provided an invoice, despite other notices being received promptly. He commended the EnviroSchools Programme and acknowledged the work staff had undertaken to propose the reallocation of funding, stating that the projects identified were worthwhile.

## 5.2 **Rangiora Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) Accidental Overflow – C Fahey** (Water and Wastewater Asset Manager) and K Simpson (3 Waters Manager)

K Simpson spoke to the report, providing a summary of the accidental wastewater overflow incident at the Rangiora Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) on 26 November 2025 and the improvement actions being implemented to prevent a recurrence. It was noted that Environment Canterbury had issued an Infringement Notice earlier in the year regarding the incident. Although the Council had queried the notice, the \$3,000 fine was ultimately paid. K Simpson advised that Council believed it had responded to the incident in a proactive, responsible, and professional manner, while acknowledging that areas for improvement had been identified and were now being implemented.

Councillor Fulton questioned how the identified areas for improvement were implemented operationally when an incident of this nature occurred. He noted that while the principles were clear, there were many moving parts in the field and sought clarification on how improvements were implemented in real time. K Simpson explained that it was standard practice to hold a debrief after such an operational event. Depending on the scale of the incident, this could range from an informal discussion to a formal meeting. In this case, given the significance of the event, a formal debrief was held with contractors and team leaders, with notes taken and agreed actions recorded. He noted that the report outlined several of the improvement actions currently underway. Some of these required more substantial changes, including updates to how asset information was recorded in the GIS system, which involved multiple teams across Council. The process involved assigning actions, working through them in an orderly manner, and regularly checking progress to ensure actions were completed and signed off.

Councillor Fulton commented on responsiveness, noting that whether the incident was immediate or later, the fact that it had occurred would not have changed. He sought clarification on whether there were any legal implications arising from the timing of the report. K Simpson advised that the Council had self-reported the incident to Environment Canterbury. One of the improvement actions underway was a review of notification protocols and the processes for advising Environment Canterbury of such events. He noted that, in terms of mitigation, those involved had taken immediate steps to stop the overflow and then worked to minimise any environmental effects. K Simpson emphasised that when incidents of this nature occur, staff always take a proactive approach to reduce and mitigate impacts.

Councillor McLaren asked what steps were in place, such as supervision or procedural checklists, to ensure expectations were consistently followed on site. K Simpson explained that oversight occurred at two levels. Standard maintenance tasks had a documented Standard Operating Procedure (SOP), which operators and contractors followed routinely. Where an SOP did not exist, a Job Specific Assessment (JSA) was required. For a JSA to proceed, it needed to be formally approved and documented. Strengthening this approval

process had been identified as an area for improvement to ensure that JSAs underwent rigorous review before work commenced.

Councillor McLaren further asked: if all staff and contractors were expected to follow the SOP or JSA, what measures were in place to ensure these procedures were actually being followed on site? K Simpson responded that both the SOPs and JSAs set out the required checks and documentation for each task. For critical activities, the SOP or JSA specified the checks to be completed and recorded, along with a documented contingency plan in the event of an incident.

Councillor McLaren questioned whether it is correct that the post-incident analysis listed the changes in the SOP to ensure the incident does not happen again. K Simpson confirmed this was correct, noting that while incidents were regrettable, the key focus was on learning from them and improving processes. He emphasised that continuous improvement was an ongoing part of operational practice.

C Fahey added that, in addition to the earlier comments, standard SOPs existed for the regular, frequent tasks performed by the Water Unit. However, the incident in question did not involve a typical or routine task; it fell outside normal operating scenarios and therefore required a JSA with tailored instructions. She noted that one of the key lessons from the incident was the need to review and develop SOPs for tasks that lacked them. This had been identified as an action to ensure clearer guidance and more robust procedures for non-routine activities.

Moved: Deputy Mayor Redmond      Seconded: Councillor Ward

**THAT** the Utilities and Roading Committee:

- (a) **Receives** Report No. 260430105765.
- (b) **Notes** that an accidental wastewater overflow occurred at the Rangiora Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) on 26 November 2026, which resulted in discharge into the South Brook.
- (c) **Notes** that Council staff have identified a range of improvement actions that are currently being implemented to reduce the likelihood of similar events occurring in the future.
- (d) **Notes** that Environment Canterbury has taken enforcement action against Council and issued an Infringement Notice as they considered the discharge a breach of the Resource Management Act and the Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan.
- (e) **Notes** that Council staff believe the enforcement action was not warranted in this instance as the Council had responded in a proactive, responsible, and professional manner.
- (f) **Notes** that the Council has paid the infringement fee but has stated to Environment Canterbury that this was an accidental overflow which resulted from an unexpected discharge, rather than an intentional or negligent act.

**CARRIED**

Deputy Mayor Redmond commented that Environment Canterbury had issued both an invoice and an infringement notice in relation to the incident. He noted that the first infringement notice contained an incorrect date, which the Council challenged, but the challenge was unsuccessful, and a second notice was subsequently issued. From the numbering of the notices, he observed that Environment Canterbury did not appear to issue many infringement notices of this type and suggested the Council may have been somewhat unfortunate in this instance.

Deputy Mayor Redmond believed that staff had handled the incident very professionally and responsibly, noting that the overflow was identified and stopped within minutes. He expressed the view that there was little more staff could reasonably have done to mitigate the situation, and staff had done everything possible to manage the event, and that the learnings identified were valuable going forward. Deputy Mayor Redmond observed that the matter could have been treated as an offence of strict liability. Still, an infringement notice was issued and paid, and the matter was now resolved. He reiterated his view that the Council had been somewhat unlucky, given the prompt and responsible actions taken by staff, and congratulated them on how the incident had been managed.

Councillor Ward added that it was an unfortunate incident that was ably dealt with by Council staff.

## 6. PORTFOLIO UPDATES

### 6.1 Roading – Deputy Mayor Redmond

Deputy Mayor Redmond provided the following update:

- Road Maintenance
  - Roadworks, dig-outs and pavement repairs continued in the lead-up to winter.
  - The Ashley Street dig-out repairs were completed.
  - Asphalt resurfacing was scheduled to begin on Percival Street / Victoria Street and at Tram Road / Island Road, with night works to be used where possible to minimise traffic impacts.
- Roothing Capital Projects
  - Construction of the Kaiapoi to Pineacres Cycleway was ongoing, with completion expected by the end of July 2026.
  - Kerb and channel replacement work continued on Akaroa Street. The eastern side was nearly complete, after which work would move to the western side.
  - Kerb and channel replacement work was underway on Seddon Street, Rangiora.
  - The new footpath on Blake Street had recently been completed.
  - Tenders for Minor Footpath Improvements had closed, but no tenders were received. Staff were now seeking pricing to enable the Highfield Lane footpath project to progress, noting that the Council had agreed last year to install a sealed footpath there and complete it this financial year.
  - Installation of the Lees Valley Floating Deck was scheduled to commence in the week of 18 May 2026, replacing the former bypass bridge. The Deputy Mayor noted that the bypass bridge had been damaged beyond use following an incident involving a truck. The floating deck would provide a concrete ford at low flow, improving vehicle access during flooding.
  - Lees Valley resilience work included upsizing three existing culverts to larger-diameter pipes, with significant construction activity expected through June, despite winter conditions.

Councillor Fulton commented that he could recall other locations where a concrete base had been used, even for small fords, and asked whether this approach was used elsewhere. G Cleary confirmed that it was, noting that the two main options for a crossing were typically a ford or a bridge. The floating deck design being installed in this case involved pipework and a concrete base, with a clear span beneath the deck to allow significant water flow before reaching the structure. He advised that several options had been assessed for this site, and similar interventions could be considered at other locations where appropriate. G Cleary also noted that, in some situations, a third option would be a culvert.

Councillor Fulton further noted the ongoing cost of returning to repair gravel-based crossings. G Cleary responded that the most suitable solution depended on the characteristics of each site, and that the choice was generally between constructing a large multi-span bridge or installing a ford, as Council had done in this instance.

6.2 **Drainage, Stockwater and Three Waters (Drinking Water, Sewer and Stormwater) – Councillor Tim Fulton**

Councillor Fulton highlighted the following:

- Drinking water
  - Development work on Mandeville Bores 3 and 4 on Two Chain Road was progressing, although initial results indicated that the yield was likely to be lower than expected.
  - Work on Seddon Street was scheduled to progress from the following week, with completion expected by the end of May 2026.
- Wastewater
  - The Percival Street sewer main project was nearing completion, with sealing works expected to be finished by the end of May 2026, one month ahead of schedule.
  - Desludging works at the Kaiapoi Wastewater Treatment Plant were scheduled to take place at the end of May 2026. Councillor Fulton noted that he would be happy to visit the KWWTP facilities, but did not wish to be on site without invitation.
- Drainage/Stockwater
  - Maintenance and improvement work on the Ohoka Loop was completed, except for gravel and bamboo removal upstream of the confluence with the Cust Main Drain.
  - The Mandeville Resurgence Drainage Upgrade Stage 1A contract was awarded to Downgrade Drainage and Excavation. Construction had commenced on site during the week, with completion expected in June or July 2026.
  - Davis Ogilvy was awarded the professional services contract to design the Box Drain Stormwater Treatment Wetland.

6.3 **Solid Waste** – Councillor Niki Mealings

Councillor Mealings noted that all members were already well informed about the progress with the Southbrook Resource Recovery Park.

She advised that the Solid and Hazardous Waste Working Party meeting was scheduled for 20 June 2026, where proposed improvements to the Waste Minimisation and Management Plan (WMMP) and the renewal of the Transwaste Memorandum of Understanding would be discussed.

6.4 **Transport** – Mayor Dan Gordon

No discussion emanated from this point.

## 7. REPORTS REFERRED FROM THE KAIAPOI-TUAIHIWI COMMUNITY BOARD

### 7.1 Pines Beach and Kairaki Beach Stormwater Upgrades Report – J Recker (Stormwater and Waterways Manager) and Harry Wilson (Project Engineer)

J Recker spoke to the report, noting that approval would enable staff to proceed with the design and construction of the proposed drainage improvements for the coastal settlements of Pines Beach and Kairaki. The project aimed to reduce the risk of flooding and ponding within identified problem areas by upgrading local drainage and stormwater infrastructure. He advised that while the improvements would not eliminate all flooding risks, they would significantly improve system performance during smaller rainfall events.

J Recker outlined the main drainage challenges in Pines Beach and Kairaki, noting that the area was very flat, with high groundwater levels and a strong tidal influence from the Taranaki Creek. During high tides, stormwater could not be discharged effectively, causing water to back up in the system. As a result, even moderate rainfall could lead to ponding and slow drainage, while larger events caused surface flooding across roads and properties. These issues had been clearly demonstrated during the May 2025 rainfall event. The report requested that the Utilities and Roading Committee approve the following improvement works:

- Dunns Avenue – stormwater outfall upgrades and reticulation improvements.
- King Street / Batten Grove Corner – swale reticulation and outlet improvements.
- Featherston Avenue (North) – access road swale improvements.
- Featherston Avenue North residential area – open drain capacity and storage improvements.

J Recker further noted that the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board had requested an investigation into raising the wastewater building trucks. This work was being assessed by the Water and Wastewater Asset Team, with a follow-up report to be provided to both the Community Board and the Committee in due course.

Councillor Fulton noted that the report indicated that any assets constructed would remain vulnerable to future natural events and would be challenging to manage, even though they would maintain service levels in the current environment. He queried whether the proposed works were consistent with Council's approach in other areas, or whether the unique uncertainties in this location meant that a different standard was being applied. J Recker responded that the same level-of-service principles were applied as in other urban areas. Typically, the Council assessed whether existing infrastructure could accommodate a five-year storm event. This had recently been increased to a ten-year level of service for new developments and for upgrades where practical and appropriate. He explained that when upgrading downstream assets, it often made sense to increase capacity to the ten-year service level. However, when upgrading upstream components, increasing capacity too far could cause unintended downstream flooding. In those cases, upgrading to the five-year level of service was often the most appropriate and balanced approach.

In response to a question from Councillor Fulton regarding the earlier discussion on design standards, G Cleary reiterated that the decision to use a five- or ten-year level of service had been made by the Utilities and Roading Committee last year to align Council practice with national standards for primary stormwater systems. He explained that while pipe capacity can be upgraded to a ten-year standard, two key factors made this location particularly challenging. First, the coastal and low-lying parts of Kaiapoi were subject to significant natural hazards, including high groundwater levels, tidal influence, and high vulnerability to liquefaction. These areas were among the most susceptible in the district, as evidenced by extensive damage and subsequent rezoning after past earthquakes.

G Cleary noted that even with larger pipes, the system would still be constrained when external water levels were high, for example, when flap gates were closed due to high tides or elevated creek levels, meaning upgraded capacity would provide limited benefit in those conditions. Second, he emphasised that the area faced an ongoing risk of major natural events, such as an Alpine Fault Magnitude-eight earthquake or significant flooding from the Waimakariri River. Any infrastructure in this environment was more likely to sustain damage compared with other parts of the district. G Cleary advised that the recommended works represented a practical and reasonable level of intervention to improve drainage performance for the existing community, while acknowledging that the area's inherent vulnerabilities meant it would not be possible to provide the same level of service as in less hazard-prone locations.

Councillor Fulton followed up by asking if the situation illustrated the broader challenges faced in low-lying and coastal areas, particularly in the context of climate change adaptation. G Cleary explained that while national discussions often focused on long-term strategies such as managed retreat, the reality for existing communities was far more complex. He highlighted that the Council had, in the past, undertaken significant work to reduce risk in vulnerable areas, such as acquiring properties and relocating residents where necessary, but that responsibility for ongoing public services remained. G Cleary emphasised that these decisions were difficult and would become increasingly challenging over the coming decades as sea levels continued to rise and natural hazards intensified. He noted that at some point it may become unrealistic to continue defending certain areas, but at present there was an established community with existing infrastructure and investment. The Council, therefore, had a responsibility to make reasonable improvements where possible to support current residents. This was why the Council was undertaking wider climate change adaptation planning, to ensure a more strategic and informed approach to future decisions. G Cleary reiterated that it was important for elected members to be aware of the inherent risks in this area.

Councillor Mealings asked whether the proposed works represented money well spent, noting that the Council had previously invested significantly, alongside Environment Canterbury, in efforts to mitigate an 8.1 ARI flooding event in Kaiapoi, which had created a basin-like "bathtub" effect. She referred to the approximately \$18 million spent to protect the wider Kaiapoi area. She questioned what the long-term plan was for Pines Beach and Kairaki, and where this community might ultimately end up. Councillor Mealings emphasised the importance of being mindful of residents and ensuring their wellbeing was considered in future planning. J Recker responded that the improvements being considered by the Committee would provide minor but meaningful enhancements to the drainage system, aimed at reducing nuisance flooding during more frequent rainfall events. This included improving the ability to move runoff off roads and away from properties where possible, and addressing areas where backflow from Kairaki Creek could occur during high-water conditions. He noted that the proposed works would not mitigate the much larger, less frequent flooding events. However, he acknowledged that the Council would need to continue considering the long-term future of Pines Beach and Kairaki, given the area's vulnerability and the need to support residents as effectively as possible.

J Millward commented that J Recker had addressed the proposed improvements to reduce nuisance flooding and support recovery following larger events. He noted that the Council was currently undertaking hazard modelling, similar to the work being carried out by Christchurch City Council, and that this modelling made it clear that there would come a time when areas such as Pines Beach and Kairaki would no longer be viable as water levels continued to rise.

J Millward explained that the Council effectively had a limited window in which to manage nuisance flooding and maintain essential services, but that during major events, emergency response and recovery practices would still be required. He emphasised the severity of potential future events and noted that the Council likely had 20–30 years to prepare and develop appropriate safety and adaptation strategies for low-lying communities. J Millward further highlighted the importance of following the Council's advice and planning processes going forward, including identifying when a managed retreat might be appropriate.

Moved: Deputy Mayor Redmond      Seconded: Councillor Ward

**THAT** the Utilities and Recreation Committee:

- (a) **Approves** the following proposed infrastructure upgrades within Pines Beach and Kairaki Beach:
  - (1) Dunns Ave (North End) Stormwater Outfall Upgrades and Reticulation Improvements.
  - (2) Kain Street and Batten Grove Corner Swale, Reticulation and Outlet Improvements.
  - (3) Featherstone Ave (North Access Road) Low Point Drainage and Swale Improvements.
  - (4) Featherstone Ave (North Residential Area) Open Drain Capacity and Storage Improvements.
- (b) **Noted** that the recommended upgrades are estimated to cost \$163,791.60, including a 15% construction contingency, and that there is a total project budget of \$270,000.00 funded from the Pines Kairaki Stormwater Upgrades budget (102479.000.5123).
- (c) **Noted** that this project is intended to assist in mitigating flooding challenges being experienced in the residential areas of Pines Beach and Kairaki Beach during storm events. Acknowledging that the proposed upgrades will not remove all risk of future flooding, but will achieve some improvements during smaller- to medium-sized events.
- (d) **Noted** that Pines and Kairaki Beach Areas are subject to natural hazards such as flooding and liquefaction. This will be exacerbated in the future by sea level rise. Parts of the area were previously Red Zoned, making it challenging to maintain infrastructure and services.
- (e) **Noted** that these works are programmed to be designed this financial year (2025/26), and tendered and constructed next financial year (2026/27).
- (f) **Requested** the Three Waters Manager to investigate further work to be done on the gully traps to alleviate flooding in the area.

**CARRIED**

Deputy Mayor Redmond observed that when he first read the report, he questioned whether it was appropriate to invest further funding in an area that included red-zoned land. However, after considering the report and hearing from several Featherston Avenue residents, he acknowledged the concerns raised about drainage issues in the area. He emphasised that the project was not a response to sea-level rise, but rather to increasingly frequent and intense weather events. The programme of work was intended to reduce, though not eliminate, flooding issues. The photographs presented to the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board showed flooding on Featherston Avenue that prevented residents from accessing their properties. Deputy Mayor Redmond further noted that residents had identified additional ground-maintenance needs and that addressing these smaller-scale service needs would help reassure the community that access could be maintained during moderate events. He therefore supported the motion.

Councillor Ward expressed her support for the motion, noting the effectiveness of swales during large weather events. She commented that improvements to swales, drainage capacity and storage would be of real benefit to residents, given the events experienced over the past couple of years.

Councillor Cairns highlighted that in June 2011, 991 residential properties in Kaiapoi, Pines Beach and Kairaki Beach were designated as red zone by the Government. He noted that “red zone” had no legal status and that the area remained a Residential Zone, meaning the Council was obligated to maintain services. Councillor Cairns, therefore, urged the Committee to support the motion.

Councillor Fulton encouraged members to consider the distinction between post-earthquake recovery and the long-term physical environment, including the increasing frequency of severe weather events and the implications of climate change. He supported maintaining current service levels and ongoing community maintenance. He noted that future reports to the Council should place these considerations front and centre rather than treating them as background context. Councillor Fulton confirmed his support for the proposed works.

Councillor Bartle concurred with Councillor Cairns’ comments and supported the motion, noting that the improvements would help mitigate some of the issues currently affecting the area.

In his right of reply, Deputy Mayor Redmond acknowledged the comments made by the Chief Executive and other staff regarding the long-term challenges facing the area and the likelihood that it would become untenable in the future. However, he stated that he did not consider the recommended improvements to fall into that category. Deputy Mayor Redmond referred to the vulnerability of the sewer network in the area and reiterated the importance of undertaking the proposed works.

7.2 **Request for Approval to Install Raised Safety Platform on Island Road as part of the Sterling Development** – J McBride (Roading and Transport Manager) and J McSloy (Development Planning Manager)

J McBride confirmed that the Kaiapoi–Tuahiwi Community Board considered installing a raised safety platform on Island Road at the main pedestrian entrance to the Sterling Development. She noted the high volume of pedestrian movement expected in and out of the Sterling Retirement complex by residents, staff, and visitors, and that the proposed location of the raised safety platform on Island Road would connect directly to the footpath that runs through the reserve to the Silverstream commercial area, improving accessibility.

J McBride reported that raised safety platforms on Silverstream Boulevard have previously been the subject of complaints, particularly regarding noise and vibration, resulting in their removal. However, the circumstances in this case were different: the proposed raised table was on a clear road, not a local road or a bus route, and did not involve a curve at the bottom of the ramp that could generate noise or vibration. Additionally, it was not located directly outside a dwelling.

Deputy Mayor Redmond questioned the gradient required to access the ramp. J McBride confirmed that the ramp length was 1.8 metres. She explained that the raised table on Silverstream Boulevard had a shorter ramp on one side and a longer ramp on the departure side. She assured the Committee that care would be taken to ensure the proposed raised table met the required grade and provided a gentle transition.

Councillor Fulton noted that, in most circumstances, the Council and staff had reservations about the use of raised platforms, as there were situations in which they were not appropriate. He referred to previous discussions about connectivity and acknowledged that raised platforms could be challenging in more heavily populated areas with higher traffic volumes. Councillor Fulton noted that such treatments would not be suitable on roads such as Island Road near the Skew Bridge in Mandeville, where traffic conditions were significantly different.

J McBride noted that there was already a raised intersection on Island Road, which functioned well, and commented that the effectiveness of raised platforms often depended on several factors, including construction design. She observed that construction quality had been part of the issue with the raised tables on Silverstream Boulevard. J McBride acknowledged that raised platforms tended to generate strong views. At the same time, they were effective at reducing vehicle speeds, she recognised that they could also create noise and vibration for nearby residents, making their placement a difficult balance to strike. J McBride added that, given the feedback received, staff would be cautious about installing raised platforms on collector roads. However, there were situations where they worked well, such as at the entrance to the roundabout at Williams Street in Kaiapoi, where the treatment, although technically on a collector road, was not outside a dwelling and effectively slowed vehicles entering the area. She concluded that decisions on raised platforms needed to be made on a case-by-case basis.

Responding to a question from Councillor Fulton, J McBride explained that a range of interventions could be taken to help pedestrians safely cross busy roads, depending on the context and level of pedestrian demand. These could include formal pedestrian crossings where sufficient foot traffic existed, or signalised intersections in busier locations, which provided dedicated crossing facilities and improved pedestrian access. She noted that these treatments formed part of a spectrum of options that could be applied in different areas depending on traffic volumes, road classification and safety requirements.

Deputy Mayor Redmond observed that Councillor Fulton may have been asking whether there were alternative forms of speed-reducing interventions that could be used instead of a raised platform. J McBride responded that several options existed, depending on the context. She explained that pedestrian crossings could be effective in the right locations, but only where there was sufficient pedestrian demand; otherwise, drivers could become complacent if crossings were installed where pedestrians were rarely present. J McBride added that other treatments, such as kerb build-outs or chicanes, were also available. These interventions varied in design and purpose, and the appropriate choice depended on the specific road environment, traffic volumes and safety needs.

Deputy Mayor Redmond questioned how Island Road compared with Ohoka Road in terms of gradient and approach to raised platforms. J McBride replied that the two roads approached their intersections at different angles and that she did not have the specific information available to provide a direct comparison.

The Deputy Mayor then referred to the experience of driving from Ohoka Road over the motorway, noting that the approach to the raised platform there felt quite abrupt. J McBride responded that she was unable to comment on that particular location without reviewing the gradient details.

Councillor Mealings noted that the developer was funding the proposed works and asked whether the request for the raised table had come from the developer. J McBride advised that the design work was being undertaken by the developer, who had been asked to consider the needs of the demographic using the area, particularly elderly residents and those with mobility challenges. She explained that accessibility considerations, including safe walking and mobility-scooter access, were key factors in the proposal, and that the raised table would provide a safer and more accessible crossing point.

G Cleary clarified that the developer prepared the design and submitted it to Council staff for review. In an ideal situation, the developer would provide a fully compliant design; however, if accessibility considerations were missing, staff would assess the design and request amendments as needed.

Councillor Mealings expressed accessibility concern, particularly regarding the drop-off over raised tables. She referred to High Street in Rangiora, where raised platforms exist but the speed limit remains 50 km/h, and asked at what point a speed limit reduction would be required. She queried whether there was a rule or standard that guided such decisions. J McBride confirmed that guidance existed and noted that in town centres, a 30 km/h limit was generally considered more appropriate than a 50 km/h limit. She added that the Rangiora Town Centre Plan included an action to lower the town centre speed limit. While activity along High Street naturally reduced vehicle speeds during busy periods, she acknowledged that at quieter times, speed remained a concern.

Councillor Mealings asked at what point a speed limit became coherent with, or reflective of, the surrounding environment. J Cleary responded that many district roads currently had speed limits higher than what would be considered a safe driving speed for their environments. He explained that speed limits were not always reduced to match the surrounding conditions, although efforts had been made to improve this alignment. J Cleary noted that the current approach was to introduce physical interventions into the road environment to create conditions that naturally encourage slower speeds.

Councillor Cairns asked whether, if the treatment were a formal pedestrian crossing, there would be legally required signage, such as the standard circular orange pedestrian warning sign, and whether any warning signage was required in this case, given that the proposal was for a raised platform rather than a pedestrian crossing. He queried whether warning signs would be installed to ensure driver awareness and support safe speeds. J McBride responded that because the proposal was for a raised platform rather than a formal pedestrian crossing, the associated pedestrian-specific signage was not required. She noted that raised platforms typically included appropriate warning signage or road markings to alert drivers to the change in road environment and to encourage reduced speeds.

Councillor Cairns enquired whether the developer would also fund any required warning signage for the raised platform. J McBride confirmed that all signage and road markings were included in the developer's responsibilities. She noted that this did not require any additional mention specific to a pedestrian table, as it was already covered within the standard signage and marking requirements for the project.

Moved: Councillor Mealings

Seconded: Councillor Bartle

**THAT** the Utilities and Recreation Committee:

- (a) **Approve** the installation of a raised safety platform on Island Road, to provide a connection between the Sterling and the Reserve Walkway.
- (b) **Notes** that the Developer will fund the cost of installation of the raised safety platform.

**CARRIED**

Councillor Mealings confirmed her support for the motion and noted the relevant comparison to the Silverstream Road raised platform, as well as the variables that had been addressed.

Councillor Bartle commended staff for recommending a type of raised platform that aligned with the safety needs of Sterling Village residents. He also supported the motion.

Councillor Fulton observed that it was fortunate the design did not include red slurry paint and offered his support.

Deputy Mayor Redmond also expressed support for the recommendation, noting J McBride's advice that the proposed raised table would have a gentler approach than the one on Ohoka Road, and that it was not intended to function as a pedestrian crossing.

In her right of reply, Councillor Mealings commended the recommendation, stating that it represented the most sensible of the available solutions.

## 8. QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS

Nil.

## 9. URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS

Nil.

## 10. MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED WITH THE PUBLIC EXCLUDED

Moved. Deputy Mayor Redmond

Seconded: Councillor Ward

In accordance with section 48(1) 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 (or sections 6, 7 or 9 of the Official Information Act 1982, as the case may be), it was moved:

**That** the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting:

- 10.1 Confirmation of Minutes 14 April 2026.
- 10.2 Approval to Utilise Sole Source Procurement Method for Pump Supply for 2025/26 Wastewater Pump Renewals
- 10.3 Contract 25/91 Bridge Maintenance – Scour Remediation – Makerikeri River Scope Addition Variation Report

The general subject of each matter to be considered while the public was 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 were as follows:

Item No.	Subject	Reason for excluding the public	Grounds for excluding the public.
<b>CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES</b>			
10.1	Minutes of the Public Excluded Portion of the Utilities and Roothing Committee Meeting 14 April 2026	Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7	To protect the privacy of natural persons, including that of deceased natural persons, maintain legal professional privilege and enable any local authority holding the information to carry on, without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations (including commercial and industrial negotiations) <b>LGOIMA Sections 7 (2)(a), (g) and (i).</b>

Item No.	Subject	Reason for excluding the public	Grounds for excluding the public.
<b>REPORTS FOR INFORMATION</b>			
10.2	Approval to Utilise Sole Source Procurement Method for Pump Supply for 2025/26 Wastewater Pump Renewals	Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7	To protect the privacy of natural persons and enable the local authority to carry on without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations (including commercial and industrial) negotiations, and maintain legal professional privilege. <b>LGOIMA Section 7 (2)(a), (g) and (i).</b>
10.3	Contract 25/91 Bridge Maintenance – Scour Remediation – Makerikeri River Scope Addition Variation Report	Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7	To protect the privacy of natural persons and enable the local authority to carry on without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations (including commercial and industrial) negotiations, and maintain legal professional privilege. <b>LGOIMA Section 7 (2)(a), (g) and (i).</b>

**CARRIED****CLOSED MEETING**

*The Public Excluded portion of the meeting commenced at 10.32 am and concluded at 10.43 am.*

**OPEN MEETING**

Moved: Deputy Mayor Redmond

Seconded: Councillor Mealings

**That** the open meeting resumes, and the business discussed with the public excluded remains public excluded unless otherwise resolved in the individual resolutions.

**CARRIED****11. NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting of the Utilities and Roding Committee was scheduled for Tuesday, 9 June 2026, at 9am in the Council Chamber, Rangiora Service Centre, 215 High Street, Rangiora.

*THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE MEETING CONCLUDED AT 10.45AM.*

**CONFIRMED**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chairperson

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

**WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL****REPORT FOR DECISION**

**FILE NO and TRIM NO:** RDG-03-09/260514116450

**REPORT TO:** KAIAPOI-TUAHIWI COMMUNITY BOARD

**DATE OF MEETING:** 18 May 2026

**AUTHOR(S):** Nithin Puthupparambil, Transportation Engineer  
Shane Binder, Senior Transportation Engineer

**SUBJECT:** Request to Approve a Change of Intersection Controls on Heywards Road and Baynons Road

**ENDORSED BY:**  
(for Reports to Council,  
Committees or Boards)



General Manager



Chief Executive

**1. SUMMARY**

- 1.1. This report seeks approval from the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board to change the following intersection controls:
- 1.1.1. Revoke the existing Give Way control on Baynons Road at Heywards Road and replace with a new Stop control.
- 1.1.2. Revoke the existing Give Way control on Heywards Road at South Eyre Road and replace with a new Stop control.
- 1.2. Staff reviewed the visibility at Baynons Road / Heywards Road and Heywards Road / South Eyre Road intersections following a safety review.
- 1.3. A lack of visibility was identified for vehicles on both side roads to oncoming traffic traveling along the through road at both intersections. The constrained visibility is primarily caused by vegetation within private property.
- 1.4. As a result of the above assessments, these intersection controls are recommended by staff for implementation.

**2. RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:

- (a) **Receives** Report No. 260514116450.
- (b) **Approves** the following intersection control changes pursuant to section 2 of the Land Transport Rule: Traffic Control Devices 2004, with effect from the date of installation of appropriate signage:

Item	Road to be Controlled	Road to Remain Uncontrolled	Type of Control to be Imposed	Type of Control to be Revoked
1	Baynons Road	Heywards Road	Stop	Give Way
2	Heywards Road	South Eyre Road	Stop	Give Way

- (c) **Circulates** this report to the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board and the Utilities and Roading Committee for information.

### 3. **BACKGROUND**

- 3.1. The intersections of Baynons Road with Heywards Road, and Heywards Road with South Eyre Road, connect rural local roads with a key collector route within the Clarkville area. South Eyre Road functions as a Collector Road and carries comparatively higher traffic volumes.
- 3.1.1. Baynons Road carries approximately 174 vehicles per day, with an 85th percentile speed of 77 km/h.
- 3.1.2. Heywards Road carries approximately 208 vehicles per day, with an 85th percentile speed of 89 km/h.
- 3.1.3. South Eyre Road carries approximately 2,911 vehicles per day, with an 85th percentile speed of 85 km/h.
- 3.2. A safety review of Clarkville area roads was commissioned due to gravel extraction undertaken from the Waimakariri River at Baynons Break, in response to community concerns.
- 3.3. At the Heywards Road / Baynons Road intersection, the safety review identified sightline obstructions from a hedge encroaching into the road corridor (at No. 375) and noted that current conditions do not meet Give Way requirements.
- 3.4. At the Heywards Road / South Eyre Road intersection, the safety review found adequate sight distance on the south-east corner, but restricted visibility due to vegetation and road curvature on the south-west corner, and similarly concluded that current conditions do not meet Give Way requirements.

### 4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

- 4.1. Per the NZTA *Traffic Control Devices Manual Part 4*, give-way control is recommended as the default intersection control under normal operating circumstances.
- 4.2. Section 4.1.2 of the *TCD Manual* recommends that a stop control should be implemented at intersections “where at a point 9 m from the limit line on a controlled approach to the intersection a lack of visibility means that, at an approach speed of more than 10 km/h, a driver could not see a vehicle on an uncontrolled approach at a distance (in metres) of 1.2 times the numeric value of the speed (in km/h) exceeded by 15% of vehicles approaching on the main road.”
- 4.3. The NZTA *Guidelines for the implementation of traffic control at crossroads* (RTS 1), recommends that the use of different controls (e.g., stop control, give-way control) on opposite approaches of a crossroads should be avoided to minimise driver confusion. It is therefore considered best practice to have the same traffic control on both side streets unless other safety considerations take higher priority.
- 4.4. As the safety review identified concerns regarding intersection visibility, staff undertook site visits and reviewed available traffic data to inform any recommended changes in intersection control.

#### Baynons Road / Heywards Road

- 4.5. Staff observations indicate restricted visibility for drivers on Baynons Road to traffic on Heywards Road when approaching the intersection. The available sight distance does not meet the 107 m requirement for Give Way control in the 89 km/h speed environment as per the *TCD Manual*. See Figures 1 and 2 on the next page.



Figure 1: Baynons Road / Heywards Road intersection with restricted visibility



Figure 2: Available Sightlines at Baynons Road / Heywards Road intersection

- 4.6. To improve safety at this intersection, a Stop control is proposed on Baynons Road at Heywards Road.

#### Heywards Road / South Eyre Road

- 4.7. Staff observations indicate restricted visibility for drivers on Heywards Road to traffic on South Eyre Road, particularly for left-looking movements when approaching the intersection. The available intersection sight distance does not meet the 102 m requirement for Give Way control in the 85 km/h speed environment as per the *TCD Manual*. See Figures 3 and 4 on the next page.



Figure 3: Heywards Road / South Eyre Road intersection with restricted visibility



Figure 4: Available Sightlines at Heywards Road / South Eyre Road intersection

- 4.8. To improve safety at this intersection, it is recommended that the existing Give Way control be replaced with a Stop control including sign and corresponding road markings, on Heywards Road approach to South Eyre Road.
- 4.9. The Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board has the following options available to them:
- 4.10. Option One: Approve installation of intersection controls at the following locations
- Stop control on Baynons Road and Heywards Road
  - Stop control on Heywards Road at South Eyre Road

This option involves Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board approving the installation of Stop controls, consisting of signs and road markings, at the above locations.

This is the recommended option because it improves safety by mandating drivers to come to a complete stop where sight distance does not meet Give Way thresholds.

#### 4.11. Option Two: Approve a partial installation of Stop controls

This option involves the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board approving the installation of controls at one but not both of the intersections.

This is not the recommended option as it does not address identified visibility concerns across both intersections, which could still pose safety risks.

#### 4.12. Option Three: Decline approval of any new intersection controls (retain status quo)

This option would see the current intersection controls retained.

This is not the recommended option because retaining the status quo does not address safety concerns at the two intersections.

#### **Implications for Community Wellbeing**

There are implications on community wellbeing by the issues and options that are the subject matter of this report. Setting appropriate intersection controls helps reduce the risk of harm from a crash.

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

### **5. COMMUNITY VIEWS**

#### 5.1. **Mana whenua**

Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri hapū are not likely to be affected by, or have an interest in the subject matter of this report.

#### 5.2. **Groups and Organisations**

There are not groups and organisations likely to be affected by, or to have an interest in the subject matter of this report.

#### 5.3. **Wider Community**

The proposed actions outlined in this report are expected to have minimal impact on the wider community, and significant public interest is unlikely, as the changes being implemented are minor in nature. Consequently, public consultation with adjacent residents or the broader community has not been undertaken.

### **6. OTHER IMPLICATIONS AND RISK MANAGEMENT**

#### 6.1. **Financial Implications**

There are financial implications of the decisions sought by this report. There are minimal costs associated with installing intersection control, chiefly new signs and limit line pavement marking.

The costs are estimated to be \$3,700 and can be accommodated within the Road Maintenance budgets (Signs Renewal PJ 100183.000.5134 & Pavement Marking GL 10.270.582.2500).

This budget is included in the Annual Plan/Long Term Plan.

#### 6.2. **Sustainability and Climate Change Impacts**

The recommendations in this report do not have sustainability and/or climate change impacts as the effects of intersection control are quite localised.

#### 6.3. **Risk Management**

There are no risks arising from the adoption/implementation of the recommendations in this report.

#### 6.4. **Health and Safety**

There are health and safety risks arising from the adoption/implementation of the recommendations in this report. Failure to provide appropriate intersection controls can increase the risk of harm to motorists.

Physical works will be undertaken through the Road Maintenance contract. The Road Maintenance contractor has a Health and Safety Plan and a SiteWise score of 100.

### 7. **CONTEXT**

#### 7.1. **Consistency with Policy**

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

#### 7.2. **Authorising Legislation**

Section 2 of the Land Transport Rule: Traffic Control Devices requires a Road Controlling Authority to "authorise and, as appropriate, install or operate traffic control devices."

#### 7.3. **Consistency with Community Outcomes**

The Council's community outcomes are relevant to the actions arising from the recommendations in this report. In particular, the following community outcomes are of relevance to the issue under discussion:

***Social: a place where everyone can have a sense of belonging***

- Our community has equitable access to the essential infrastructure and services required to support community wellbeing.

***Environmental: a place that values and restores our environment***

- The natural and built environment in which people live is clean, healthy and safe.
- Our communities are able to access and enjoy natural areas and public spaces.

#### 7.4. **Authorising Delegations**

As per Part 3 of the WDC Delegations Manual, the Community Board has the delegated authority to approve control signs on streets (e.g., stop, give way, etc.).

It is noted that South Eyre Road is on the boundary between the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi and Oxford -Ohoka Community Boards; however, the intersecting road with the intersection control (Heywards Rd) is fully within the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board area. As such the report for decision sits with the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board and is shared with the Oxford -Ohoka Community Board for information.