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WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

A meeting of the WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL will be held in the COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA on TUESDAY 28 MAY and WEDNESDAY 29 MAY 2019, commencing at 9.00am each day, for the purposes of deliberating the Draft Annual Plan 2019-2020.

Sarah Nichols
GOVERNANCE MANAGER

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

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

- Draft Annual Plan 2019-2020
- Copy of all submissions received

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

2. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

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

3. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

3.1 Minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on Thursday 9 May 2019 to hear submissions to the Draft 2019-2020 Annual Plan

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Confirms as a true and correct record the minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on Thursday 9 May 2019.

4. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES
5. **OVERVIEW**

J Palmer and J Millward will provide an overview of the financial aspects related to the Annual Plan.

6. **REPORTS**

6.1 Draft Annual Plan 2019-2020 Special Consultative Procedure – Helene Street (Corporate Planner)

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report LTC-03-15-02/TRIM Number 190521071264

(b) **Receives** all 129 submissions and associated submission points raised by submitters, which are included in the ‘Deliberations Pack’ previously distributed to Councillors.

6.2 Rating for Drinking Water Supply UV Disinfection – Summary of Submissions – Colin Roxburgh (Water Asset Manager)

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 190426060012.

(b) **Notes** that as part of the consultation on the Draft 2019/20 Annual Plan, residents were invited to make submissions on a proposal to aggregate the costs of UV disinfection treatment for water supplies into one account and establish a new uniform annual charge for each property connected to a Council water supply (presented as Option A), with the alternative option of continuing to rate each scheme individually for UV costs being presented as Option B.

(c) **Notes** that 63 individuals or groups made submissions on this topic, with 40 (63%) being in favour of Option A and 23 (37%) in favour of Option B.

(d) **Notes** that groups that submitted in favour of Option A included the Pegasus Residents’ Group, The Woodend-Sefton Community Board, the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board, the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board and the Canterbury District Health Board.

(e) **Notes** that groups that submitted in favour of Option B included the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board and Federated Farmers of New Zealand.

Either;

(f) **Resolves** to adopt the rating proposal presented as ‘Option A’ in the Draft 2019/20 Annual Plan to aggregate the costs of UV disinfection treatment for water supplies into one account and establish a new uniform annual charge for each property connected to a Council water supply.
Notes that this will result in current costs associated with UV upgrade projects (and in the case of Poyntzs Road a connection to another scheme as an alternative to a UV upgrade project) being taken out of each individual water supply account, and replaced by a new uniform annual charge starting at $5 per connection per year in 2019/20 to $34 per connection per year in 2028/29.

OR alternatively;

(h) Resolves to adopt the rating proposal presented as ‘Option B’ in the Draft 2019/20 Annual Plan to continue to rate each water supply scheme individually for UV treatment costs.

(i) Notes that this will mean that there will be no new uniform annual charge applied across water supply schemes for UV disinfection, but will result in significant cost increases for some schemes such as Poyntzs Road and Garrymere relative to Option A.

(j) Circulates this report to the Community Boards for their information.

6.3 Water Supply – Utilities and Roading Department Staff Submission to the Draft 2019-20 Annual Plan – Colin Roxburgh (Water Asset Manager)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 190424059253.

(b) Approves deferring $500,000 of the Rangiora UV treatment installation budget from 2019-20 to 2020-21, to allow consideration of the upcoming draft changes to the Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand prior to committing to construction of the proposed upgrade.

(c) Approves deferring $700,000 of the Kaiapoi UV treatment installation budget from 2019-20 to 2020-21, to allow consideration of the upcoming draft changes to the Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand prior to committing to construction of the proposed upgrade.

(d) Approves deferring $200,000 of the Domain Road UV Treatment Installation Budget – Oxford Urban Share from 2019-20 to 2020-21, to allow consideration of the upcoming draft changes to the Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand prior to committing to construction of the proposed upgrade.

(e) Approves deferring $70,000 of the Domain Road UV Treatment Installation Budget – Oxford Rural No.2 Share from 2019-20 to 2020-21, to allow consideration of the upcoming draft changes to the Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand prior to committing to construction of the proposed upgrade.

(f) Approves deferring $100,000 of the Cust UV treatment installation budget from 2019-20 to 2020-21, to allow consideration of the upcoming draft changes to the Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand prior to committing to construction of the proposed upgrade.
(g) **Approves** deferring $100,000 of the Cust Headworks Renewal budget from 2019-20 to 2020-21, to allow consideration of the upcoming draft changes to the Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand prior to committing to construction of the proposed upgrade, which is part of the wider Cust UV installation project.

(h) **Approves** deferring $200,000 of the Pegasus UV treatment installation budget from 2019-20 to 2020-21, to allow consideration of the upcoming draft changes to the Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand prior to committing to construction of the proposed upgrade.

(i) **Notes** that there is still a degree of uncertainty regarding the timing of the upcoming changes to requirements, and in the event that the drivers for these projects require the upgrades to progress faster than allowed for with the proposed changes to the budgets, staff will bring a further report to Council to request some or all of these budgets to be brought forward.

6.4 **Wastewater – Utilities and Roading Department Staff Submissions to the Draft 2019-20 Annual Plan**

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 190416056516.

(b) **Approves** the request to defer budget for the Fernside connection to EDSS Project as set out in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme - Project</th>
<th>Budget Type</th>
<th>Draft 2019/20 Annual Plan</th>
<th>Revised Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fernside Connection to Eastern Districts Sewer Scheme</td>
<td>Solely Growth</td>
<td>$169,225 (2019/20)</td>
<td>$40,000 (2019/20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$406,013 (2021/22)</td>
<td>$406,013 (2021/22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>$73,075 (2019/20)</td>
<td>$50,000 (2019/20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$135,338 (2020/21)</td>
<td>$158,413 (2020/21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$135,337 (2021/22)</td>
<td>$135,337 (2021/22)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(c) **Approves** the request to defer budget for the Cridland Street Sewer Repairs Project as set out in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme - Project</th>
<th>Budget Type</th>
<th>Draft 2019/20 Annual Plan</th>
<th>Revised Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cridland Street Sewer Repairs</td>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>$500,000 (2019/20)</td>
<td>$100,000 (2019/20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$500,000 (2020/21)</td>
<td>$900,000 (2020/21)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(d) **Approves** a new renewal budget of $215,000 in 2019/20 for improving the standard of fencing of the districts WWTP’s.

(e) **Notes** that $215,000 is not budgeted for in 2019/20 that will need to be funded from renewals.

(f) **Notes** that this new budget will increase the Eastern Sewer rate by approximately 0.16% (0.26% if the Septage facility design project is not deferred)

(g) **Approves** that the deferring of the Septage facility design budget $100,000 to 2020/21.
6.5 **Mandeville Drainage – Summary of Submissions – Kalley Simpson (3 Waters Manager)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council

(a) Receives report No. 190517069694.

(b) Notes that a recommendation is included in the Drainage & Stockwater – Utilities & Roading Department Staff Submission to the Draft 2019-20 Annual Plan report on bringing forward the investigation budget from 20/21 to 19/20 for the Mandeville Resurgence Channel Diversion / Upgrade project.

(c) Notes that this change will have no impact on rates.

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

6.6 **Drainage and Stockwater – Utilities and Roading Department Staff Submission to the Draft 2019-20 Annual Plan – Owen Davies (Drainage Asset Manager) and Kalley Simpson (3 Waters Manager)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council

(a) Receives report No. 190418057971.

   Lehmans Rd Drain Upgrade Stage 1

(b) Approves an additional capital works (LOS) budget of $125,000 in 19/20 for the Lehmans Rd Drain Upgrade Stage 1 project under the District Drainage account.

(c) Notes that this with give a total budget of $250,000 for Lehmans Rd Drain Upgrade Stage 1 project, when combined with the existing budget of $125,000 in the 18/19 financial year proposed to be carried forward to the 19/20 financial year.

(d) Notes that the additional $125,000 budget would increase the District Drainage rate by approximately 1.8% or $0.38 per property.

   North Brook - Janelle to White

(e) Approves transferring the capital works (LOS) budget of $280,000 in 19/20 to 20/21 for North Brook – Janelle Place to White St under the Rangiora urban drainage account.

(f) Notes that this will give a total budget of $560,000, with $150,000 in 19/20 and $410,000 in 20/21.
Wiltshire / Green Pipework Upgrade.

(g) Approves an additional capital works (LOS) budget of $475,000 in the 21/22 financial year for the Wiltshire / Green Pipework Upgrade Stage 1 to be funded from the Rangiora urban drainage account.

(h) Notes that this will give a total budget of $975,000 for the Wiltshire / Green Pipework Upgrade Stage 1 project.

(i) Notes that the additional $475,000 budget would increase the Rangiora Drainage rate by approximately 2.5% or $4.89 per property.

(j) Notes that the main reason for the increase in budget is to provide capacity within the primary system for the 1 in 50 year level of service from the end of Janelle Place and Wiltshire Court, as there is no secondary flow from these cul-de-sacs.

(k) Approves the deferral of the Stage 2 works by three financial years to commence in the 24/25 financial year as follows:

\[\sum\text{Investigation and consultation in 24/25 - $72,000}\]
\[\sum\text{Design and consenting/landowner approval in 25/26 - $405,000}\]

Pentecost Road Stormwater Main and SMA

(l) Approves the reallocation of $378,000 from the Pentecost Road Stormwater Main – LOS budget, $102,000 from the Pentecost Road Stormwater Main – Growth budget, $180,000 from the Pentecost Road SMA – LOS budget and $45,000 from the Pentecost Road SMA – Growth, from the 19/20 financial year to the 20/21 financial year.

(m) Notes that the remaining budgets in the 19/20 financial year, combined with the planned carryover from 18/19 to 19/20, give a budget of $445,000 in the 19/20 financial year for the construction of the stormwater main adjacent to the new Rangiora West School and the consenting and detailed design of the remaining works.

(n) Notes that the total budget of $1,150,000 for the works remains unchanged and hence has no impact on rates.

(o) Notes that staff will bring a report to Council if additional budget is required once the concept design is complete.

Pegasus – Stormwater Minor Improvements.

(p) Approves the removal of the Pegasus Minor Stormwater Improvements budget of $10,000 per year.

(q) Notes that no works have been identified for this budget over the last two financial years.

Kaiapoi West / Silverstream - Pond Areas 1&2; Land Purchase

(r) Approves the reallocation of $206,250 from 19/20 to 20/21 and $1,856,250 from 20/21 to 21/22 for the Kaiapoi West / Silverstream Pond Areas 1&2; Land Purchase project.

(s) Notes that there will be no impact on development contributions as a result of this budget reallocation.
Parnhams Drain Catchment Improvements.

(t) Approves the transfer of $100,000 from 20/21 to 19/20 for Parnhams Drain Catchment Improvement project.

(u) Notes that if approved the budgets for Parnhams Drain Catchment Improvement will be $300,000 in 19/20 (was $200,000), $700,000 in 20/21 (was $800,000) and $3,000,000 in 21/22 (unchanged).

Feldwick Drain Catchment Improvements.

(v) Approves the reallocation of $200,000 from 19/20 to 20/21 and $3,600,000 from 20/21 to 21/22 for Feldwick Drain Catchment Improvement project.

(w) Notes that if approved the budgets for Feldwick Drain Catchment Improvement will be $200,000 in 19/20 (was $400,000), $200,000 in 20/21 (was $3,600,000) and $3,600,000 in 21/22 (was $0).

Mandeville Resurgence Channel Diversion / Upgrade.

(x) Approves bringing forward the investigation budget for the Mandeville Resurgence Channel Diversion / Upgrade project of $20,000 in 20/21 by one financial year to 19/20.

(y) Notes that the budgets for design and consent of $100,000 and construction of $550,000 will remain in 21/22 and 22/23 respectively.

(z) Notes that this change will have no impact on rates.

(aa) Notes that staff will report back to Council on any further changes to budgets for this project as part of the proposed draft 20/21 Annual Plan in January 2020.

Stockwater – Syphon Renewals

(bb) Approves a new capital works (renewals) budget of $60,000 in 19/20 for the renewal of stockwater syphons under the Stockwater account.

(cc) Notes that as this work is funded from the stockwater renewals fund, there will be no impact on rates.

Stockwater – Operational budgets

(dd) Approves an increase to the stockwater operating budget of $22,860, comprising of a $3,500 increase in the asset management (operations) budget, $2,000 increase in the public education budget and a $17,360 increase in the maintenance budget.

(ee) Notes that as this additional operational budget will increase the stockwater race rates by approximately 6.4% $16.07 per property on average.

Carryovers from 18/19

(ff) Approves the additional carryover of the following budgets from the 18/19 financial year to the 19/20 financial year.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No.</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>18/19 Budget</th>
<th>Carryover to 19/20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100551</td>
<td>North Brook Enhancement Work</td>
<td>$184,400</td>
<td>$184,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101266</td>
<td>Lehmans Rd Drain Upgrade Stage 1</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100645</td>
<td>Rangiora West / Townsend Fields - Land Purchase Pond 5, Culverts, Swales</td>
<td>$2,280,000</td>
<td>$855,000 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100848</td>
<td>North Brook - Janelle to White</td>
<td>$280,000</td>
<td>$280,000 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100849</td>
<td>Wiltshire / Green Pipework Upgrade</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101262</td>
<td>Flaxton Road Urbanisation</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100631</td>
<td>Parnhams Drain PS Upgrade &amp; Access</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100561</td>
<td>Oxford Drainage Upgrade Non Scheduled</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101012</td>
<td>Mill Road SMAs</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>$350,000 (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Includes $565,000 carryover to 19/20 and $290,000 carryover to 20/21.

(2) Includes $100,000 carryover to 19/20 and $180,000 carryover to 20/21.

(3) Includes $50,000 carryover to 19/20 and $300,000 carryover to 20/21.

Notes that the Tuahiwi Stream Capacity Upgrades and the Kaiapoi – Pump Station Renewals projects no longer need to be carried forward to the 19/20 financial year.

Notes that the McIntosh Drain Upgrade, Pentecost Rd Stormwater Main and Pentecost Road SMA projects are planned carryovers from the 18/19 financial year already approved as part of the LTP.

Circulates this report to the Community Boards for their information.

6.7 Waimakariri Water Zone – Recommendation for Option A – Sophie Allen (Water Environment Advisor)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council

(a) Receives report No. 190501061992.

(b) Adopts Option A for the Waimakariri Water Zone – Zone Implementation Programme Addendum, as presented in the Draft Annual Plan. Option A is for Council to play a coordination role, in addition to the role of educator and advisor, and also the creation of a Biodiversity Officer role.

(c) Notes that Option A was supported by 66% of submitters to the Draft Annual Plan for the Waimakariri Water Zone topic.
(d) Approves the funding of Option A: Implementation of the ZIPA with a budget of $205,000 for 19/20 and 20/21 from the general rate, for inclusion in the Annual Plan. This comprises of $150,000 under the District Drainage account, and $55,000 from the Greenspace Operations account.

(e) Notes $100,000 per annum for 19/20 and 20/21 for ZIPA Implementation has already been approved from the District Drainage account in the Long Term Plan, which is funded from the general rate.

(f) Notes Option A funding would bring the total ZIPA implementation funding to a total of $305,000 per year for the 2019-21 financial years. Option A funding includes primarily creation of the role of a WDC Biodiversity Officer, who would have a dual role i.e. also implementation of biodiversity regulations under the WDC District Plan.

(g) Notes that the increase in the general rate is calculated to be $9.48 per average rateable property for Option A.

(h) Notes that the Revenue and Financing Policy will be updated to include a new activity of ‘Land and Water (Waimakariri Water Zone)’ under the general rate.

(i) Circulates this report to Community Boards and Waimakariri Water Zone Committee.

6.8 Solid Waste Activity – Utilities and Roading Department Staff Submission to the Draft 2019-20 Annual Plan – Kitty Waghorn (Solid Waste Asset Manager) and Gerard Cleary (Manager Utilities and Roading)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 190424059253.

(b) Approves amending the budget allowances in the Collection Account as follows:

i) Kerbside Collection Rates (Opt-In) income increase from $1,427,261 to $1,742,565

ii) Wheelie Bin Fees income increase from $0 to $85,820

iii) Kerbside Collection management & promotions expenditure from $135,580 to $146,840

iv) Disposal Charges Refuse expenditure increase from $655,500 to $781,170

v) Disposal Charges Organics expenditure increase from $241,590 to $283,560

vi) Landfill Levy expenditure increase from $29,585 to $35,257

vii) Contract Payments – Refuse Collection expenditure decrease from $479,236 to $412,752

viii) Contract Payments – Recycling expenditure decrease from $414,245 to $411,316
ix) Contract Payments – Organics expenditure decrease from $508,537 to $464,885

(c) **Approves** amending the budget allowances in the Disposal Account as follows:

i) Southbrook Gate Sales income decrease from $2,858,585 to $2,674,135

ii) Refuse Collection Charges income increase from $655,500 to $781,170

iii) Refuse to Landfill expenditure decrease from $1,660,657 to $1,646,572

iv) Green Waste expenditure decrease from $246,460 to $214,949

v) Transportation expenditure decrease from $558,365 to $547,060

(d) **Approves** the new charges for the delivery of additional replacement bins when a set of bins is being replaced at a property at one time, to be recovered through the Council’s Debtors system, as follows:

i) Delivery of an additional 80 litre bin $89.60

ii) Delivery of an additional 140 litre bin $98.40

iii) Delivery of an additional 240 litre bin $108.00

(e) **Notes** that the remaining fees and charges and the targeted rates approved for the draft Annual Plan budgets will not be adjusted.

(f) **Notes** that the Collection Account is funded by targeted rates, refuse bag sales and wheelie bin fees.

(g) **Notes** that the Disposal Account is funded by general rates and gate fees, and that the gate fees for refuse and greenwaste disposal are set at a level that fully funds the handling, transport and disposal costs of these materials.

(h) **Notes** that the updated bin numbers, and the effect on costs and revenue, were not available at the time the draft Annual Plan Budgets were prepared.

(i) **Circulate** report No. 190424059253 to the Community Boards.
6.9 **Roading Staff Submission – Topito Road Upgrade – Joanne McBride (Roading and Transport Manager) and Gerard Cleary (Manager Utilities and Roading)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report TRIM number 190501062382;

(b) **Advises** the Runanga that Council will fund 70% ($177,100 excluding GST) of the cost subject to developers funding the remaining 30% share ($75,900 excluding GST);

(c) **Notes** that obtaining additional road reserve width along Topito Road will not be pursued at this time and that this matter will be discussed with Runanga in terms of the ongoing development in MR873;

(d) **Circulates** this report to the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board for information.

6.10 **Roading Staff Submission – Runanga Request for improvements on Tuahiwi Road – Joanne McBride (Roading and Transport Manager) and Gerard Cleary (Manager Utilities and Roading)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 190415056053;

(b) **Approves** the recommend approach of installing a swale along the roadside and monitoring;

(c) **Notes** that this work can be carried out form within Maintenance Budgets in 2019/20;

(d) **Circulates** this report to the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board and the Utilities & Roading Committee.

6.11 **Roading Staff Submission – Coldstream Road Improvements – (Joanne McBride (Roading and Transport Manager) and Gerard Cleary (Manager Utilities and Roading)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 190415056065;

(b) **Approves** the budget of $50,000 being retained in 2019/20;

(c) **Approves** the budget of $450,000 being moved to 2020/21 and additional budget of $210,000 being allocated to allow the upgrade work to be carried out (total budget of $660,000 for 2020/21);
(d) **Notes** that a briefing will be held with the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board prior to formal approval of the scheme design being sought;

(e) **Circulates** this report to all Community Boards and the Utilities & Roading Committee for information.

6.12 **Roading Staff Submission – Ohoka Road Fencing – Joanne McBride (Roading and Transport Manager) and Gerard Cleary (Manager Utilities and Roading)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 190407051583;

(b) **Declines** the request for fencing improvements and maintains the status quo;

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

6.13 **Roading Staff Submission – Request changes to the Roading Capital Works Budget – Joanne McBride (Roading and Transport Manager) and Gerard Cleary (Manager Utilities and Roading)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 190415055924;

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Draft Annual Plan 2019/20 ($000)</th>
<th>Updated Annual Plan 2019/20 ($000)</th>
<th>NZTA Funding Share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Woodend / Boys Rd / Tuahiwi Rd</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Demand Management / Modelling</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$591.3</td>
<td>$301.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$791.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>$401.5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(c) **Approves** bringing forward $100,000 of budget for Park and Ride investigation as outlined in the Draft Annual Plan Consultation document;

(d) **Notes** that the budget of $591,250 for Travel Demand Management has a Council share of $289,712 which will be reallocated from Footpath Reconstruction funding which is now subsidised;
(e) **Notes** that an application will be made to NZTA for a 51% share of the funding required for Travel Demand Management / Modelling. The risk of this not being funded is considered to be low;

(f) **Notes** that budget may need to be brought forward for other projects if work progresses more quickly than anticipated;

(g) **Notes** that all GCO Partners are contributing to the cost of this work;

(h) **Circulates** this report to the Community Boards and the Utilities and Roading Committee.

6.14 **Roading Staff Submission – Subdivision Contribution Programme Update**

- Joanne McBride (Roading and Transport Manager) and Gerard Cleary (Manager Utilities and Roading)

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 190413055719;

(b) **Notes** that there is likely to be pressure on the Subdivision Contribution budget in the 2019/20 year due to the quantum of anticipated development;

(c) **Notes** that further reports will be brought before Council as and when there is more certainty around future projects and costs;

(d) **Notes** that support has previously been given to Browns Road / North Eyre Road property owners north of the Eyre River, as well as Broad Road / Rangiora Leithfield Road property owners should they come up with a 50% cost share for sealing outside of their properties;

(e) **Circulates** this report to Utilities & Roading Committee for information.

6.15 **Development Contributions Schedules Following Draft 2019-20 Annual Plan Consultation** – Kelly LaValley (Project Delivery Manager)

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 190516069213.

(b) **Approves** the 2019/20 Development Contribution schedules to be effected on 1 July 2019 at the start of the new financial year.

(c) **Notes** if further changes to the 2019/20 Development Contributions schedules are required based on the Annual Plan deliberations, a further report will be presented to Council at the 18 June Annual Plan adoption meeting.

(d) **Notes** that consent and connection applications receipted prior to 1 July 2019 will include the 2018/19 Development Contribution rate.
Notes that UV projects have been removed from growth budgets for 2019/20 and that there have been development contributions assessed and paid during the 2018/19 year. Based on Local Government Act 2002 requirements, these development contributions do not have to be refunded as the UV treatment projects will still be completed.

6.16 Earthquake Recovery – 3 Waters and Roading Staff Submission to the 2019-2020 Draft Annual Plan – Gary Boot (Senior Engineering Advisor), Kalley Simpson (3 Waters Manager) and Joanne McBride (Roading and Transport Manager)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 190418058189

(b) **Approves** the amendments to the Earthquake Recovery budgets for Roading and Drainage, as outlined in Tables 1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account Number</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Draft Annual Plan Budget (19/20)</th>
<th>Proposed Annual Plan Budget (19/20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100268.000.5134</td>
<td>Kaiapoi East Access Road</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100251.000.5124</td>
<td>Feldwick Drain Pump Station</td>
<td>$192,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Recommended changes to the 19/20 roading and drainage earthquake budgets

(c) **Notes** that the current programme estimate is $38.70M, which compares favourably with the overall programme budget of $38.65M (<0.2%).

(d) **Notes** that the additional $30,000 for Kaiapoi East Access Road receives a 51% subsidy from NZTA.

(e) **Circulates** this report to the Community Boards.

6.17 Tennis Development Coldstream Road – Chris Brown (Manager Community and Recreation)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 190404050422

(b) **Notes** the tennis clubs draft business case (Trim 190502062504)

(c) **Notes** the Peer Review of the business case (Trim 190502062506)

(d) **Approves** staff developing a Heads of Agreement, for approval by Council, with the Southbrook and Rangiora Tennis Clubs with the key responsibilities as outlined in the Section 4.6 of this report.
(e) Approves the provision of $1 million as signalled in the Annual Plan for the development of the infrastructure and base for the ten court tennis development at Coldstream Road.

(f) Notes that, in accordance with the key terms of the proposed Heads of Agreement, no expenditure will occur until Council has agreed that Tennis Clubs have the necessary funding to complete the development.

(g) Approves the funding provision over two financial years with existing funding of $515,000 being available for use during 19/20 financial year and the balance of $485,000 to be funded in the 20/21 financial year.

(h) Notes that a resource consent will be required before any construction can commence.

(i) Notes that timing of construction will be managed so as not to conflict with the construction of the multi sports facility in Coldstream Road.

6.18 Airfield Fees and Charges – Craig Sargison (Manager Special Projects)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 190513067253

(b) Approves airfield landing fees to be set at $10.00 per day, inclusive of GST, from 1 July 2019.

(c) Approves a 50% reduction in landing fees for Way to Go Helicopter Company.

(d) Delegates to the Community and Recreation Committee the authority to consider any submissions from Clubs and individuals at the Airfield for a concession on landing fees.

(e) Approves ground rental being increased to $6.00 per sq metre, incl GST, for 2019/20 financial year.

(f) Recommends to the incoming Council that it increases the ground rental for 2020/21 to $8.00 per sq m, including GST and for 201/22 to $9.42 sq m (incl GST).

(g) Recommends to the incoming Council that all annual ground leases increases are linked to the Local Government Cost Index for all ground rental leases from 22/23.

(h) Approves each new lease at the airfield having the ground rental set at $9.42 including GST and a provision in the lease for annual ground rental increases linked to the movement of the Cost Price Index.

(i) Notes that because of the timing of rent review clauses in existing leases it can take two financial years for increases to come into effect.

(j) Notes that the Airfield Advisory Group supports the proposed changes to the landing fees and the ground rental.
6.19 Cust Community Centre Upgrade – Craig Sargison (Manager Special Projects)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 190506064053

(b) **Notes** the report from Holmes Fire regarding fire safety compliance.

(c) **Approves** a budget of $335,990, funded from the Community Facilities Renewals account for the necessary compliance and cosmetic upgrades to the Cust Community Centre as listed in this report.

(d) **Notes** that staff will work with the Cust Community Advisory Group on the details of the replacement and centre upgrades.

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

6.20 Community and Recreation Department Staff Submission to the Draft 2019-20 Annual Plan – Chris Brown (Manager Community and Recreation) and Grant MacLeod (Community Greenspace Manager)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 190510066599.

(b) **Approves** a Grant of $25,000 for the Rangiora Croquet Club as a contribution towards the development of two new Croquet Lawns

(c) **Approves** a $6,580 increase to the Surf Lifesaving New Zealand budget 104871002410 increasing it to a total of $88,600.

(d) **Approves** Surf Lifesaving services provided by Surf Life Saving New Zealand for the 2019/20 season being undertaken at Waikuku, Pegasus and Woodend Beach for a period 33, 26 and 26 days respectively.

(e) **Approves** an additional $10,000 allocation from the Pools renewal fund to allow for the renewal of plant and equipment located at Dudley Aquatic Centre.

(f) **Approves** an additional $25,000 operational budget for the maintenance of the Marine Precinct in Kaiapoi.

(g) **Approves** a $0.50 increase, effective from 1 July 2019 to the Aquarobics Casual Community Services/Senior rate which increases the fee from $6.50 - $7.00.

(h) **Notes** that recommendation (e) will have no effect on rates as the money requested is from depreciation accounts which has already been collected.
6.21 Rangiora Service Centre Refurbishment Project – Rob Hawthorne (Property Manager)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 190521071635.

(b) Receives the Civic Accommodation Indicative Business Case (190521071636).

(c) Notes that the Accommodation Indicative Business Case has been peer reviewed and updated in response to the reviewers' comments.

(d) Notes that the Indicative Business Case recommends Option B: Full refurbishment of existing building & staged expansion outside envelope as the best balance between the whole of life cost and investment objectives.

(e) Notes that the 30 Year Infrastructure Strategy allows for expenditure on extensions of both the Rangiora Library and Service Centre on the current site. This will be allowed for in the next Long Term Plan to reflect the changes.

(f) Agrees that the existing site (215 High Street, Rangiora) will be Council’s long term Administrative Headquarters and primary Service Centre.

(g) Notes that revised concept plans prepared by Council’s architect for refurbishment of the existing building:

i) increases the useable floor space for office functions,

ii) provides enhanced public meeting spaces with better separation from staff areas,

iii) improves customer service areas; and

iv) better aligns the refurbishment project with the future service centre and library extensions.

(h) Approves a budget variation of an additional $2.735 million in the 2020/21 financial year, with the revised total project budget of $6.735 million.

(i) Approves progressing to the developed design phase, with a further report to be presented to Council in September 2019.
6.22 Governance Staff Submission – ANZAC Service Budget – Sarah Nichols (Governance Manager) 488 - 490

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 190516069154.

(b) Approves the increased allocation of $12,000 to GL10.135.343.2465 (from $5,500 to $17,500) of the ANZAC Day Services Operational Budget.

6.23 Carryovers from 2018-2019 to 2019-2020 – Paul Christensen (Finance Manager) 491 - 499

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 190513067283.

(b) Adopts the carryovers as listed (190513067281) for inclusion in the 2019-20 Annual Plan.

(c) Notes the rate effect of the carryovers is 0.13% between years. This is adjusted by effectively “smoothing” the rate effect between these years.

7. CONSIDERATION OF SUBMISSIONS TO THE DRAFT ANNUAL PLAN 2019-2020

8. QUESTIONS

9. URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS

10. NEXT MEETING

The Council will meet at 3.15pm on Tuesday 18 June 2019 to adopt the Annual Plan.
MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL, FOR THE HEARING OF SUBMISSIONS TO THE DRAFT ANNUAL PLAN 2019/20, HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS, RANGIORA SERVICE CENTRE, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA ON THURSDAY 9 MAY 2019 COMMENCING AT 1.00PM

PRESENT:

IN ATTENDANCE:
J Palmer (Chief Executive), A Smith (Governance Coordinator), K Rabe (Governance Advisor), and E Stubbs (Governance Support Officer).

1. APOLOGIES
There were no apologies.

2. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
Kaiapoi Promotions Association Inc. – Councillor Atkinson and Mayor Ayers as members.
Cust Community Network – Councillor Barnett as member
Southbrook Sports Club – Councillor Brine attended meeting of the Sports Club.

3. HEARING OF SUBMISSIONS TO THE DRAFT ANNUAL PLAN 2019/20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ORGANISATION</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Martyn Cook</td>
<td>Kaiapoi Promotions Association Inc. (KPA)</td>
<td>M Cook commented that KPA were excited about the proposed cycleways. It was important that the cycleways were located in areas that made access to central Kaiapoi simple and safe. KPA were keen to assist the team working on the project and noted key areas including the route from Williams Street to the Passchendaele Path; need for cycle parks, good signage and good links to other cycleways around town. M Cook noted a number of gaps in the existing Kaiapoi cycleway network including Williams Street, Beach Road / Cass Street, to the stop bank on the north side of the river, Otaki Street / Fuller Street. M Cook spoke to a PowerPoint presentation regarding regeneration land safety improvements using the Kaiapoi Carnival as an example. He noted that the Carnival had been a great success and a key contributor to that was the location with the ability to use the regeneration zone and host two independent but connected events. However, there was concern with the condition of the Recovery Zone land. Improvements would require consultation with WDC and additional expenditure. M Cook provided a list of the safety improvements required including drainage and access improvements. He also provided a cost estimate of those at $50,000. This cost could be reduced if access to topsoil to the north east were available. KPA could manage the project he stated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Pinkham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions

A Blackie suggested the Council may be reluctant to spend $50,000 on land that a developer could take control of in the future and asked if there was a ‘Plan B’ for the land. M Cook replied while Option A was preferable there was a second option.

K Barnett asked if the entire area was WDC owned and M Cook replied yes. K Barnett asked if it needed to stay in greenspace for the carnival or would it be useful in a car parking scenario. M Cook replied that creating a carnival atmosphere on tar seal was difficult. Nice level greenspace was adequate.

Linda Pocock

L Pocock spoke to the effects of global warming and the pressures on sustainability due to a rapid increase in population in the area. She argued against additional investment of public money in sports facilities as it would not be in line with the expressed intention to improve sustainability.

She suggested that there needed to be policy change and that the Biodiversity Officer role required ‘teeth’. She commented on land management practices by farming which has contributed to the need for UV treatment of water to be paid for by the whole community.

With regard to the ZIPA she believed ‘asking’ was not enough, there needed to be education backed up by subsidised action and compulsion through laws.

L Pocock spoke to the loss of hedgerows effect on the environment, including decline in air quality, lack of shelter for animals, increase in surface run-off, loss of habitat for biological controls and loss of bio-film filter, comparable to what was trying to be achieved at the Silverstream experiment without the problem of anaerobic run-off. L Pocock suggested flax would provide those advantages and be compatible with irrigation. She provided a list of advantages of establishing flax or tall grass hedges.

L Pocock suggested the Council should subsidise hedge planting and restoration and introduce bylaws that require consents to remove mature trees and hedge lines. This action would demonstrate leadership to the ratepayers.

Questions

Mayor Ayers asked why L Pocock believed flax hedges were not more common and L Pocock suggested that some regarded flax as weeds.

Councilor Barnett asked if L Pocock had presented her ideas to ECAn or nationally and L Pocock replied no. this was her first platform; the ideas were commonplace in Europe and she had assumed it was the case in New Zealand.

Councilor Blackie referred to her comment on anaerobic run-off from Silverstream as that was the first he had heard of it. L Pocock explained it was from personnel communication with someone involved; it equated to a normal urban sewage plant where run-off had been aerated.

L Pocock referred to a recent Danish study that showed increased risk of cancer at concentrations of 4mg nitrate per litre.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emma Twaddell</th>
<th>St Albans Residents Association (SARA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E Twaddell introduced herself as Chair of the St Albans Residents Association (SARA). She had presented to Councillors previously on their alternative plan for the Downstream Effects Management Plan (DEMP) for the end of the northern arterial in St Albans. She applauded WDC for forward planning of park and ride systems. E Twaddell outlined the problems with congestion that were likely to occur in St Albans with the opening of the Northern Arterial. She outlined some of the history of St Albans, the growing population and intensification and noted the numerous local parks, recreational facilities, schools, shopping precincts and community projects. E Twaddell noted they had presented the CCC with an alternative plan to manage the traffic generated by northern Christchurch including 1) a new ‘fast’, frequent bus route connected to hubs; 2) priority measures including permanent bus lanes and traffic restriction at Bealey Ave; 3) paid parking in central city and other high parking generators to dampen demand for driving and generate funds for public transport. E Twaddell noted the new government’s direction on public transport. E Twaddell advised that SARA supported Park and Ride in the Waimakariri, and encouraged implementation as soon as possible. They also supported express bus services and believed Park and Ride should be adjacent to future railway stations. SARA believed parking should be charged for from day one. E Twaddell encouraged greater collaboration between stakeholders. <strong>Questions</strong> Councillor Blackie asked why it had taken SARA so long to recognise potential issues. E Twaddell replied that was not the case, SARA had submitted since 1998 on these issues. In plans the St Albans section had always been left off; only since last year had it been out to the public.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Gillian Giller | |
|---------------||
| G Giller spoke to the role of a Biodiversity Officer. She supported the funding for the role in the Draft Annual Plan, however expressed concern regarding the role. The summary in the DAP did not indicate the full extent of tasks that an officer would be responsible for as discussed in the report to Council on 29 January 2019. In the DAP the role was under the ZIPA and the role would be to work alongside ECan and lead the ZIPA implementation. There was no reference to the role addressing the decline of Kanuka and other terrestrial biodiversity issues and believed there would be insufficient time to focus on that core part of the role. In addition by leading the ZIPA that person would need not just to be an ecologist but a hydrologist. G Giller believed the biodiversity officer and the person to lead ZIPA were two separate jobs, there was a certain degree of integration but to lead the ZIPA would compromise the terrestrial ecology role. G Giller commented that the biodiversity officer role needed a person with specialist skill in ecology and good communication skills to win ‘hearts and minds’. They also needed adequate funding to provide a ‘bag of carrots’ so that the presence of indigenous vegetation would become positive to landowners. |
rather than a burden or something to be frightened of.

**Questions**

S Stewart commented in the text of G Giller’s submission she discussed the ecological fund. G Giller suggested the fund should be reorganised so that vegetation sites had a separate fund for heritage and notable trees. The biodiversity officer would have control of the fund and the separation would make it easier to administer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sally Rossiter</th>
<th>The Hope Community Trust</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| S Rossiter explained the Trust wished to run a pilot program for year 12 and 13 youth. They had been in discussion with WINZ and RHS regarding the program. The pilot would try to help prevent the increase in number of 18-24 year old youths who had left school and were unemployable. RHS currently had 200 students in the category of at-risk and vulnerable for whom they were struggling to provide support.  

The Trust’s proposal was to go in with specialist counsellors and 24/7 youth workers (who were already working in RHS in collaboration with MSD) to provide counselling sessions for high risk youth to address anxiety, addictions and other issues before they left school. What made the programme different was that it included family to walk alongside students. There was the potential for it to go in all schools. The pilot would involve 64 students and there would be a ripple effect.  

**Questions**

Councilor Atkinson asked what would happen after the 14 week course. S Rossiter replied because of the wrap around care parents would get involved and there would be relationships established with agencies and other programs. The idea of the pilot would be to track progress.  

Councilor Gordon asked what had been the response of other potential funders. S Rossiter replied they had not been successful for funding elsewhere; it was difficult to get funding for youth as so many were looking for funding. It was the reason they were looking to do the pilot to show it would be successful.  

Councilor Gordon asked if the proposal had been discussed with the Council’s Community Team and S Rossiter replied she spoke to the same groups that the Council team liaised with. The health sector was strapped for funding and there was a gap for youth. They were constantly looking for funding. The counsellors had said they would be prepared to trial for nothing but that was not appropriate.  

Councilor Doody asked how those attending would be selected and S Rossiter advised that they could not have a group of ‘the worst’ as they were difficult to manage in groups, they would look at the middle group.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Daniel Huisman</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D Huisman spoke to the topic of water quality, UV treatment and the implementation of ZIPA. He was concerned with nitrate levels and noted the recent research which showed increase in colorectal cancer risk at 0.87ppm nitrate-nitrogen in drinking water. Some parts of the district were already above that level. UV treatment would not help with that. He was</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
concerned with public health and in light of research wanted the Council to review their risk threshold. Should Council be looking at options such as filtering systems, reverse osmosis and distillation?

D Huisman also spoke to sustainability and liked the Council mission statement referring to ‘responsibility and leadership’ however noted there were no actions or budget put aside. It was important for the Council to show leadership in the tough decisions regarding coastal retreat, for example.

D Huisman referred to the recent building refit presentation and noted that sustainability was not a core principle of the design.

D Huisman summarised the ways in which the Council could reduce its carbon footprint as outlined in the written submission including decrease in air travel, moving the Council fleet to electric vehicles and charging points, transportation options such as car-pooling, prioritising local hires, solar energy for building refit, pushing ECan for public transport options and intensive dairying controls and take more active role in local sustainability campaigns. He would like to see carbon neutral targets for the Council and District.

Mary Sparrow / Will Henderson
Rangiora Croquet Club Inc.

W Henderson referred to a report of the March Community and Recreation Committee meeting which supported allocating $25,000 to the Rangiora Croquet Club to develop two new greens.

W Henderson outlined the reason for the need for the new greens. There had been in increase in the number of players from nine to 50, meaning the current two lawns were inadequate. Croquet was now a sports option for RHS and the club was looking to recruit younger members. In addition the club hosted community groups including retirement villages, staff groups and visitors from other parts of New Zealand and overseas.

W Henderson noted that the lawns would be of a sufficient grade to host national and international competitions and were the best lawns in the Canterbury area. He commented the club members contributed to a wide range of skills for volunteering and fundraising.

M Sparrow tabled a financial assessment of the additional croquet lawns. Stage 1 had been undertaken in early March. Stage 2 was the major stage and was scheduled for October/November 2019. M Sparrow outlined where the funding would come from including Rata Foundation, Canterbury Croquet Association, Rangiora Croquet Club (cash and labour by members). There was $8,000 yet to be sourced. Keep Rangiora Beautiful was assisting with planting.

Questions

Councilor Barnett asked if there were other funding sources, in addition to the Rata Foundation. It was advised that the club would be applying to the Southern Trust.

Councilor Williams asked if membership would grow with more greens, with W Henderson advising youth was a growth area however the club needed the greens open before they tried to grow further.
K Galloway spoke to a PowerPoint presentation and explained that the Friends of the Dog Park looked after basic maintenance and new facilities of the park. The submission sought approval to develop a third area (for both large and small dogs) which would be an agility course. They were currently fundraising for the materials for the agility course and the Rangiora Lions Club would build the course.

K Galloway highlighted the popularity of the dog park noting how much it was utilized.

Friends of the Dog Park were requesting $10,000 - $15,000 to be allocated towards fencing of the new activity area, including three sets of gates.

Questions

Mayor Ayers asked if the request had been before the Community Board. K Galloway advised Greenspace had been involved and previously the Council had provided fencing for the dog park.

Councillor Brine asked about large and small dogs being allowed in the same area and C Prickett noted it was expected the dogs going into the agility area would be under a higher level of control. There was an anticipation for two courses which could be used together or separately.

S Huo spoke to a PowerPoint presentation noting the purpose was to apply for 2020 NZPGA Championship funding and report on outcomes for the 2019 event.

Support from Council – local network

Σ Promote the 2020 NZPGA as a local iconic event by NZ and Australia working together to make it more attractive to top golfers. The 2019 event included most of NZ top golfers.

Σ Promote Waimakariri region as a new "destination" to domestic and international high-net-worthy individuals.

Σ Engagement with domestic and international business delegations. In 2019 there was a sport and education seminar held concurrently.

Support from Council – Financial

Σ Competition from other regions eg Hawkes Bay / Auckland for hosting the NZ PGA 2020, local government support is vitally important. Suggested $50,000 funding support, to demonstrate local encouragement for hosting this event. Funding will be fully used on marketing and promotion of the Tournament and the region.

2019 outcomes

S Huo explained that a research company had looked at media exposure and spectator numbers. Total circulation was 2.2 million with a targeted audience of around 2 million. There were 71 news items to 1.2 million people. 37 domestic mainstream media platforms reported the event. There had been 8,500 domestic visitors (7,000 Christchurch) and 1,500 international visitors to the event. The international visitors had stayed five to eight nights; largely in Christchurch due to lack of accommodation facilities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Overview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S Huo</td>
<td></td>
<td>Advised that a resource consent application for a proposed hotel would be in to the Council the following week.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target of 2020</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Provided a mission statement for 2020. He noted the NZ Women’s Open hosted between 2010 and 2012 at Pegasus had helped the local sport a lot and the 2019 champion had been a local amateur. S Huo noted the plan to drive visitation to the Waimakariri region. With good funding it could help accomplish another successful event.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Questions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Councilor Gordon asked if there had been any discussion with ENC regarding event funding. S Huo replied yes, they were looking for their support also. He noted they had a limited budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y Lawrence</td>
<td>Cust Community Network (CCN)</td>
<td>Spoke to the issue of road safety. She noted there was a general consensus from residents that speed through Cust Village and outside the Cust School were too high. She noted that Cust School had requested help in this and a process was underway. Y Lawrence commented the high speeds were dangerous considering the high population of young residents and elderly using the footpaths. Currently they were working with the roading team and speed sampling had been done. They had been told that a review of speed limits in Cust was dependent on a speed management strategy being developed by the Council. She urged the Council to prioritise lowering the speed limit in the Cust urban area to 50km/hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K Barnett tabled the response to the CCN 2018 submission and noted that the 2019 submission was similar. The reason for similarity was that the request for a footpath from the Cust Community Centre (CCC) to the main road had not been referred to the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board for consideration and determination of priority as had been stated in the 2018 submission response. CCN felt as if the submission had been largely ignored.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K Barnett commented footpaths were poorly maintained and believed the footpath to the CCC was essential. She asked that the Council follow up the response so that it was progressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K Barnett noted support for sustainably and was appreciative of assistance with the CCC rural recycling project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Questions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Councilor Doody asked if the CCN preferred the footpath to the CCC to follow the road or grassed area. Y Lawrence commented there was a case for both options. There was a concern stairs would be difficult for elderly or those with prams to navigate. However traffic turned down the road with speed and a safety barrier may be required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Richard Belcher | Mandeville Sports Club (MSC)   | Spoke to a PowerPoint, advising that they wished to discuss two key areas for an increase in the annual maintenance budget. Following the 2013 wind storm 3km (9 hectares) of the boundary was cleared of pine trees. This had created maintenance issues as the equipment was
The MSC also had the goal to develop a track with shelter and ornamental trees around the perimeter of the reserve for recreation and leisure. To return the land to a state which could be maintained with MSC owned equipment the club requested $6,700 annually for the next four years. The funding would assist mulching, removing the vegetation growth and stumps. The second area for which they requested funding was for tree topping near the playground and on the east boundary at $4,900.

Questions

Councilor Gordon asked for clarity on the amount requested and R Belcher advised it was for $6,720 for four years and a one off of $4900 for a total this year of $11,620.

Councilor Blackie noted the audit fee cost and asked on whose requirement the accounts be audited. R Belcher advised that it was in the constitution the accounts be audited. In the past that had been by internal members however that was no longer allowed. Councilor Gordon advised Canterbury Community Accounting charged a low audit fee.

Wayne Hart
Angela Kennedy
Southbrook Community Sports Club (SCSC)

W Hart commented that the Southbrook Sports Club was coming out of a dark hole over the past two years with issues around funding and management. A lot of work had been put in over the past year on improved costings and understanding economic drivers to work out their position.

The Club was a joint venture between Saracens Rugby and Southbrook Cricket. Southbrook had since withdrawn and was affiliated along with netball, touch and Special Olympics. He was conscious of the hard work and effort over many decades, however acknowledged there were legacy problems.

WDC had provided a lot of support to the club. As a committee, the question was where to go now. Analysis of costs showed a high level of fixed costs at $36,000. The club received income from bar proceeds. There was a structural deficit in the annual budget of $15,000. In order to operate the club on a sustainable basis they needed assistance with the fixed costs of operating the club. The application was for a $15,000 grant to assist with operating costs for the 2019-20 year.

Upgrade developments could be funded through grants and fundraising and Saracens also had earthquake insurance. They did not want to use these funds for operating costs. W Hart noted the written submission included a copy of the strategic plan and relevant pages from financial statements.

Councilor Brine asked if the club was aware that in the case of last resort the club would revert back to WDC ownership. The club was aware. W Hart noted that the main building and changing rooms were in dilapidated condition. The changing rooms required upgrade or replacement, due to their location in the middle of the carpark, replacing was a better option.

Councilor Atkinson asked how the heating costs had been halved and W Hart advised that the karate club no longer used the facilities and they had required significant heating.
Councilor Barnett asked if it was possible to see income and expenditure for the club. W Hart advised there was a summarised version in the strategic plan. Accounts over the past few years had not been to a good standard.

Councilor Barnett noted the Council had raised fees on community facilities and asked if there was potential for the club to do the same. W Hart noted advice from the clubs were that they financially restrained.

Afternoon Tea break

Paula Greer

Canterbury Botanical Society (CBS)

P Greer spoke to the Council’s recommendation to employ a full-time biodiversity officer, noting that the draft National Policy Statement on Biodiversity signals the identification and protection of significant natural areas. The Society is in support of fencing off areas of the Canterbury plains to protect them from damage from grazing, and human interaction so that the natural vegetation and eco systems have a chance to recover. There may need to be some weeding out of exotic plants and by clearing sections some of the seeds embedded in the ground would have a chance to shoot and thrive. Added to this some eco planting where necessary would encourage regrowth of the natural flora and encourage insects and birds to re-inhabit the area.

It is important to note these plain plants were dry and too much water can be harmful to the native plantings. Flax which is predominant now does not like arid ground.

Questions:

Councillor Barnett enquired about disposable water run-off from lifestyle blocks and farms in the area; would this not defeat the object of encouraging plain-loving plants. P Greer responded, no because the protected areas could have a mixture of plantings to mitigate the extra water from run-off.

Jackie Watson

Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board (KTGB)

J Watson summarised the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board submission, drawing attention to items listed under the heading ‘Other’. Some of these items had been requested for several years.

Questions:

Councillor Barnett asked why the Board did not support the recommendation of a biodiversity officer. The Board feels that the Council should continue to use contractors when required rather than employing another staff member.

Annie Bonifant

Ohoka Domain Advisory Group (ODAG)

The Group acknowledges the support that WDC has given the group and the Domain. Recently the peppercorn rent charged to the Ohoka Market was increased to a more market based rental. The Group feel that this and any other income generated by the Domain should be given to the Group to be used for the betterment of the Domain and in particular the restoration of the Gatekeepers Lodge which is now a much loved and admired feature of the domain.

Questions:

Councillor Gordon enquired of plans to restore the Gatehouse, and if the Group have costings for the full restoration of the building? It was advised a full restoration plan is being worked on but is difficult as
things change depending on what can be saved and what is available in the line of materials.

Councillor Felstead asked if the Group were aware that the income generated by the Domain is, in fact used for the Domain eg the upgrade of the children’s playground. Yes was the response.

Ann Jeffs  Rangiora Museum  

David Petrie spoke to his presentation (Trim 190510066646). D Petrie gave a brief overview of the work done by the Rangiora Museum and the inherent responsibility of caring and protecting the artifacts donated to them. However the Museum did not have a sufficient storage space or one that is climatically controlled. At present the museum was using two shipping containers which are not fit for purpose as they were too small and not ventilated. This is a real concern for the storage of photographs which are now being damaged due to dampness. The museum would like the Council to investigate the provision of a permanent solution and provide a suitable building, specifically for holding and maintaining valuable memorabilia, records and photographs. This building must be climatically controlled.

Questions:
Councillor Blackie enquired what the criteria for a purpose built facility is. D Petrie responded that it should be constructed on piles, insolated, access for storage and approximately 192m² which will fit on the museum site.

Helen Edh  Oxford Visually Impaired Group  

H Edh spoke about her concern regarding the speed of traffic on High Street, Oxford. It is very difficult for disabled people to cross the road and the crossing in the middle of the retail section of Oxford is not terribly safe. She feels that traffic needed better signage warning them of the crossing as many vehicles do not seem to be aware that the crossing is there until they are right on top of it. She would like the Council to reduce the speed limit from 50k/hr to 30k/hr as many smaller towns are doing on the North Island.

Questions:
Councillor Meyer enquired if cars do not stop at the crossing? H Edh was unable to answer because she cannot see if the cars have stopped or not. She relies on her hearing but this is not infallible now as some cars are electric and very quiet.

Councillor Felstead asked if the footpaths had been repaired. H Edh advised work was occurring now.

Deirdre Ryan  Community Wellbeing North Canterbury Trust (CWNCT)  

D Ryan spoke to her presentation (Trim 190510066645) which highlighted new programmes and the ongoing work done by the Trust and thanked the Council for its ongoing support throughout the year. The Trust is requesting an increase in its annual funding of $17,000 as a contribution toward a vehicle replacement programme.

Jim Gerard  Rangiora-Ashley Community Board (RACB)  

Duncan Lundy spoke to the Board’s submission providing a brief summary and also highlighting the section “Other Matters” which covered roading, cycleways, walkways and rates.

Questions:
Councillor Brine commented on the change in rates and the difficulty in predicting income and
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doug Nicholl</td>
<td>Oxford-Ohoka Community Board (OOCB)</td>
<td>D Nicholl spoke to the Board’s submission giving a brief summary highlighting the Other Comments section which covers Board funding, car parking, skate park, footpaths, cycleways, Ashley Gorge Road safety barrier, Mandeville flooding, Pearson Park lighting, Swannanoa Domain, West Eyreton Well and surrounds, general landscaping fund.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Questions:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Councillor Gordon enquired what the discretionary fund was currently. It was advised $6,200.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Councillor Blackie asked why does the Board not want to support the Park and Ride recommendation. The response was that the rural area does not have a public transport system so it is not considered relevant at this time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mayor Ayers enquired if the skate park lighting had improved. It was advised that the Service Centre lights shine down the street which can make it difficult to see when looking in that direction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mayor Ayers asked if the improvement of drains along Two Chain Road had made any difference. It was advised that there was little difference as the Silverstream was at capacity which still causes flooding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen McQuarrie</td>
<td>Rangiora Youth Community Trust (RYCT)</td>
<td>S McQuarrie spoke to a PowerPoint presentation, which provided a snap shot of the work of the Youth Workers. Currently seven youth-workers, working a total of 80 hours per week at both Rangiora High School and Rangiora New Life School. The submission requests funding of $20,000 over the next two years to cover wages and training. Youth work is a 24/7 connection, connecting with schools and providing one on one mentoring. The Youth Workers work with schools, including helping to integrate year 9’s into school, who run their own clubs (craft club and gaming club). RYCT promotes ways for young people to grow and develop. S McQuarrie spoke on the WDC Youth Strategy, noting a lot of shared goals with the goals of Rangiora Youth Community Trust and a lot of crossover. Julia Malcolm, Deputy Principal at RHS quoted that Youth Workers provide a need in the schools for students and fully endorses their work. It was noted that a lot of students have anxiety issues. A recently published WDC Youth Strategy Survey, showed the positive impact of the youth workers, with 56% of young people responding that a youth worker is the best support for young people. Councillor Barnett asked about the funding for the Youth Workers. It was advised the budget is targeted at a quarter from the Church, quarter from the school, and half from community grants and fundraising by the Trust. There is a similar arrangement in Selwyn, with the Selwyn District Council successfully partnering with local trusts and churches in the same way. Councillor Doody asked if the counsellors at RHS work with the Youth Workers. This is a two way support and sometimes counsellors refer young people to the Youth Worker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Morgan</td>
<td>Morgan Group Ltd</td>
<td>D Morgan spoke on Development Contributions, specifically for redevelopment/in-fill housing. In WDC the current development contribution rate is so high that it is not commercially viable. D Morgan has spoken to numerous Councils about development levies and quoted the different levies, with some Councils having zero levies, and some with higher levels where residential development is discouraged. D Morgan believes that development contributions are important and noted the benefits of constantly changing existing residential area. Noted that their business is currently developing an existing property of one house, with four new residences. Condensed developments in existing areas has advantages with better quality insulated homes. It is an opportunity for improved housing stock, improving the town centre without depreciating values. He believed there is a real imbalance in Waimakariri in the development contributions charged for in-fill housing than what is charged for a new subdivision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Pinkham</td>
<td></td>
<td>M Pinkham did not attend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug Nicholl</td>
<td>Ohoka Drainage Advisory Group (ODAG)</td>
<td>D Nicholl spoke to the submission topic of Mandeville flooding. The Advisory Group is aware of the concerns of many residents when there is heavy rainfall, referring to the 2014 rain event. The issue is where the water is going to be taken. The ODAG would like to have funding for the redirection of resurgence of Mandeville storm water to be brought forward to 2019/20 as this is urgently required. There were no questions from members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Jackson</td>
<td>Mandeville Residents’ Association (MRA)</td>
<td>Members of the MRA present at the hearing included: Des Lines, Graham Rouse, Rosina Rouse, James Ensor, Richard Jackson and Graeme Chisnall. A copy of the presentation read by Rosina Rouse was made available for Councillors and also shown as a PowerPoint presentation. The submission concerns the stormwater drainage issues in the Mandeville and Swannanoa area. The MRA represents more than 50 households in the Mandeville, Swannanoa area. The MRA has met regularly over the last year discussing these concerns with flooding and drainage and to determine some options for remediation of these. The MRA is grateful to the Council staff and consultants for the time provided in meeting, discussing plans and recommendations. The MRA is asking the Council to establish and provide costs for all of the options in the comprehensive Drainage Plan (the Plan is part of the Associations submission documentation). Mayor Ayers commented on the recommendation from the MRA of redirecting flood water to the old Eyre River bed, which could be challenging getting water across Mandeville Road. J Ensor acknowledges this is a challenge, but said this is only short times when there are peak flows. The MRA also submitted on options for a car park at the commercial centre on Mandeville Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shona Powell</td>
<td>Woodend-Sefton Community Board (WSCB)</td>
<td>Board Chair Shona Powell, supported by Board members Rhonda Mather, Andrea Allen and John Archer, presented the submission on behalf of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board. ZIPA – supported Option A, but the Board members...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
have concerns with duplicating and/or encroaching on ECAN responsibilities. Issues noted were the monitoring of private wells and education on stormwater.

The Board does not support the Tennis Courts development, suggesting the Council investigate what other sports could use this land. There are plenty of tennis courts already available for use in the district.

Park and Ride facilities – asked the Council to put funding towards a local park and ride facility if ECAN are not willing to. This could involve more parking available in Rangiora.

Pegasus Community Facilities – the Board believes the Council needs to start planning for a purpose built facility that the area deserves. This facility needs to include a kitchen and toilets.

The Board suggested a need for some car parking provided along Tiritiri Moana Drive as this gets very busy in the summer with people walking on the pathway to either Waikuku or Woodend Beaches. Currently parking is on the verge alongside the road and the Board noted safety issues with cyclists and pedestrians.

Gladstone Park – redevelopment has been very well received by residents, but there needs to be lighting along the new path for safety reasons, and also a request for equipment provided at the dog park for some interest for the dogs.

Connectivity - the Board would like to see some funding for the pathway along Rangiora Woodend Road extended to connect with the Jill Creamer Walkway on Woodend Beach Road. The Board would like Council support for NZTA to provide a footpath north of Woodend to the Anglican Church and also south of Woodend on SH1 so pedestrians can safely connect with the Jill Creamer Trail to the Beach.

Mayor Ayers asked if information recently produced from NZTA, included the footpath on north of Woodend. Board Members said no this did not appear to be included.

Councillor Gordon questioned on priorities for community facilities in both Pegasus and Ravenswood. Board members responded that land should be set aside for community facilities in both Pegasus and Ravenswood.

Councillor Williams asked if members have a preference of priority. S Powell responded that Pegasus would be the priority over Ravenswood, with the population already established at Pegasus.

Councillor Barnett questioned the current state of the pathway between Woodend School and the Jill Creamer Walkway. S Powell confirmed that the upgrade of the pathway from the Jill Creamer Walkway along to Woodend School has not progressed at this stage.

Dinner Break

Drucilla Kingi-Patterson

D Kingi-Patterson was lobbying for an after-hours health service and would like to see the old Rangiora Hospital restored. The provision of health services is...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Skate Park – would like some discussion on having this facility expanded for the young people to accommodate all age groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Security Lighting – requests that the Council provide adequate lighting along the pathway from Main Street to the Oval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sealing of car park, between Oxford Butchery shop and old pine trees - this area is used for the Oxford Farmers Market. Members would like this area to be sealed and it would tidy up the area; it currently is not a good look in the middle of the town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Resealing of Oval and drainage - this is already in the Council plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fencing and gates – the Group would like the fence between the Park and the housing complex in Meyer Place replaced in the 2019/2020 year so that the landscaping and plantings can be done. Gates at the entrance to the Farmers market need to be replaced or else hung a bit better and trees planted in the area of the Skate Park and Farmers Market. This would provide shade in the summer. Request that this tree planting programme commence in 2019/2020 year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>When asked on preferred priority, D McPherson advised this would be the sealing of the car park, and the second priority if the fencing between the park and the pensioner housing. Also would like the Council to look at funding for the skate park expansion. Security lighting is also a preference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Councillor Doody confirmed there are currently discussions between Council staff and parties regarding the fence between the pensioner units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson Park Advisory group receive a grant of $10,000 a year which has been used for a hard court close to the skate park (helped with the Lions), put in some tables and seating. Put in a stage and would like to put a roof on top of that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Councillor Barnett asked if there could be a plan provided to Councillors, with a budget included for</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
each part of the development in the plan. D McPherson said this could be provided.

Councillor Gordon, asked if the Council was of a mind to increase that grant, what figure would fit. D McPherson replied that the grant money is used for amenities in the park, whereas it is felt that the sealing is not something that the grant should be used for.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sam Redman</th>
<th>Waimakariri Youth Council (WYC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sam Redman introduced the presentation, and spoke on the Waimakariri Youth Strategy. Bella, Ellie and Caitlyn for the Youth Council were present. The Youth Council have a concept plan for a Development at the Dudley Skate Park. Stage One of this plan includes an activation platform (stage), mounded seat, fixed seating, and further additions including a power station, solar charging seat and other fixtures. An estimate of the cost of Stage One is $50,000. Bella spoke on the plan for the stage as part of the redevelopment project. Mention was made of the Gap Filler projects in Christchurch which are well used, and believes this would be a good thing to have in the community which could be used by lots of different groups. Youth need to have somewhere to go and meet together. Caitlyn noted that there have been concerns about the skate park area being safe, for the youngest of ages and oldest of ages. It is hoped that having this development nearby would reduce any bad behaviour. Ellie would like this space to inspire further development in the Park and be a space where community can come together. The Youth Council are asking for $20,000 for permanent aspects of the development. Mayor Ayers noted that he, and Councillors Gordon and Barnett are on the Youth Council. The stage (activation platform) could be used for any sort of performances, or classes. S Reman noted that with the Kaiapoi Skate Park where everything is together, this is a place where people feel safe.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laurence Smith</th>
<th>Rangiora and Southbrook Tennis Club</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laurence Smith, President of Rangiora Tennis Club, Johnny Carter (President) and Brian Heron (Secretary) from the Southbrook Tennis Club presented the submission which seeks support from the Council to build a tennis club complex on Coldstream Road. L Smith thanked the Council and staff who have assisted with the proposal to date. The current Rangiora Club owns its own facility and has a small but stable membership at its current site. The future of tennis in Rangiora comes before the long term needs of current membership. The club is asset rich and cash poor, which limits any ability for development of the current site. The courts are locked and there is no court lighting, This year the club has had limited ability to provide coaching, with more juniors playing than could be coached. The combination of the clubs, Southbrook and Rangiora, and partnering with the Council would enhance the ability to promote tennis, provide more public accessibility to courts, all year round play with lighting, future proof a complex for players of all levels and put Rangiora on the tennis map for hosting tournaments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Brian Heron noted having the courts available with lighting provides the ability to play all year around. Southbrook Club has an asset which could realise $250,000 - $300,000 and to join with Rangiora, this would give the opportunity to promote the membership of the sport.

Councillor Williams asked if the clubs would be able to fund the maintenance and lighting of the courts, or would that be up to the Council. B Heron advised that there has been a draft business plan drawn up, and with people using the courts on a “pay to play” basis, this will generate some income. The NC Sports Trust are in support of this proposal. If the courts are used for tournaments this could generate income.

Councillor Barnett remarked that a comment has been made that tennis has low participation rates, L Smith believes the memberships are low here now, but there is the opportunity to grow tennis in Rangiora with this proposal.

If this proposal did not progress through the Council, L Smith advised that this matter would have to go back to the committees of both tennis clubs for a decision and Southbrook Club would also have to reconsider their situation.

A copy of the letter of support for the tennis court proposal from the North Canterbury Sport and Recreation Trust was tabled and copies will be circulated to all Councillors.

Jim Martin

J Martin spoke to his presentation and provided a history of his involvement with tennis which he has been involved with all his life, either as a player or administrator. When he moved to Rangiora to live in 2012 he saw the need to promote the game of tennis and has become involved with the possibility to build a new tennis facility in Rangiora. J Martin has had the role as a facilitator between Rangiora and Southbrook tennis clubs and the Council. Personally, J Martin said this case is overwhelming; the opportunity would make the game much more visible and complement the courts at Kaiapoi. The Clubs contribution would be more than the Councils contribution. The two tennis clubs want a quality and complete facility. This would provide certainty for the Clubs. The Clubs want a fit for purpose facility for the Clubs, and if this does not progress, it will be the younger players who will miss out, and the casual “pay to play” players.

Mayor Ayers noted the newly opened Wai Puna Wai, there is tennis courts there - this is a tennis centre like Wilding Park.

Councillor Barnett asked about the Ashburton tennis facility. J Martin said the Council did contribute to this facility as well as the Ashburton Licensing Trust.
### Martin Searle

M Searle advised he had been involved in tennis in North Canterbury for 35 years, as a player and now coach. Reference was made to the new hockey turf that has had the support of the Council and the covered pool at Dudley Park, with these sports both being encouraged. M Searle is involved with the Fernside Club, which has asphalt courts. There is lighting on these courts, but the lights are for netball and not suitable for tennis. A lot of people in North Canterbury drive into Christchurch to play business house tennis, under a covered environment or under lights. A modern facility with good lights would keep local people playing locally and would support this facility. Ashburton Tennis Centre has promoted the game there, and their tennis is a lot stronger now. This is a similar situation with the tennis centre in Blenheim. Having a good tennis facility like this on Coldstream Road will encourage more people to play the game, and be a good drawcard for new people moving to the district.

Councillor Brine asked if there would be benefits in centering the sport in both Kaiapoi and Rangiora. Interclub competition could move to this new centre for some of the smaller clubs.

Mayor Ayers enquired if having children play, means that parents will start playing or then resume playing again. Yes this happens. Supports the “pay for play” of courts; rather than commitment to paying a subscription to a club.

Following a question from Councillor Meyer, M Searle believes there is enough capable people to support this proposed facility once it is up and running.

### Rhonda Mather

Rhonda Mather, Ronnel Stevens, and Roger Rule from the Pegasus Residents Group presented the submission. Also present in the public gallery, were a large number of supporters of the Group.

R Rule spoke on the need to have a purpose built community facility in Pegasus.

R Mather spoke on fees for hiring the current Community Centre and is involved with booking of the centre. Noted that the increase in fees charged are penalising the elderly who are a large group of users of the centre and urged the Council to reconsider these proposed increases.

The quest is for the Council to start planning for a purpose built facility which will be on reserve land which has been provided by Todd Properties. R Mather referred to a media announcement from 16 December 2014 advising that Todd Properties would be vesting two large parcels of lakefront land to the community and the Council was accepting this offer. The Group suggests that one of these sites could accommodate the proposed community facility. The building suggested as a community facility, will provide a focus for the community and to have a sense of ownership. The centre will be a focal point where people can gather and socialise with others. (To have a state of the art building). It is as leaders of the community, to invest and develop in North Canterbury. There is significant support from various groups in Pegasus for a community facility to be built. The Group suggests that the money set aside for the tennis court proposal on Coldstream Road might be
Councillor Barnett asked if residents of Pegasus would be happy with a rate rise to accommodate funding for a new community centre at Pegasus. R Mather would like the Council to commit in the future, suggesting three years’ time, and the PRG would then have time to work with stakeholders and source other funding. This would be a centre partially staffed by volunteers. There is a definite preference for any facility to be located in Pegasus, rather than Ravenswood, whether this is a community facility or a library/community facility, as there are already 3,000 residents in Pegasus and some have been waiting ten years for such a facility. The land has yet to be vested to the Council, as this will happen when the Lake comes under control of the Council.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 8.20pm.
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1. SUMMARY

1.1 This report provides the Council with a summary on the outcome of the Special Consultative Procedure (SCP) undertaken for the Draft Annual Plan 2019-2020, which opened on Monday 11 March and closed Thursday 11 April 2019.

Attachments:

i. Draft Annual Plan 2019-2020 Summary of Submissions by Topics with Recommendations (Trim No. 190521071541) (to be circulated separately in paper copy to Members)


2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report LTC-03-15-02/TRIM Number 190521071264

(b) Receives all 129 submissions and associated submission points raised by submitters, which are included in the ‘Deliberations Pack’ previously distributed to Councillors.

3. BACKGROUND


3.2 Public consultation opened on Monday 11 March and closed Thursday 11 April 2019. The Council received a total of 129 submissions on the Draft Annual Plan 2019-2020 and supporting information. There were also 3 anonymous submissions received however these unable to be processed.
3.3 A public hearing was held in Rangiora on Thursday 9 May 2019, with 33 submitters heard by the Council.

3.4 The community engagement and media campaign included four face-to-face public engagements, all were attended by some of the Councillors. The events were held in Rangiora, Kaiapoi, Woodend and culminated at the Oxford A&P Show.

Attendance/Public engagement numbers at the various events ranged from between 20-40 people to in excess of 100. As well as being able to speak in person to councillors at these events, the public were both offered written collateral and the opportunity to submit their views on the spot through the presence of mobile tablets which enabled access to the online submission form.

The dedicated Draft Annual Plan page on the website produced a total of 1804 views throughout the duration of the consultation period. It was linked to a dedicated email-signature banner which carried set messages and accompanied all council emails sent in the lead up to (preview), during (promotion of campaign) and after (thank you for participating) stages of the campaign. The page included the online rates calculator which is very popular.

Our online activity was aligned with efforts in the social media space via Facebook. We made four Draft Annual Plan related posts during the consultation period, collectively being viewed on a total of 6,967 occasions.

On the print media front, we ran four quarter page educational advertorials locally in the Northern Outlook and North Canterbury News explaining the Draft Annual Plan and what the key issues were.

4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

4.1 There were five key proposals contained in the Draft Annual Plan 2019-2020 Consultation Document (CD) the Council sought feedback on:

- Funding of Ultra-violet (UV) Treatment of Water Supplies
- Waimakariri Water Zone – Water Zone Implementation Plan Addendum (ZIPA)
- Proposal to develop Tennis Courts in Coldstream Road, Rangiora
- Investigation Park and Ride Facilities
- Sustainability.

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

4.2 Submissions regarding the five key proposals were well supported with 66 responses to UV, 61 to the ZIPA, 87 for the Tennis Courts, 61 for Park and Ride and 63 for Sustainability.

4.3 With 129 submissions received during the Special Consultative Procedure (SCP) process there were a number of other topics raised by submitters, some of those mentioned:

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

4.4 A report with council officer recommendations for all submission topics, to assist with Council deliberations, is provided in attachment (i) Trim No. 190521071541. There are also a number of submission topics that have separate reports providing responses and recommendations which will be presented during the Draft Annual Plan 2019-2020 Deliberations.

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

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

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

Community views were sought during the Draft Annual Plan 2019-2020 submission period and hearings process.

6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1 Financial Implications

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

6.2 Community Implications

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

6.3 Risk Management

The Draft Annual Plan 2019-2020 is scheduled to be adopted by Council on Tuesday 18 June 2019. All submitters will receive a response to their submission detailing the Council’s decision as an outcome of deliberations.
6.4. Health and Safety

Not applicable.

7. CONTEXT

7.1. Policy

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

7.2. Legislation

*Local Government Act 2002 Part 6 Planning, decision-making, and accountability*
Consultation section 83 special consultative procedure

Planning section 93 Long-term plan and section; 93A Use of special consultative procedure in relation to long-term plan; 93B Purpose of consultation document for long-term plan.

7.3. Community Outcomes

**GOVERNANCE**

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

- The Council makes information about its plans and activities readily available.
- 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

The Mayor and Councillors have delegated authority to formulate the District’s strategic direction in conjunction with the community through the Long Term Planning process.
### Anonymous Submissions Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trim Reference</th>
<th>UV</th>
<th>ZIPA</th>
<th>Tennis Courts</th>
<th>Park and Ride</th>
<th>Sustainability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>190318035048</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO NOT if it can NOT be used when people want and ONLY when club say it's ok</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190322038663</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Why should rate payers pay even more for facilities the small minority use?</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Should remain in 2025-2027 plan, rates are too high as they are.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190408051645</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Trim No. 190521071157*
1. SUMMARY

1.1. In December 2018 Council instructed staff to include a rating proposal into the Draft 2019/20 Annual Plan to aggregate the costs of ultra-violet (UV) disinfection treatment for water supplies into one account and establish a new uniform annual charge for each property connected to a Council water supply (refer to report 181126138621).

1.2. This proposal was presented to Council in January 2019 (refer report 190115003350) with detailed information of how rates would be affected by the proposal. At that meeting Council resolved to include this proposal within the Draft 2019-20 Annual Plan consultation document. Two funding options were presented:

Option A: All water supply ratepayers are charged a uniform amount for ultra-violet treatment.

Option B: To continue to rate each water supply scheme individually for ultra-violet treatment costs.

1.3. Residents were invited to make submissions on the proposal, as part of the wider Annual Plan consultation. In total 63 submissions were made on UV funding; 40 (63%) in favour of Option A, and 23 (37%) in favour of Option B.

1.4. Common themes amongst those that submitted in support of Option A were:

- An effective way to spread costs evenly.
- A fairer way to apportion costs.
- All residents should receive clean and safe water.

1.5. Common themes amongst those that submitted in Support of Option B were:

- Results in one group of residents subsidising another.
- User pays is a fairer approach.

1.6. Other themes noted that were not specific to the funding mechanism but were made on the more general topic on the treatment of water are:
Concerns that UV treatment does not address nitrates in groundwater which is a concern in Canterbury.

Projects should be deferred until there is more certainty regarding future legislative requirements.

1.7. In regard to points made about projects being carried out prior to legislative requirements to do so, this is discussed and addressed in a separate staff submission report on the timing of the required works (refer report 190424059253).

1.8. It was noted in the initial report to Council on this matter that while there are benefits to both options, the decision as to which option to proceed with is ultimately a political decision.

1.9. There were submissions received both for Option A and Option B which considered that option to be a fairer way to apportion costs. The contrasting arguments are whether the fairness of the charge should be judged on a cost reflecting the quality and safety of the water, or the cost to treat the water on a scheme by scheme basis. What this reflects is that there is no option that is definitively fairer than the other, there are simply different ways interpreting how fair is defined.

1.10. Therefore, this report does not recommend one option over the other, rather it presents information to Council in order to make an informed decision.

Attachments:
1. Consultation Document Material
2. Summary of Submissions and Responses

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 190426060012.

(b) Notes that as part of the consultation on the Draft 2019/20 Annual Plan, residents were invited to make submissions on a proposal to aggregate the costs of UV disinfection treatment for water supplies into one account and establish a new uniform annual charge for each property connected to a Council water supply (presented as Option A), with the alternative option of continuing to rate each scheme individually for UV costs being presented as Option B.

(c) Notes that 63 individuals or groups made submissions on this topic, with 40 (63%) being in favour of Option A and 23 (37%) in favour of Option B.

(d) Notes that groups that submitted in favour of Option A included the Pegasus Residents’ Group, The Woodend-Seton Community Board, the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board, the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board and the Canterbury District Health Board.

(e) Notes that groups that submitted in favour of Option B included the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board and Federated Farmers of New Zealand.

Either;

(f) Resolves to adopt the rating proposal presented as ‘Option A’ in the Draft 2019/20 Annual Plan to aggregate the costs of UV disinfection treatment for water supplies into one account and establish a new uniform annual charge for each property connected to a Council water supply.

(g) Notes that this will result in current costs associated with UV upgrade projects (and in the case of Poyntze’s Road a connection to another scheme as an alternative to a UV upgrade project) being taken out of each individual water supply account, and replaced by a new uniform annual charge starting at $5 per connection per year in 2019/20 to $34 per connection per year in 2028/29.
OR alternatively;

(h) Resolves to adopt the rating proposal presented as ‘Option B’ in the Draft 2019/20 Annual Plan to continue to rate each water supply scheme individually for UV treatment costs.

(i) Notes that this will mean that there will be no new uniform annual charge applied across water supply schemes for UV disinfection, but will result in significant cost increases for some schemes such as Poyntz Road and Garrymere relative to Option A.

(j) Circulates this report to the Community Boards for their information.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1. The majority of the background to this proposal was covered in report 181126138621 that was presented to Council in December 2018, and the subsequent report 190115003350 that was presented in January 2019.

3.2. At the December 2018 Council meeting, Council instructed staff to include a rating proposal into the Draft 2019/20 Annual Plan to aggregate the costs of UV disinfection treatment for water supplies into one account and establish a new uniform annual charge for each property connected to a Council water supply. At the January 2019 meeting staff presented the Council with detailed rating figures for this potential new rate, and Council resolved to consult with the wider community on this basis.

3.3. A key driver for this proposed change to drinking water rating is the expected changes to the Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand (DWSNZ). In December 2018, the Ministry of Health released a 2018 revision to the DWSNZ as well as indicating further more comprehensive changes to come out for consultation in mid-2019.

3.4. The expectation from the updated standards is that treatment for both bacteria and protozoa will be required, through the removal of the secure section of the standards. Initial assessments by CH2M Beca are that UV disinfection will be the most cost effective method of providing this level of treatment. CH2M Beca produced cost estimates to implement UV disinfection which fed into budgets within the 2018-28 Long Term Plan, and are included within the 2019-20 Draft Annual Plan (refer Beca reports 180118004007 and 180626071039). Further information on the derivation of costs to feed into the proposed UV rate are contained within the report that went to Council prior to consultation on the Draft 2019-20 Annual Plan in January 2019 (190115003350).

3.5. As the new standards are yet to be released, when the UV budgets were adopted by Council it was agreed that design work would proceed within the 2018-19 financial year, but physical works would not commence until a further report was brought to Council seeking Council direction to do this. This report is intended to be in the format of a Business Case that is planned to be presented to Council early in 2020.

3.6. When the Draft 2019-20 Annual Planconsultation document was released in March, residents were invited to make a submission on which funding option for UV treatment that they prefer. Submissions closed on 11 April 2019. This report presents a summary of the submissions received on this matter.

4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

4.1. Two options were presented as part of the consultation on this topic:

Option A: All water supply ratepayers are charged a uniform amount for ultra-violet treatment.

Option B: To continue to rate each water supply scheme individually for ultra-violet treatment costs.
4.2. Residents were invited to make submissions on the proposal. In total 63 submissions were made on UV funding; 40 (63%) in favour of Option A, and 23 (37%) in favour of Option B.

4.3. Common themes amongst those that submitted in support of Option A were:

- An effective way to spread costs evenly.
- A fairer way to apportion costs.
- All residents should receive clean and safe water.

4.4. Common themes amongst those that submitted in Support of Option B were:

- Results in one group of residents subsidising another.
- User pays is a fairer approach.

4.5. Other themes noted that were not specific to the funding mechanism but were made on the more general topic on the treatment of water are:

- Concerns that UV treatment does not address nitrates in groundwater which is a concern in Canterbury.
- Projects should be deferred until there is more certainty regarding future legislative requirements.

4.6. There were submissions received both for Option A and Option B which considered that option to be a fairer way to apportion costs. The contrasting arguments are whether the fairness of the charge should be judged on a cost reflecting the quality and safety of the water, or the cost to treat the water on a scheme by scheme basis. What this reflects is that there is no option that is definitively fairer than the other; there are simply different ways interpreting how fair is defined.

4.7. Ultimately, when it comes to assessing matters related to fairness and equity that is a political decision and one that the Council must decide on. In order to make an informed decision, Council will need to take into account the views of the public connected to the district’s public water supply schemes which is presented within this report. Each submission point, and the proposed response to this are included as Attachment 2 to this report. A standardised response has been prepared to similar submissions, and specific responses prepared for submissions that raise specific issues.

4.8. The Management Team have reviewed this report to ensure the Council has sufficient information to make a decision.

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. Groups and Organisations

5.1.1. A number of submissions were made by various groups and organisations both for and against the proposed rate:

- Groups that submitted in favour of Option A included the Pegasus Residents’ Group, The Woodend-Sefton Community Board, the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board, the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board and the Canterbury District Health Board.
- Groups that submitted in favour of Option B included the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board and Federated Farmers of New Zealand.

5.1.2. The specific points made in each of the group submissions can be read in the Attachment.
5.1.3. Previous consultation with water supplies advisory groups has shown there to be a very strong interest in any matters related to water treatment, quality and cost sharing mechanisms. The past consultation with Cust, West Eyreton, Summerhill, Rural Oxford communities, as well as Garrymere and Poyntzs Road show there is a very strong interest in the matters. All groups, at various times, have expressed concern about the cost of providing drinking water and that it is becoming unaffordable. Specific feedback was received from the Garrymere community as part of the 2018-28 LTP process and the Council has decided to establish a working group, including residents, to consider options for the water scheme.

5.1.4. Targeted consultation is proposed after the 2019-20 Annual Plan deliberations with the Poyntzs Road, West Eyreton and Summerhill schemes regarding the joining of the Poyntzs Road scheme to the Summerhill and West Eyreton schemes as a means of upgrading the source for the Poyntzs Road scheme, as well as with the Garrymere scheme regarding their source upgrade. The decision to how these projects are funded will affect the rating projections that will be communicated to residents as part of these consultation exercises.

5.2. Wider Community

5.2.1. Wider community consultation is covered within the main body of this report.

5.2.2. Other communities outside the District have debated these matters in recent years. Communities such in the Hurunui and Selwyn districts have both recently been consulted on moving to district-wide rating for water supplies and both Councils decided to do so. Many other Councils have, or are, considering following a similar approach.

6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1. Financial Implications

6.1.1. Attachment 1 shows the effects on each water supply of the two funding options considered.

6.1.2. The Council has budgeted $7.8 million of the capital costs associated with installing UV disinfection, as well as the operating costs within the Draft 2019-20 Annual Plan.

6.2. Community Implications

6.2.1. Community implications relate to fairness and equity of the proposal, and the affordability issues, especially facing rural communities for the cost of meeting national drinking water regulations.

6.3. Risk Management

6.3.1. Key risks for the Council are:

∑ Community reaction to the proposal - there will need to a good explanation of the rationale for the change as part of any communications.

∑ If not supported, the affordability of upgrades on small water supplies may provide a barrier to these upgrades being completed. This would put Council at risk of potentially not meeting its obligations under the Health Act to take all practicable steps to meet the Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand, if an acceptable way to fund and complete these upgrades cannot be found.

6.4. Health and Safety

6.4.1. The Council is required to meet the drinking water standards and protect against protozoa or bacterial contamination.

6.4.2. The Havelock North Drinking-water Inquiry highlighted risks inherent with supplying large populations with untreated drinking-water. Two schemes within the district (Rangiora and Kaiapoi) were specifically noted within the Havelock North Drinking-water Inquiry Stage 1
Therefore, regardless of the speed at which the expected changes to standards come into effect to require treatment of all water, there are currently risks associated with the supply of untreated drinking-water. These risks have been identified as part of the Havelock North Drinking-water Inquiry but have not yet been addressed.

6.4.3. In addition to the above, there are two schemes that do not meet current drinking-water standards; Garrymere and Poyntzs Road. Both of these schemes do not provide any treatment for protozoa. This inherently presents an unacceptable level of risk and under the Health Act Council is obliged to take all practicable steps to address this risk. The scope of upgrades required has been defined in both cases, however in order to make progress certainty is required on how these projects will be funded so that the next stages of community consultation can progress.

7. CONTEXT

7.1. Policy

7.1.1. This matter is likely to be a matter of significance in terms of the Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy, given how it affects the rates of a large number of ratepayers. Note: the legislative requirements require the same process to be followed as though it were significant matter, in any event.

7.2. Legislation

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

7.2.2. The key legislation is the Local Government Rating Act which outlines how rates must be set, the process for doing so and the disclosure requirements. These matters have been addressed through the Draft Annual Plan consultation process.

7.2.3. The Local Government Act specifies the process that must be considered when making a decision and the process for making decisions in conjunction with the preparation of an Annual Plan.

7.3. Community Outcomes

7.3.1. The main community outcomes related to the issue are:

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

∑ 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.

7.4. Delegations

7.4.1. The Council has the delegated authority to make decisions in the process for rating and funding capital works.
Appendix 1 – Consultation Document Material
Funding of Ultra-violet (UV) Treatment of Water Supplies

To help make drinking water safer, UV treatment is proposed on all Council public water supply schemes across the District. The Council proposes to share the cost across all Council public water supplies.

The 2018-28 Long Term Plan includes a provision of $7.8 million in the budget to enable the installation of ultra-violet disinfection. This change to the level of service will need to be funded through rates. Currently, water supply schemes across the District are rated individually. This means, for instance, that water rates in Woodend are different from those in Oxford.

This enables the Council to charge for the level of infrastructure required to get water from an aquifer and any necessary treatment to make the water safe. This results in different schemes being charged varying amounts, depending on the individual scheme requirements. The Annual Plan proposes that each property connected to a Council water supply will pay the same amount for UV treatment, with the charge per property being $5 in 2019/20 which will increase to about $35 per property over the next three years as the UV treatment system is progressively installed.

Other than the change relating to UV treatment, the rating approach for all water supply costs remains unchanged.

Tell us what you think

(End Annual Plan 2019-20 Council Business)
Options

A: COUNCIL’S PREFERENCE

All water supply ratepayers are charged a uniform amount for ultra-violet treatment. If Council’s preferred funding option is supported, smaller water supplies would see a reduction in their water rates compared to that which was disclosed in the 2018-28 Long Term Plan, while larger water supplies will see a slight increase.

B: CONTINUE TO RATE EACH WATER SUPPLY SCHEME INDIVIDUALLY FOR UV TREATMENT COSTS

This would result in an uneven distribution of the costs of ultra-violet treatment, with some supplies paying significantly more than others per connection for this treatment.

Summary of Water Rates from Option A & B (For the next 3 years)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WATER SCHEME</th>
<th>Common Rating Unit (S/year)</th>
<th>2016/20</th>
<th>2020/21</th>
<th>2021/22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OPTION A</td>
<td>OPTION B</td>
<td>OPTION A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>per UAC</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend/Tuahiwi/Pegasus</td>
<td>per UAC</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikuku</td>
<td>per UAC</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohoka</td>
<td>per 2 unit connection</td>
<td>1174</td>
<td>1170</td>
<td>1221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandeville</td>
<td>per 19 unit connection</td>
<td>1546</td>
<td>1541</td>
<td>1604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KalapoI</td>
<td>per 2 unit connection</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford No 1 Rural</td>
<td>per 2 unit connection</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford No 2 Rural</td>
<td>per 2 unit connection</td>
<td>822</td>
<td>818</td>
<td>831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>per UAC</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summerhill</td>
<td>per 2 unit connection</td>
<td>1246</td>
<td>1241</td>
<td>1367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cust</td>
<td>per UAC</td>
<td>979</td>
<td>995</td>
<td>985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poyntz Road</td>
<td>per 2 unit connection</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Eyreton</td>
<td>per 19 unit connection</td>
<td>1130</td>
<td>1187</td>
<td>1238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrymere</td>
<td>per 2 unit connection</td>
<td>848</td>
<td>843</td>
<td>875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>per 19 unit connection</td>
<td>1247</td>
<td>1242</td>
<td>1377</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Attachment 2  Draft Annual Plan Submissions and Proposed Council Responses
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submission Points in Support of Option A</th>
<th>Council Response to Option A Submission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supports averaged out water rate across the district.</strong></td>
<td>The Council acknowledges the points you have raised in support of the sharing of the costs of UV treatment across the Council’s public water supplies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Safe water is a basic requirement for everyone and as such, everyone should pay to ensure this occurs across the district.</strong></td>
<td>Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>This fully supports.</strong></td>
<td>Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Uniform charge is simpler to administer and probably more cost efficient</strong></td>
<td>Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments: Great idea for safer, cleaner water and costs shared fairly.</strong></td>
<td>Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supports averaged out water rate across the district. Seems a better way to allow progress on an integrated plan to upgrade the water supply, reducing expensive and time wasting comparison in rates made between small areas.</strong></td>
<td>The Council acknowledges the points you have raised in support of the sharing of the costs of UV treatment across the Council’s public water supplies. The proposal however does not address the point you make regarding contamination of water. Any discharges to ground that may impact on a water supply fall under the responsibility of Environment Canterbury, however Council does work closely with Environment Canterbury on these matters, and protecting water sources is a priority for Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Believe this a fair option, and even costs out across the district.</strong></td>
<td>Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>This is fully support.</strong></td>
<td>Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments: Great idea for safer, cleaner water and costs shared fairly.</strong></td>
<td>Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>** THERE should be an equal access to water for NZ residents as this is going to be a costly affair for all going into the future. There is inequity in water access ie overseas companies have free rein to make money, some pay less for water and some are going to have to pay large amounts as citizens for a basic right.**</td>
<td>Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall is fairer.</strong></td>
<td>Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>congratulate the council on this initiative. It shows true leadership to be able to understand the difference between equality and equity in a social sense. While equality does treat everyone the same, it does discriminate against some people, equity on the other hand is about fairness, the decision on how people are treated is based on what is fair.</strong></td>
<td>Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>This policy is clearly about equity.</strong></td>
<td>Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There will no doubt be other challenges in the next few years for Councils and residents to come to grips with that will require more rates increases to cover the cost of an aging infrastructure. It is only fair that all infrastructure that is the fabric of our societies is funded in a like manner. It is for these reasons that I fully endorse the Council to adopt option A.</strong></td>
<td>Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>An equitable approach.</strong></td>
<td>Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>applaud the council for providing this option in the annual plan and for supporting GWSAG.</strong></td>
<td>Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Council supports the introduction of UV treatment across all Council public water supply schemes across the District and supports Option A – charging a uniform rate for this – as this fairly distributes the cost of this important upgrade to protect drinking water across the community.</strong></td>
<td>Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>This is the only option I think A is the only way forward, I would personally like to have my own UV treatment system my stock don’t need UV treated water</strong></td>
<td>The Council acknowledges the points you have raised in support of the sharing of the costs of UV treatment across the Council’s public water supplies. It is noted that Council’s responsibility is to provide safe and compliant water to the point of supply at each property boundary on public water supplies, and therefore cannot rely on individual private treatment systems to ensure the safety of water supplies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Wider Community.</strong></td>
<td>Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>We all help pay for all services. Currently we pay for services only others can use.</strong></td>
<td>Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Currently we pay for parks in Suburbia and bus services we don’t get so we have to help fund town people schemes. Only fair they return and help pay for water for all.</strong></td>
<td>Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>This is the most fair. We share town costs on their bus service which we don’t get so they should help with this.</strong></td>
<td>Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pegasus Medical Centre support Option A in which all water supply ratepayers are charged a uniform amount for ultra-violet treatment.</strong></td>
<td>Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A sensible option</strong></td>
<td>Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document ID</td>
<td>Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAP19-20.114.1 by Pegasus Residents' Group Inc.</td>
<td>We support Option A in which all water supply ratepayers are charged a uniform amount for ultra-violet treatment. Increases appear to be minimal and in some cases, such as Poyntzs Road, significant savings can be achieved for ratepayers through this system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAP19-20.116.1 by Woodend-Sefton Community Board</td>
<td>The Board acknowledges that safe drinking water is a key responsibility of the Council. Some schemes are too small for residents concerned to be expected to pay for the scheme in its entirety as well as covering the previous costs they have faced around water supply and storage. The Board is of the opinion that a shared cost for the supply of water is only fair and right.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAP19-20.104.1 by Oxford-Ohoka Community Board</td>
<td>Summary: The Board supports the proposed financial model that the costs of UV treatment be shared District wide. However, the Board is also concerned that a UV solution is being progressed in advance of any formal Government announcement on the outcome of the Havelock North enquiry and is concerned that UV treatment may not be recommended or the total solution to the matter. The Board asks that the timeframe for any UV implementation or allocation of funds is not progressed until the government requirements are evident.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAP19-20.103.1 by Rangiora-Ashley Community Board</td>
<td>Summary: The Board supports the introduction of UV where this is essential to meet Drinking Water Standards but is more reticent regarding the widespread introduction of UV until the Government Policy direction resulting from the outcome of the Havelock North Enquiry is known. Chlorination may be proposed for assessment and consideration. The Board is also concerned that UV treatment does not eliminate all contaminants and that other methods may be needed and would not wish to see unwarranted expenditure on UV for the wider network until this final direction is identified by Government. Indeed there may be some schemes that do not require any additional treatment. The Council acknowledges the points you have raised in support of the sharing of the costs of UV treatment across the Council’s public water supplies. It is acknowledged while signals have been strong that all water will require treatment, the legislation has not yet come into affect to require this. Council will monitor progress as the situation develops and ultimately will make a decision after receiving advice from staff on timing for the projects. It is expected that this decision will be made early in 2020, with construction budgets for upgrades requiring completion by June 2021 for schemes currently without any treatment. It is noted that construction budgets for the proposed works have been adjusted through a staff submission to the Draft Annual Plan such that construction works are now planned for the 2020/21 year rather than construction being spread over the 2019/20 and 2020/21 years. This will allow time for review of draft Drinking-water Standards which are to be released in 2019, and any amendments to designs following this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAP19-20.102.1 by Selwyn-Opihopuni Community Board</td>
<td>Summary: The Board supports the introduction of UV where this is essential to meet Drinking Water Standards. However, the Board is also concerned that UV treatment does not eliminate all contaminants and that other methods may be needed and would not wish to see unwarranted expenditure on UV for the wider network until this final direction is identified by Government. Indeed there may be some schemes that do not require any additional treatment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission Points in Support of Option B</td>
<td>Council Response to Option B Submission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary:</strong> People who need/use it should pay.</td>
<td>Standard: The Council acknowledges the points you have raised in your submission favouring a user pays approach to the funding of UV treatment of Council’s public water supplies. In making its final decision Council needs to weigh up the merits of a purely user pays approach, versus the need to provide all residents on a Council run scheme with safe and affordable water.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary:</strong> Democracy always supports user pays</td>
<td>Standard: The Council acknowledges the points you have raised in your submission favouring a user pays approach to the funding of UV treatment of Council’s public water supplies. It is acknowledged that you have highlighted concerns about equity in charging where some properties use more or less water than others. In the case of UV treatment, the majority of the costs would not change if more or less water is used as most costs are fixed capital costs to construct the treatment infrastructure, rather than variable operating costs that may go up or down depending on actual usage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary:</strong> Live in the Ashley Loburn ward and we pay for our water from Hurunui as a separate amount to our rates - it is therefore fair that each community should fund their own costs.</td>
<td>As a point of clarification, the proposed UV rate is only to be applied to ratepayers currently on Waimakariri District Council public water supplies. Therefore, residents on the Ashley Rural Water scheme which is managed by the Hurunui District Council would not be required to pay the proposed rate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary:</strong> Fair</td>
<td>Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary:</strong> No to share the cost across all council public water supplies - many on fixed income and outlayed extra costs when they brought their land.</td>
<td>Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary:</strong> Most fair. User pays.</td>
<td>Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary:</strong> Should be user pays</td>
<td>Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary:</strong> Each individual water scheme area, e.g. Kaiapoi, Summerhill, Ohoka, should look after it's own cost of UV Treatment.</td>
<td>Standard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DAP19-20.55.1 by Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board

| **Summary:** Opposes the proposal for a uniform amount for UV treatment. | The Board considers the proposal for a uniform charge for UV treatment is simply the first step as part of a wider proposal for a uniform charge for the operation of all water supplies. An earlier proposal for uniform charges for the provision of 3 Waters services was rejected following significant opposition to the concept. |
| **Summary:** The Board feels that the above proposal is in contravention of the concept of charges for service being relative to the cost of supplying those services. It is clear from the data supplied in the annual plan documentation that the cost of supplying water services to rural areas is much higher than that for urban areas. In addition, Rural Water Supply users tend to use a lot more water per day than urban users. It is quite inappropriate for rural properties owners with properties that have an average around one million dollars to expect landowners that have a property with an average value of $500,000 to subsidise them. | The Council acknowledges the points you have raised in your submission favouring a user pays approach to the funding of UV treatment of Council’s public water supplies. In making its final decision Council needs to weigh up the merits of a purely user pays approach, versus the need to provide all residents on a Council run scheme with safe and affordable water. In response to your point about the UV rating proposal being a pre-cursor to wider uniform charging, it is noted that this proposal is independent of any other potential future proposals and does not commit Council to any more than its stated purpose and scope. The wider review of three waters rating is due to be consulted on in 2022 which is a separate process to this. |
believe user-pays for water supply is a fairer system. However I would be interested in hearing how the Council plans to clean our water supply of nitrates, in light of the links discovered between nitrates in water and bowel cancer.


The research found a statistically significant increase in colorectal cancer risk at 0.87ppm (parts per million) of nitrate-nitrogen in drinking water. There was a 15 percent increase in risk at levels over 2.1ppm, compared with those who have the least exposure.

Considering most of our public drinking water supplies are already over the risk threshold and the levels are expected to get much higher in the future, what is the Council’s plan to protect our community from the increased risk of Bowel Cancer? Is it worth spending all this money on UV treatment at all if we need to find a new source of drinking water due to high nitrate levels?

The concept of a Uniform Charge is contrary to the concept of charges for service being relative to the cost of supplying those services. It is clear from the data supplied in the annual plan documentation that the cost of supplying water services to rural areas is much higher than that for urban areas. In addition, Rural Water Supply users tend to use a lot more water per day than urban users. It is a bit rich, please excuse the pun, for rural properties owners with day than urban users. It is a bit rich, please excuse the pun, for rural properties owners with properties that have an average around one million dollars to expect landowners that have a property with an average value of $500,000 to subsidise them.

The introduction of ultraviolet treatment should be delayed until the government decides, a property with an average value of $500,000 to subsidise them.

The Council acknowledges the points you have raised in your submission favouring a user pays approach to the funding of UV treatment of Council’s public water supplies. In making its final decision Council needs to weigh up the merits of a user pays approach, versus the need to provide all residents on a public scheme with safe and affordable water.

It is acknowledged while signals have been strong that all water will require treatment, the legislation has not yet come into effect to require this. Council will monitor progress as the situation develops and ultimately will make a decision after receiving advice from staff as to whether to implement the upgrades immediately, or whether to continue to wait for legislative requirements. It is expected that this decision will be made early in 2020, with construction budgets for upgrades requiring completion by June 2021 for schemes currently without any treatment.

The Council acknowledges the points you have raised in your submission favouring a user pays approach to the funding of UV treatment of Council’s public water supplies. In making its final decision Council needs to weigh up the merits of a user pays approach, versus the need to provide all residents on a public scheme with safe and affordable water.

Considering most of our public drinking water supplies are already over the risk threshold and the levels are expected to get much higher in the future, what is the Council’s plan to protect our community from the increased risk of Bowel Cancer? Is it worth spending all this money on UV treatment at all if we need to find a new source of drinking water due to high nitrate levels?

The Council acknowledges the points you have raised in your submission favouring a user pays approach to the funding of UV treatment of Council’s public water supplies. In making its final decision Council needs to weigh up the merits of a user pays approach, versus the need to provide all residents on a public scheme with safe and affordable water.

It is acknowledged while signals have been strong that all water will require treatment, the legislation has not yet come into effect to require this. Council will monitor progress as the situation develops and ultimately will make a decision after receiving advice from staff as to whether to implement the upgrades immediately, or whether to continue to wait for legislative requirements. It is expected that this decision will be made early in 2020, with construction budgets for upgrades requiring completion by June 2021 for schemes currently without any treatment.

The Council acknowledges the points you have raised in your submission favouring a user pays approach to the funding of UV treatment of Council’s public water supplies. In making its final decision Council needs to weigh up the merits of a user pays approach, versus the need to provide all residents on a public scheme with safe and affordable water.

It is acknowledged while signals have been strong that all water will require treatment, the legislation has not yet come into effect to require this. Council will monitor progress as the situation develops and ultimately will make a decision after receiving advice from staff as to whether to implement the upgrades immediately, or whether to continue to wait for legislative requirements. It is expected that this decision will be made early in 2020, with construction budgets for upgrades requiring completion by June 2021 for schemes currently without any treatment.

Each year Kaiapoi is TWICE as much per UAC.

2020/21 extra $39 and 38
2021/22 extra $75 and 72

DAP 19-20.106.1 by Federated Farmers of New Zealand

The Council acknowledges the points you have raised in your submission favouring a user pays approach to the funding of UV treatment of Council’s public water supplies. In making its final decision Council needs to weigh up the merits of a user pays approach, versus the need to provide all residents on a public scheme with safe and affordable water.

In terms of the cost difference, the figures to compare when assessing the impact of the proposed uniform UV charge is to look at the rate under ‘Option A’ versus the rate under ‘Option B’ for a given year. In the case of Kaiapoi, the difference between the Option A and Option B columns is $4 in the first year, $5 in the second year, and $7 in the third year. It is acknowledged that there are increases in the Kaiapoi water rate forecast over the coming three years, however these are occurring for reasons independent of the UV rating proposal.
1. SUMMARY

1.1. This report is to provide a request for changes to the water supply budgets for the 2019-20 Annual Plan.

1.2. Table 1 shows the items that are proposed to change.

1.3. All the items relate to the wider UV installation projects which are proposed in anticipation of changes to requirements following the Havelock North Drinking-water Inquiry Stage 2 Report. The key points regarding the recommendations for changes are:

   a. There is still the expectation that treatment for protozoa and bacteria will be required, and that UV will be the best mechanism to achieve this.

   b. The speed at which the changes to requirements have been made has not been as quick as initially expected.

   c. The risk of not completing the upgrades as quickly as initially planned and continuing to deliver untreated water is required to be balanced against the desire to have certainty on the nature of treatment requirements before committing to capital expenditure. Given that draft changes to the Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand are expected to be forthcoming in June or July 2019 at the earliest, it is proposed to delay the construction start time for these works until the 2020-21 year, without shifting the final completion date of June 2021. This essentially means extending the period for design work such that the draft update of the Drinking-water Standards can be taken into account, and condensing the construction programme to a 12 month period.

   d. The budget allocated for 2018-19 will be carried over to 2019-20 to allow design and investigation works to continue into the 2019-20 financial year.
Table 1: Proposed Changes to 2019-20 Water Supply Budgets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Budget Name</th>
<th>2019-20 Budget Amount</th>
<th>2020-21 Budget Amount</th>
<th>Proposed Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>UV Installation</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>Move all 2019-20 budget to 2020-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
<td>UV Installation</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain Road</td>
<td>UV Installation – Oxford Urban Share</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$260,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UV Installation – Oxford Rural No.2 Share</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cust</td>
<td>UV Installation</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Headworks Renewals</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pegasus</td>
<td>UV Installation</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,870,000</td>
<td>$3,230,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.5. As the proposed changes do not increase or decrease any budgets overall, they will not result in any increases or decreases to water rates long term. The will however mean that the rating impact of these projects will occur 12 months later than previously forecast.

Attachments:

i. Nil

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 190424059253.

(b) **Approves** deferring $500,000 of the Rangiora UV treatment installation budget from 2019-20 to 2020-21, to allow consideration of the upcoming draft changes to the Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand prior to committing to construction of the proposed upgrade.

(c) **Approves** deferring $700,000 of the Kaiapoi UV treatment installation budget from 2019-20 to 2020-21, to allow consideration of the upcoming draft changes to the Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand prior to committing to construction of the proposed upgrade.

(d) **Approves** deferring $200,000 of the Domain Road UV Treatment Installation Budget – Oxford Urban Share from 2019-20 to 2020-21, to allow consideration of the upcoming draft changes to the Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand prior to committing to construction of the proposed upgrade.

(e) **Approves** deferring $70,000 of the Domain Road UV Treatment Installation Budget – Oxford Rural No.2 Share from 2019-20 to 2020-21, to allow consideration of the upcoming draft changes to the Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand prior to committing to construction of the proposed upgrade.

(f) **Approves** deferring $100,000 of the Cust UV treatment installation budget from 2019-20 to 2020-21, to allow consideration of the upcoming draft changes to the Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand prior to committing to construction of the proposed upgrade.

(g) **Approves** deferring $100,000 of the Cust Headworks Renewal budget from 2019-20 to 2020-21, to allow consideration of the upcoming draft changes to the Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand prior to committing to construction of the proposed upgrade, which is part of the wider Cust UV installation project.

(h) **Approves** deferring $200,000 of the Pegasus UV treatment installation budget from 2019-20 to 2020-21, to allow consideration of the upcoming draft changes to the Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand prior to committing to construction of the proposed upgrade.
Notes that there is still a degree of uncertainty regarding the timing of the upcoming changes to requirements, and in the event that the drivers for these projects require the upgrades to progress faster than allowed for with the proposed changes to the budgets, staff will bring a further report to Council to request some or all of these budgets to be brought forward.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1. In December 2017 the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry Stage 2 Report was released. This included a recommendation that all water be treated, and also a recommendation that the secure classification section of the current drinking water standards be abolished. The inferred implication from this is that all water would need to be treated for both bacteria and protozoa.

3.1 Also in December 2017 the Council received a letter from the Director General of Health advising that suppliers delivering untreated drinking water should consider appropriate treatment without delay, and that suppliers should reconsider reliance on secure bore status in the current standards.

3.2 In response to the above signals of the upcoming requirement to treat all water and the risks highlighted in delivering untreated water, an assessment was carried out of how to address these issues. It was recommended that UV treatment be installed on all schemes on which secure status is currently relied upon for compliance. Budgets were therefore included in the 2018-28 Long Term Plan for UV treatment installation projects.

3.3 Design works on proposed upgrades on schemes that currently have no treatment commenced in the 2018-19 financial year, with construction budgets on these schemes allocated for the 2019-20 and 2020-21 financial years. It was agreed that construction works would not commence until either the Government had changed the Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand to require this to occur, or until Council directed staff to do so.

3.4 It was expected that the changes to the standards / legislation to require these projects to occur may have eventuated by this time, however this has not been the case. There were minor changes made to the Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand in late 2018, and further more comprehensive changes expected to be released in draft format in mid-2019.

3.5 In parallel with the review of the Drinking-water Standards, the Government is carrying out a wider Three Waters Review. This is focused on the regulatory regime of all three waters, and also reviewing service delivery options. The first expected outcome of this is for legislation to establish a new drinking-water regulator to be released in mid-2019 potentially coming into effect from mid-2020. The key requirement from this regulator relevant to the UV projects referenced in this report would be to ensure compliance with the proposed updated Drinking-water Standards, with a much higher level of enforcement than has been seen under the current regulatory system.

4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

4.1. There are two key options to consider at the current point in time:

1. Council could proceed with the construction of the proposed UV treatment projects on all schemes that currently do not treat their water in the 2019-20 financial year, to address the current risk in delivering untreated drinking-water and to meet expected future legislative requirements, or;

2. Council could continue with detailed design works but defer construction of the proposed upgrades until greater certainty is gained with regard to expected future requirements. This would mean deferring capital works until the draft changes to the
Drinking-water Standards have been released in mid-2019 and subsequently reviewed.

4.2. The key benefit with the first option would be that Council would address the risks currently present with untreated drinking-water without any further delay. The risk is that the draft changes to the Drinking-water Standards may differ from those anticipated in some way, meaning that the nature of the upgrades may not completely align with the future standards.

4.3. The key benefits of the second option are that Council will have a higher degree of confidence that the proposed works will meet and align with the requirements of the future standards. This however comes with the downside that the water will remain untreated for longer than would otherwise be the case, which carries some level of inherent risk.

4.4. It is clear that both options have their own benefits and risks. Given that the draft changes to Drinking-water Standards are expected relatively soon (June or July 2019), on balance it is recommended that the second option be proceeded with, which is to wait until there is more certainty before committing to capital expenditure.

4.5. The changes to budgets recommended within this submission have been made in line with this second option. The budgets proposed essentially allow for continued design and investigation works in the 2019-20 financial year following review of the draft revision of the Drinking-water Standards, ready for construction works throughout the 2020-21 financial year. This will result in a more condensed construction programme, and will require staff to consider the procurement strategy to deliver these all these physical works within a 12 month window rather than an 18 – 24 month window.

4.6. Council staff have started work on a business case to support these works, and this will be presented prior to commencement of construction works. By deferring the construction works on these projects in line with the recommendations of this report, this will allow a more comprehensive business case to include direct reference to updated standards, rather than purely referencing the current risks with untreated water, and expected changes to standards. The key point to note with overall timing is that there is a reasonable degree of confidence in the draft changes to the Drinking-water Standards being released for consultation in mid-2019, but not as much certainly in terms of when these will be formally adopted. This matter can be considered as part of the wider business case in terms of putting an argument forward as to when to proceed.

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

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. Groups and Organisations

5.2. There has been no direct consultation with groups or organisations regarding the realignment of the construction programme for the UV treatment budgets referenced in this report. The Council has consulted on the funding of UV treatment projects through its 2019-20 Annual Plan process, and as part of the feedback received the Canterbury District Health Board made a submission in support of the UV treatment of the Council’s water supplies.

5.3. Wider Community

5.4. The wider community has not been consulted regarding the realignment of the construction programme for the UV treatment budgets.
6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1. Financial Implications

6.2. The proposed changes to budgets are summarised in Table 2.

Table 2: Proposed Changes to 2019-20 Water Supply Budgets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Budget Name</th>
<th>2019-20 Budget Amount</th>
<th>2020-21 Budget Amount</th>
<th>Proposed Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora UV</td>
<td>Installation</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>Move all 2019-20 budget to 2020-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi UV</td>
<td>Installation</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain Road</td>
<td>UV Installation – Oxford Urban Share</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$260,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UV Installation – Oxford Rural No.2 Share</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cust</td>
<td>UV Installation</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headworks Renewals</td>
<td></td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pegasus</td>
<td>UV Installation</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,870,000</td>
<td>$3,230,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.4. Overall the proposed changes reduce the total capital spend for the 2019-20 financial year, but increases the forecast spend for the following year. This will require a number of similar projects to be constructed in parallel with each other, rather than in series. This will require some further consideration to the procurement strategy for these works prior to tendering to ensure that the Council receives good value, while still completing the works within a relatively condensed timeframe.

6.5. Community Implications

6.6. The proposed projects will have positive community implications by improving the safety of the currently untreated water supplies. The deferral of some of the construction budget will mean that some of these projects are completed later than they would otherwise be, meaning that these benefits are realised later than they would otherwise be.

6.7. Risk Management

6.8. The proposal included within this report aims to strike a balance between the risks associated with delivering untreated water versus the risk of commencing construction works in anticipation of standards and legislation which has not yet been released.

6.9. Health and Safety

6.10. The key driver for these projects is to improve the safety of the district’s water supplies.

7. CONTEXT

7.1. Policy

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

7.2. Legislation

7.3. Section 69 of the Health (Drinking Water) Amendment Act 2007 is relevant in this matter.

7.4. Community Outcomes
7.5. 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

7.6. Delegations

7.7. The Council has the delegated authority to add or amend budgets.
1. SUMMARY

1.1 The purpose of this report is to provide a request for changes to the Wastewater budgets in the Draft 2019-20 Annual Plan.

Wastewater:

- Fernside connection to the Eastern Districts Sewer Scheme Project – Request to defer a portion of the 2019/20 budget
- Cridland Street Sewer Repairs – Request to defer a portion of the 2019/20 budget
- Wastewater Treatment Plant Fencing – Request for new budget
- Rangiora Septage Facility – Request to defer the 2019/20 budget

Attachments:

i. Request for budget to improve fencing of Wastewater Treatment Plant Sites (Trim 190402047731)
2. **RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 190416056516.

(b) **Approves** the request to defer budget for the Fernside connection to EDSS Project as set out in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme - Project</th>
<th>Budget Type</th>
<th>Draft 2019/20 Annual</th>
<th>Revised Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fernside Connection to Eastern Districts Sewer Scheme</td>
<td>Solely Growth</td>
<td>$169,225 (2019/20)</td>
<td>$40,000 (2019/20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$406,013 (2021/22)</td>
<td>$406,013 (2021/22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>$73,075 (2019/20)</td>
<td>$50,000 (2019/20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$135,338 (2020/21)</td>
<td>$158,413 (2020/21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$135,337 (2021/22)</td>
<td>$135,337 (2021/22)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(c) **Approves** the request to defer budget for the Cridland Street Sewer Repairs Project as set out in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme - Project</th>
<th>Budget Type</th>
<th>Draft 2019/20 Annual</th>
<th>Revised Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cridland Street Sewer Repairs</td>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>$500,000 (2019/20)</td>
<td>$100,000 (2019/20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$500,000 (2020/21)</td>
<td>$900,000 (2020/21)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(d) **Approves** a new renewal budget of $215,000 in 2019/20 for improving the standard of fencing of the districts WWTP’s.

(e) **Notes** that $215,000 is not budgeted for in 2019/20 that will need to be funded from renewals.

(f) **Notes** that this new budget will increase the Eastern Sewer rate by approximately 0.16% (0.26% if the Septage facility design project is not deferred)

(g) **Approves** that the deferring of the Septage facility design budget $100,000 to 2020/21.

3. **Fernside connection to the Eastern Districts Sewer Scheme**

**REASON IT WAS NOT INCLUDED IN THE DRAFT ANNUAL PLAN**

3.1 The budget for the Fernside connection to the EDSS project is currently split over four years in the Long Term Plan. Those budgets and purpose of each are:

- Design & Consultation 2018/19 – $50,000 (Growth)
- Design & Consultation 2019/20 – $169,225 (Growth) + $73,075 (LOS)
- Construction 2020/21 - $406,012 (Growth) + $135,338 (LOS)
- Construction 2021/22 - $406,012 (Growth) + $135,337 (LOS)

3.2 Staff have reviewed the project program for 2019/20 and determined that a portion of the current budget can be deferred to 2020/21. This is in line with the planned expenditure for 2019/20.
RISK OF NOT ADOPTING THE RECOMMENDATION

3.3 The planned 2019/20 budget will not be fully spent.

ISSUES AND OPTIONS

3.4 There will be no impact to the current program.

3.5 Council Staff request that $152,300 of the 2019/20 budget be moved to 2020/21. This will reflect when the actual spend will occur. The revised budgets are detailed in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme - Project</th>
<th>Budget Type</th>
<th>Draft 2019/20 Annual Plan</th>
<th>Revised Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fernside Connection to Eastern Districts Sewer Scheme</td>
<td>Solely Growth</td>
<td>$169,225 (2019/20)</td>
<td>$40,000 (2019/20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$406,013 (2021/22)</td>
<td>$406,013 (2021/22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>$73,075 (2019/20)</td>
<td>$50,000 (2019/20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$135,338 (2020/21)</td>
<td>$158,413 (2020/21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$135,337 (2021/22)</td>
<td>$135,337 (2021/22)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.6 This change will result in no difference in the cost of the project.

COMMUNITY VIEWS

Groups and Organisations

3.7 No community views have been consulted on this.

Wider Community

3.8 The wider community has not been consulted on this.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

Financial Implications

3.9 There is no change to the overall project budget. Deferring a portion of the 2019/20 budget will have a positive impact on the Fernside rates.

Community Implications

3.10 There are no community implications by deferring a portion of the budget.

Risk Management

3.11 There is no risk associated with deferring a portion of the budget.

Health and Safety
3.12 There are no health and safety issues with deferring a portion of the budget.

CONTEXT

Policy

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

LEGISLATION

3.14 There is no relevant legislation to this request to defer a portion of budget.

COMMUNITY OUTCOMES

3.15 There is a healthy and sustainable environment for all

3.16 Core utility services are provided in a timely and sustainable manner.

DELEGATIONS

3.17 As this is a change to the budgets in the Annual Plan, Council approval is required.

4. Cridland Street Sewer Repairs

REASON IT WAS NOT INCLUDED IN THE DRAFT ANNUAL PLAN

4.1 The budget for the Cridland Street sewer repairs is currently split over three years in the Long Term Plan. Those budgets and purpose of each are:

- Investigation and design 2018/19 – $50,000 (LOS)
- Construction 2019/20 - $500,000 (LOS)
- Construction 2020/21 - $500,000 (LOS)

4.2 Staff have reviewed the project program for 2019/20 and determined that a portion of the current budget should be deferred to 2020/21. This is in line with the planned expenditure for 2019/20.

RISK OF NOT ADOPTING THE RECOMMENDATION
4.3. The planned 2019/20 budget will not be fully spent.

**ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.4. There will be no impact to the current program.

4.5. Council Staff request that $400,000 of the 2019/20 budget be moved to 2020/21. This will reflect when the actual spend will occur. The revised budgets are detailed in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme - Project</th>
<th>Budget Type</th>
<th>Draft Plan 2019/20</th>
<th>Annual Plan 2020/21</th>
<th>Revised Budget 2019/20</th>
<th>Revised Budget 2020/21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cridland Street Sewer</td>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>$500,000 (2019/20)</td>
<td>$500,000 (2020/21)</td>
<td>$100,000 (2019/20)</td>
<td>$900,000 (2020/21)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.6. This change will result in no difference in the cost of the project.

**COMMUNITY VIEWS**

Groups and Organisations

4.7. No community views have been consulted on this.

Wider Community

4.8. The wider community has not been consulted on this.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

Financial Implications

4.9. There is no change to the overall project budget. Deferring a portion of the 2019/20 budget will have a positive impact on the Eastern District Sewer Scheme rates.

Community Implications

4.10. There are no community implications by deferring a portion of the budget.

Risk Management

4.11. There is no risk associated with deferring a portion of the budget.

Health and Safety
4.12. There are no health and safety issues with deferring a portion of the budget.

**CONTEXT**

**Policy**

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

**LEGISLATION**

4.14. There is no relevant legislation to this request to defer a portion of budget.

**COMMUNITY OUTCOMES**

4.15. There is a healthy and sustainable environment for all

4.16. Core utility services are provided in a timely and sustainable manner.

**DELEGATIONS**

4.17. As this is a change to the budgets in the Annual Plan, Council approval is required.

**5. FENCING OF WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT SITES**

**REASON IT WAS NOT INCLUDED IN THE DRAFT ANNUAL PLAN**

5.1. In January 2019 there was an incident at the Gore wastewater treatment plant where a 3 year old gained access to the site and drowned in one of the ponds. The site appears to have been fenced with a standard 7 wire stock fence. This has highlighted the need for appropriate fencing to minimise the risk to the public.

5.2. A risk based assessment was undertaken of all WWTP's to select an appropriate level of fencing. It has been identified that six of the seven sites need to be improved. The attached report (190402047731) summarises the review, options assessed and recommendations.

**RISK OF NOT ADOPTING THE RECOMMENDATION**

5.3. There is an increased risk a member of the public could enter a Wastewater Treatment Plant Site that contains significant hazards.

**ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

5.4. The current standard of fencing does not provide an adequate barrier to the public.
5.5. A risk based assessment of the existing fencing identified a high risk rating for the majority of the WWTP’s sites.

5.6. A total of five options were assessed for the improving the site fencing. These are described in the attached ‘Request for budget to improve fencing of Wastewater Treatment Plant Sites Report’ (Trim 190402047731).

The recommended upgrade for sites with hazards such as open water bodies is to replace the deer fence mesh with X-fence security mesh. The cost estimate for the sites requiring improvements are summarised in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WWTP Site</th>
<th>LoS</th>
<th>Renewals</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora WWTP</td>
<td>$60,000(^1)</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi WWTP</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$96,000</td>
<td>$96,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend WWTP</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$42,000</td>
<td>$42,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikuku WWTP</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$17,000</td>
<td>$17,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMUNITY VIEWS**

**Groups and Organisations**

5.7. No community views have been consulted on this.

**Wider Community**

5.8. The wider community has not been consulted on this.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

**Financial Implications**

5.9. A budget of $60,000 has been included in 2019/20 financial year for fencing at the Rangiora WWTP.

5.10. The request is for a new budget of $215,000. The deferral of the 2019/20 Septage facility design budget ($100,000) would therefore have a net additional budget of $115,000. The additional budget would be funded through renewals. The table below summarises the funding split for the proposed capital works.

\(^1\) 2019/20 budget currently includes $60,000 for new fencing. This is funded from level of service.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WWTP Site</th>
<th>LoS</th>
<th>Renewals</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora WWTP</td>
<td>$60,000²</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi WWTP</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$96,000</td>
<td>$96,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend WWTP</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$42,000</td>
<td>$42,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikuku WWTP</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$17,000</td>
<td>$17,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The renewals would be loan funded. The impact to the 2020/21 rates would be an increase of 0.16% to the Eastern District Sewer rate.

Community Implications

5.11. There is an increased risk to the public through the current fencing being inadequate. The recommendation will reduce the risk to a low level.

Risk Management

5.12. There is a risk a member of the public can gain access to the treatment plant sites.

Health and Safety

5.13. Through having adequate site fencing the risk to Council staff and contractors is minimised through not allowing access to the public.

CONTEXT

Policy

5.14. This matter is not a matter of significance in terms of the Councils Significance and Engagement Policy.

LEGISLATION

5.15. There following legislation is relevant the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015.

² 2019/20 budget currently includes $60,000 for new fencing. This is funded from level of service.
COMMUNITY OUTCOMES

5.16. There is a safe environment for all
5.17. There is a healthy and sustainable environment for all

DELEGATIONS

5.18. As this unbudgeted capital expenditure, Council approval is required.


REASON IT WAS NOT INCLUDED IN THE DRAFT ANNUAL PLAN

6.1. Staff are requesting to defer this expenditure to reduce the impact to the sewer rate from the additional budget request for fencing of WWTP sites.

6.2. By deferring this budget Council can take a considered approach in reviewing the business case for a septage facility before committing funds in future financial years.

RISK OF NOT ADOPTING THE RECOMMENDATION

6.3. If the budget for the fencing of WWTP sites is approved, the EDSS rate would increase by an additional 0.10% in 2019/20.

ISSUES AND OPTIONS

6.4. The deferring of this project will not result in any issues. A septage discharge facility is currently available in Christchurch.
6.5. A business case is being undertaken in the 2018/19 financial year to assess if the construction of a new septage facility in the district is an investment that is justified to be undertaken. This work will also provide a more accurate cost estimate for this project.

6.6. A budget of $100,000 has been included in 2019/20 financial year for the design of the facility.

6.7. Should the business case show that this is a viable project for Council to undertake, the budgets will be confirmed and adjusted based on the work completed in the 2018/19 financial year.

6.8. It is recommended that this budget is deferred to 2020/21 with construction in 2021/22. This is on the basis the business case recommends the project moves ahead.

COMMUNITY VIEWS
Groups and Organisations
6.9. No community views have been consulted on this.

Wider Community
6.10. The wider community has not been consulted on this.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

Financial Implications
6.11. Deferring the design of the Septage facility will move $100,000 to the 2020/21 financial year.

Community Implications
6.12. There are no community implications.

Risk Management
6.13. There is no risk associated in deferring this project.

Health and Safety
6.14. A safety in design will be undertaken at the preliminary design stage.

CONTEXT
Policy
6.15. This matter is not a matter of significance in terms of the Councils Significance and Engagement Policy.

LEGISLATION

6.16. There is no legislation relevant to this specific project.

COMMUNITY OUTCOMES

6.17. There is a safe environment for all

6.18. There is a healthy and sustainable environment for all

DELEGATIONS

6.19. As this unbudgeted capital expenditure, Council approval is required.
1. SUMMARY

1.1 This report is to seek approval as part of the 2019/20 Annual Plan deliberations for a new budget of $215,000 in the 2019/20 financial year for improvement to the districts Wastewater Treatment Plants (WWTP) boundary fences.

1.2 The improvement to the WWTP site fencing is to provide public safety through avoiding accidental access, and protection of Council staff and contractors working on remote sites.

1.3 In January 2019 there was an incident at the Gore wastewater treatment plant where a 3 year old gained access to the site and drowned in one of the ponds. The site appears to have been fenced with a standard 7 wire stock fence. This has highlighted the need for appropriate fencing to minimise the risk to the public.

1.4 A risk based assessment was undertaken of all WWTP’s to select an appropriate level of fencing. It has been identified that six of the seven sites need to be improved. The attached memorandum summarises the review and recommendations.

1.5 A budget of $60,000 has been included in 2019/20 financial year for new fencing at the Rangiora WWTP. An increase in budget of $215,000 would be required to improve the fencing at all WWTP’s to the recommended standard. The budget increase would be funded through renewals.

Attachments:

i. Wastewater Treatment Plant Site Fencing Memorandum (Trim 190305025926)
2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Management Team Recommends as part of their deliberations on the 2019/20 Annual Plan:

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 190402047731.

(b) Approves a new renewal budget of $215,000 in 2019/20 for improving the standard of fencing of the districts WWTP’s.

(c) Notes that there is $215,000 not budgeted for in 2019/20 that will need to be funded from renewals.

(d) Circulates to the community boards for their information.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1 In September 2018 a child climbed the gate at the Woodend WWTP and gained access. As a result of this incident an assessment of all WDC wastewater treatment sites was undertaken in November 2018 to assess the level of boundary fencing. The key driver for fencing is to provide public safety through avoiding accidental access, and protection of Council staff and contractors working on remote sites.

3.2 Since this assessment there has been an incident at Gore wastewater treatment pond where a 3 year old gained access to the site and drowned in one of the ponds. The site appears to be fenced with a standard 7 wire stock fence.

3.3 The majority of the districts WWTP’s have standard deer fencing around the perimeter of the site.

3.4 A risk based assessment was undertaken of each WWTP site. Sites with deer or stock fencing were assessed as being inadequate to mitigate the risk of a person or child entering the site.

4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

4.1. The current standard of fencing does not provide an adequate barrier to the public.

4.2. A risk based assessment of the existing fencing identified a high risk rating for the majority of the WWTP’s sites.

4.3. A total of five options were assessed for the improving the site fencing. These are described in attached memorandum ‘WDC WWTP Fencing Review Memorandum’ (Trim 190305025926).

4.4. Following the risk based assessment recommendations were made to reduce the residual risk to an acceptable level.

4.5. Those sites that have open water bodies coupled with slippery and steep pond sides presents the highest risk to the public. For those sites option 4 was assessed as an adequate level of fencing. Option 4 is the installation of X-fence security fence (Figure 1.0 below). This is stronger and more difficult to climb compared to deer fencing. Where there is existing deer fence the existing posts would be reused, some strainer posts may need to be upgraded. A strand of barbed wire would be included on the top section of fence.
4.6. Loburn Lea and Fernside WWTP’s will have barbed wire retrofitted to the existing deer fence. These sites do not have the risk of open water, therefore the improvements to the fencing are not as extensive. Improvements at these sites will be funded from existing operational budgets.
4.7. The table below summarises the recommended options and cost estimates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WWTP Site</th>
<th>Cost Estimate for Recommended works</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora WWTP</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>Option 4 – X-fence security fence with a top strand of barbed wire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi WWTP</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>Option 4 – X-fence security fence with a top strand of barbed wire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend WWTP</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>Option 4 – X-fence security fence with a top strand of barbed wire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikuku W WTP</td>
<td>$13,000</td>
<td>Option 4 – X-fence security fence with a top strand of barbed wire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford WWTP</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>No works required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loburn Lea WWTP</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Option 2 – Proposed works would be undertaken from existing operational budgets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernside WWTP</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Option 2 – Proposed works would be undertaken from existing operational budgets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Cost Estimate (20% contingency included)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$275,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

5. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

5.1. The community have not been consulted on this work.
6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1. Financial Implications

A budget of $60,000 has been included in 2019/20 financial year for fencing at the Rangiora WWTP. An increase of $215,000 would be required to complete all recommended upgrades. The additional budget would be funded through renewals. The table below summarises the funding split for the proposed capital works.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WWTP Site</th>
<th>LoS</th>
<th>Renewals</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora WWTP</td>
<td>$60,000¹</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi WWTP</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend WWTP</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikuku W WTP</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$13,000</td>
<td>$13,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The renewals would be loan funded. The impact to the 2020/21 rates would be an increase of 0.26% to the Eastern District Sewer rate.

6.2. Community Implications

Improvements to the WWTP site fencing will reduce the risk to the community.

6.3. Risk Management

The recommended upgrades are driven by the management of the risks. These works will reduce the risks to an acceptable level.

6.4. Health and Safety

The recommended upgrades will improve the health and safety for the public and Council staff.

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

- Health and Safety at Work Act 2015

7.3. Community Outcomes

- Harm to people from natural and man-made hazards is minimised

¹ 2019/20 budget currently includes $60,000 for new fencing. This is funded from level of service.
Attachment – Wastewater Treatment Plant Site Fencing Memorandum
1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to summarise the three submissions made in relation to drainage in the Mandeville area and to provide background to the Mandeville Resurgence Channel Diversion / Upgrade project that these submissions were mainly focussed on.

1.2. The following three submissions were received relating to Mandeville drainage:

- Mandeville Residents Association – provided a detailed submission covering 31 sites of concern in the wider Mandeville and Swannanoa area. These have been classified into the following five groups and are outlined in more detail in Section 3 of this report:
  - 7 sites would directly benefit from the Mandeville Resurgence Channel Diversion / Upgrade project,
  - 5 sites relate to other upgrades currently underway,
  - 8 sites relate to maintenance works that staff will follow up on,
  - 7 sites relate to private issues that staff will provide advice on, and
  - 5 sites were non drainage related.

The key request from the Mandeville Residents Association is that Council progress a long term solution as soon as possible. Bringing forward the investigation budget from 20/21 to 19/20 for the Mandeville Resurgence Channel Diversion / Upgrade project would give effect to their request.

- Ohoka Drainage Advisory Group – requests that the Long Term Plan funding for the redirection of resurgence of Mandeville storm water be brought forward to 2019/20 as this is urgently required.

- Oxford-Ohoka Community Board – requests that the Long Term Plan funding for the redirection of resurgence of Mandeville storm water be brought forward to 2019/20 as this is urgently required and has been the subject of numerous deputations to the board by the Mandeville Residents Association and other members of the community.

1.3. Council staff have considered these submission and have recommended in the Drainage & Stockwater – Utilities & Roading Department Staff Submission to the Draft 2019-20 Annual Plan report (refer TRIM 190418057971), that Council approve bring forward the investigation budget from 20/21 to 19/20 to initial this work as request by the three submitters.
1.4. The Mandeville Resurgence Channel Diversion / Upgrade project was originally put in the Long Term Plan following the June 2014 floods, which resulted in extensive flooding of the Mandeville area (refer TRIM 140821089353). The project essentially involves either diverting the existing channel to the south into the Old Eyre River Channel or upgrading the existing channel through Mandeville, although there are various sub options and combination of options that need to be assessed to determine a final solution.

1.5. Significant work has been undertaken in the wider Mandeville area since the June 2014 flood, however, this project is seen as providing a long term solution to reduce future flooding in Mandeville.

Attachments:
1. Summary of Submissions and Responses.

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives report No. 190517069694.
(b) Notes that a recommendation is included in the Drainage & Stockwater – Utilities & Roading Department Staff Submission to the Draft 2019-20 Annual Plan report on bringing forward the investigation budget from 20/21 to 19/20 for the Mandeville Resurgence Channel Diversion / Upgrade project.
(c) Notes that this change will have no impact on rates.
(d) Circulates this report to the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board for their information.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1 The Mandeville area was significantly affected by heavy rainfall events and high ground water levels in June and July 2014, and again in July and August 2017. Additionally, above average rainfall has raised the groundwater levels and resulted in resurgent groundwater (springs) operating in the Mandeville area over an extended period in 2017 and 2018.

3.2 Significant upgrading works were undertaken flooding the June 2014 flood event, particularly in the Bradleys Road area, and additional works were proposed for future years.

3.3 Upgrading works completed since June 2014 include:
- Whites Road Upgrade Stage 1
- Bradleys Road Drain Upgrade (Millfield to Ohoka Stream).
- Clearview Lane Upgrades.

3.4 The following projects are currently underway in the Mandeville Area:
- Siena/Sillano Improvements – current
- Redfern Lane Improvements – current

3.5 The following projects are proposed in the Annual Plan:
- Whites Road Upgrade Stage 2 – 19/20
3.6 The Mandeville Resurgence Channel Diversion / Upgrade project, which provides a long term solution for the Mandeville area, is the main focus of the submissions from the Mandeville Residents Association, Ohoka Drainage Advisory Group and Oxford-Ohoka Community Board.

4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

Mandeville Resurgence Channel Diversion / Upgrade

4.1. The Mandeville Resurgence Channel Diversion / Upgrade project involves the development of a long term solution for the Mandeville area. The scope of the project includes investigations, consultation, design, consenting and construction.

4.2. The potential long term diversion options involves either diverting the existing channel to the south into the Old Eyre River Channel or upgrading the existing channel through Mandeville (though Millfield or down Tram Road) as set out below and shown in Figure 1:

- Upgrade Main Channel: upgrade the capacity along the existing channel through Redfern Lane, Crossing Tram Road, then through Millfield, San Dona, to Bradleys Road.
- Diversion: diversion south down No. 10 Road to the old Eyre River
- Diversion: diversion north to Tram Road and onto Bradleys Road.

Figure 1 – Long Term Upgrade / Diversion Options
4.3. There are also various sub options that have been raised by the Mandeville Residents Association that will be assessed, such as diverting the flow through the walkway into Cullen Ave in Millfield rather than through private property, which will be assessed as part of the investigation work.

4.4. Investigation into options will also include the potential diversion of flow to the south upstream of No. 10 Road in the Two Chain Road area although this is not expected to be feasible based on an initial high level desk top assessment.

4.5. The assessment will also consider a combination of the options outlined above (i.e.: partial diversion and partial upgrade) to determine a final solution.

4.6. Staff consider that bringing forward the investigation budget of $20,000 to 19/20 is a sensible approach to enable this initial work to commence. This will enable staff to undertake options development, scoping of the consultation approach and budget refinement prior to reporting back to Council as part of the Draft 20/21 Annual Plan.

**Mandeville Resurgence Channel Diversion / Upgrade**

4.7. The Mandeville Residents Association also raised multiple drainage issues in the wider Mandeville area, following a tour of the area with Mandeville Residents Association representatives and Council staff. These are summarised below and a route of the tour is shown in Figure 2 below.

![Figure 2 – Route and Sites Visited on Bus Tour](image.png)

4.8. Council’s responses to the individual recommendation / suggestions by the Mandeville Residents Association are shown in below in the table in Attachment 2 and summarised into the following groupings below.

4.9. Public issues related to the Mandeville Resurgence Channel Diversion / Upgrade:

- Site 2 – Tram Road / Resurgence Channel (this will be considered as a sub option as part of the investigation work into the long term options).

- Site 18 – Wards Road (this will be considered as a sub option as part of the investigation work into the long term options).

- Site 21 – Mandeville Village (drainage issues will benefit from long term solution as well as other minor work as part of parking works)
• Site 23 – Wards Road towards Wetherfield Lane (this will be considered as a sub option as part of the investigation work into the long term options).

• Site 25b – Braeburn Subdivision / No 10 Road (this will benefit from long term solution)

• Site 28 – No. 10 Road to Old Eyre River (this is one of the key options for diversion of the resurgence flow)

• Site 31 – No.10 Road to Tram Road flow routes (this will be considered as a sub option as part of the investigation work into the long term options).

4.10. Public issues related to other upgrades (separately budgeted for in the Annual Plan):

• Site 16/17 – Dawsons Road (upgrades currently underway in Sienna Place)

• Site 20 – San Dona (upgrades currently underway in Sienna Place / Sillano place)

• Site 22 – Dawe Subdivision (Harris Block) (Council to provide drainage plan)

• Site 29 – Red Fern lane (drainage upgrade underway)

• Site 30 – 1136 Tram Road (culvert upgrade currently underway)

4.11. Public issues related to the drain maintenance:

• Site 10 – Colliers Creek (this has now been resolved)

• Site 11 – Two Chain Road Drain (advice is to submit a service request if occurs in future)

• Site 12 – Clear View Lane (Council to monitor performance of upgraded system)

• Site 14 – Cameo Drive (Council to follow up with landowners)

• Site 15 – Mandalea Road (advice is to submit a service request if occurs in future)

• Site 19 – Tram Road to Millfield (culvert capacity to be reviewed)

• Site 24 – Mandeville Park (Council to provide advice)

• Site 25a – Braeburn Subdivision (Council to investigate)

4.12. Private issues that Council staff have provided / will provide advice on:

• Site 1 – Des Lines’ Hangar

• Site 3b – Two Chain Road / North Eyre Road

• Site 4 – Alessio Lane and Milton Grange

• Site 6 – Chapman Boundary Road / Tram Road

• Site 8 – Kennedys Road

• Site 13 – Pattersons Road

• Site 26 – West Denby Lane

4.13. Other non-drainage matter:
• Site 3a – Two Chain Road Pump Station (water supply related – Council provided advice)
• Site 5 – Chapman Boundary Road / North Eyre Road (water race issue now resolved)
• Site 7 – Woodfield Road (fire risk issue – private responsibility)
• Site 9 – Two Chain Road Irrigation Pond (safety issue – Council to provide advice)
• Site 27 – No. 10 Road (Council has undertaken maintenance of water race)

4.14. The above maintenance and advice from staff related work can be managed from existing operational budgets.

4.15. The Management Team have reviewed this report to ensure the Council has sufficient information to make a decision.

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. Groups and Organisations

5.1.1. Extensive consultation has occurred with the Mandeville Residence Association and the Drainage team over the past year, but particularly in early 2019. This has included van tour around approximately 30 sites of interest to the Mandeville Residents Association. The main relief sought by the Mandeville Residents Association is to progress the long term solution to manage the resurgence channel flow through Mandeville as soon as possible.

5.1.2. The Oxford-Ohoka Community Board were also presented an update on the Mandeville Flood Works in October 2018 (refer TRIM 180727084111[v1]).

5.2. Wider Community

5.2.1. The wider community were consulted following the June 2014 flood event. Further community consultation will be required as part of developing the preferred solution for Mandeville.

6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1. Financial Implications

6.1.1. There are no budget implication with bring this work forward.

6.2. Community Implications

6.2.1. It is expected that there would be support in the wider community to look at progressing this work as soon as possible.

6.3. Risk Management

6.3.1. The risks associated with this project will need to be carefully managed, in particular with respect to ensuring the solution meets the communities expectations and also ensuring the diversion of flood waters does not increase flooding elsewhere.

6.3.2. The objective of the project is to reduce the level of flood risk in the Mandeville area.

6.4. Health and Safety

6.4.1. Safety in Design will be formally considered and documented as part of the detailed design stage for any construction works.
7. CONTEXT

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

7.2. Legislation
7.2.1. The Local Government Act 2002 sets out the power and responsibility of local authorities, including the Council’s role in providing drainage services.

7.3. Community Outcomes
7.3.1. The main community outcomes related to the issue are:

- There is a healthy and sustainable environment for all.
- 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.

7.4. Delegations
7.4.1. The Council has the delegated authority to make decisions in the process for rating and funding capital works.
### Appendix 1 – Draft Annual Plan Submissions and Proposed Council Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submitter</th>
<th>Submission</th>
<th>Proposed Council Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DAP19-20.112.1 by Ohoka Drainage Advisory</strong></td>
<td><strong>Summary:</strong> The Group is aware of the concerns of many local residents and the problems that continue to be encountered. <strong>Relief:</strong> The Group urges that the Long Term Plan funding for the redirection of resurgence of Mandeville storm water be brought forward to 2019/20 as this is urgently required.</td>
<td><strong>Accepts</strong> the request to bring forward the Mandeville Resurgence Channel Diversion / Upgrade project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DAP19-20.105.1 by Mandeville Residents' Association</strong></td>
<td><strong>Summary:</strong> The Mandeville Residents’ Association (MRA) Committee is an elected body representing more than 50 households in the Mandeville, Swannanoa area. The MRA Committee has met regularly over the last year to determine the extent of flooding and drainage issues in the local area, and to determine some options for remediation of these. The MRA Committee is very grateful to the Waimakariri District Council staff Kalley Simpson, Owen Davies and Denise Clark, and Beca specialists Amber Murphy and Vicky Clark who have met with us and discussed plans and recommendations. They have facilitated meetings and engaged willingly and generously with our group. <strong>Relief:</strong> MRA is asking WDC to consider the issues relating to flooding and drainage in the Mandeville/Swannanoa areas.</td>
<td><strong>Acknowledges</strong> the work undertaken by the Mandeville Residents Association related to highlighting drainage issues and working with staff to determine approach solutions. <strong>Accepts</strong> the request to bring forward the Mandeville Resurgence Channel Diversion / Upgrade project. <strong>Notes</strong> that other maintenance and advice on private issues will be dealt with by staff from existing operational budgets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DAP19-20.104.11 by Oxford-Ohoka Community Board</strong></td>
<td><strong>Summary:</strong> Mandeville flooding. An extensive engagement was undertaken by staff with residents and the Mandeville Residents’ Association in early 2019, including site visits and meetings to respond to residents’ concerns. <strong>Relief:</strong> The Board urges that the Long Term Plan funding for the redirection of resurgence of Mandeville storm water be brought forward to 2019/20 as this is urgently required and has been the subject of numerous deputations to the board by the Mandeville Residents Association and other members of the community</td>
<td><strong>Accepts</strong> the request to bring forward the Mandeville Resurgence Channel Diversion / Upgrade project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2 – Mandeville Residents Association Submission with Council’s Response
| Mandeville Residents’ Association –  
| Flooding/drainage Sites - Mandeville, Eyreton and Swannanoa |

The following recommendations are made by the Mandeville Residents’ Association Drainage Group – elected by residents to investigate local flooding and drainage problems and determine best solutions.

The content of this document has been arrived at as the result of a process of discussion, investigation, site visits, discussions with experts, meetings at local level and meetings with Council staff over the past year. 

The document provides a record of the key sites, and early recommendations for remediation from Mandeville Residents’ Association committee. These were subsequently discussed with some WDC staff who have provided support and guidance throughout this process. They added their response (see column 5 in each section below).

MRA then met, reviewed these and put together final recommendations which will form the basis of our suggestions for the WDC Long term and Annual plan funding. (see Column 6)

This should be read in conjunction with the WDC Drainage Plan for the whole region.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sites visited</th>
<th>Discussion and possible options</th>
<th>Our recommendations</th>
<th>Suggested timeframe</th>
<th>Council’s Response to Recommendation</th>
<th>MRA Drainage Group – Final recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Des Lines’ hangar area: Des Lines - Water flowed down runway (west to east) to No 10 Rd.</td>
<td>Tom and Des – went to Ohoka Drainage Committee monthly meeting and were updated about plans for No 10 Road – permission received from B Redfern to clear waterways / culvert. Des would like to see ditch deepened and lengthened – This would help his existing culverts cope with extra flow. Undercurrent – not sure how WDC and landowners will treat this. Not consented. Does it get fixed, and by whom? On Des’s side of No 10 Rd - no drainage rates.</td>
<td>Remedial action – Des’s ditch on the east side of the runway dug deeper and a bit longer.</td>
<td>Within the next 12 months.</td>
<td>This is a private drain. It would be up to Des to arrange any private works with the contractor when they are onsite.</td>
<td>Subject to laser leveling, Des is willing to work with contractors with a view to remediating the drain.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Drove left up Tram Rd to Lane with 4 letterboxes
   - Clint Murphy’s property:
     * Looking straight ahead, lane and road were under water
     * Water was diverted around the southern end because the land was sold in 3 blocks (suited to developer)
     * New stream on southern side of block - planted with trees on southern bank.

     * There were two right-angled turns of water around corners (Digger had built corners up)
     * New diversion of water along western boundary, right angled turn, along southern boundary and another right-angled turn at the end of the forest
     * Surface water will continue to flow

   - 1 a weir to divert water into the stock race to be positioned by eucalypts, OR
   - 2. A weir at first left hand turn in new part of race OR
   - 3. Interim – make existing diversion a bit bigger/larger, wider

1. Option 2 is best long term. – this would prevent water travelling down the old swale and flooding the driveway.

   * Option 3 would serve as an interim measure and be a good improvement overall.

   * Within 12 months.

2. This will be investigated as part of the Mandeville Resurgence Channel Diversion / Upgrade project which commences in July 2020. As discussed the Mandeville Residents Association can submit on the Annual Plan regarding the timing of this project.

3. Please clarify suggested timing.

4. Needs to be investigated 2019 – ready for commencement of work early 2020
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Two Chain Road – Pump Station:</th>
<th>Costings to be done of extending water scheme – eg to Harrs, Clothiers, Harpers, South Eyre, Burgesses, Baynons Roads. (May be necessary for much wider area.)</th>
<th>Greater responsibility for monitoring and testing private wells to be undertaken by WDC and Ecan, to build an accurate picture of the district. The CLS compost site has been approved for land use by WDC. Will WDC, at their cost, provide a water scheme to ensure safe and satisfactory domestic drinking water for local residents?</th>
<th>Urgent- 3 months. Local drinking water is already affected. Does this situation meet the new NZ Govt approved drinking-water standards?</th>
<th>The Canterbury Drinking Water Reference Group will be looking into self-suppliers on a regional basis. It was a recommendation of the Waimakariri ZIPA for WDC, Ecan and CDHB to work together to address this issue. Any resident who wants to connect to a Council water supply should fill out an Application for the Supply of Water available from the WDC website.</th>
<th>Greater responsibility for monitoring and testing private wells to be undertaken by WDC and Ecan, to build an accurate, ongoing picture of the district, communicate with residents and provide public access to the results. Clarify responsibility / role of CDHB. Council, Ecan, CDHB need to work much more closely together. Does this present situation meet the new NZ Govt approved drinking-water standards?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Drove left up Tram Rd, left into Two Chain Rd</td>
<td>• Lifestylers will need to live with drains</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The CLS compost site has been approved for land use by WDC. Will WDC, at their cost, provide a water scheme to ensure safe and satisfactory domestic drinking water for local residents?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Saw water supply headworks (UV and Caustic), and second well (installed after earthquakes)</td>
<td>• Some landowners filling in and diverting drains – how is this prevented/dealt with?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• WDC will extend scheme if ‘cost neutral’ (4,500 lifestyle blocks in Waimakariri)</td>
<td>• Lifestylers need to test own wells at present. WDC and Ecan to take responsibility for this testing? People in the WDC district have been trusting that their water is OK.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ‘Lifestylers’ don’t want a drain (This may be a generalization, and just a preference, but there may be little understanding about why drains are necessary. The role of undercurrents may also not be well understood.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Down drive on left. (50 metres south of bridge) on Two Chain Rd – Millfield Stream:  
| Water race- (man-made) Channel- probably was an old stream bed  
| Lifestylers (Some residents) fill in and re-channel water  
| Natural overland flow path- follows the contours of the land  
| Stock races- over 100 years old- small, won’t carry flood water  
| Drove up Two Chain Rd to Nth Eyre Road and turned right– heading west:  
| To accommodate all flood water might need a major feature such as the Eyre Cut or Ohoka Main Drain  
| Maintenance is important to ensure main drains function well  
| Generally, drains cope well provided maintenance is done at the right time of year.  
| Awaiting more information from WDC re flow rates- various culverts and bridges from the top of the water resurgence to the bottom at Millfield.  
| Timely and regular inspection and maintenance.  
| AS soon as possible investigate and provide information on the estimated flow rate and capacity of all bridges and culverts on Millfield Stream.  
| Timely and regular inspection and maintenance is extremely important.  
| Before meeting on 7th March.  
| Information is contained within the Mandeville Area Drainage Improvements – Bradleys Drain Catchment (TRIM 140821089353) previously circulated.  
| This area is outside of a Drainage Rating Area, therefore drains on private property are maintained by the property owner and drains in the road reserve are maintained by Council.  
| MRA need more information from WDC re flow rates- various culverts and bridges from the top of the water resurgence to the bottom at Millfield.  
| Timely and regular inspection and maintenance is extremely important.  
| MRA would like WDC to ensure a more rigorous process is in place for checking drains on private property.  
| The general district wide drainage rate should cover the cost of general investigation and remedial work for this project.  
| What private owners are doing (or not doing) is impacting on other properties. |
4. Alessio Lane and Milton Grange:
   - Water flowing
   - Channels would increase downstream in peak flows
   - Flooding-paddocks ok -houses are WDC priority (can still build if floor level is high enough -300mm)
   - WDC inspections needed
   - Water runs to West-Denby subdivision
   - Property owners responsible to keep waterways on properties clear
   - Saw 4 drains and gates in ditches
   - Home low -driveway higher
   - WDC now have direct control over this lane and one other lane. (Milton Grange)
   - No maintenance done - property de-valued
   - Sheep farmer, to the west, takes water and there is no flow
   - Now it’s a fire danger and mosquitoes could breed in the stagnant water
   - Undercurrent/ springs -can’t be turned on and off

<p>| Need improved maintenance of drains and streams. Floodgates- unsatisfactory – creating blockages- need to place more effective floodgates (floating or swinging floodgates) to prevent flooding downstream. WDC inspections of floor levels need to be thoroughly implemented before sign off. | WDC need to ensure that all building sites are checked and measured for potential drainage and flooding issues prior to issue of building permits and building consents. (300mm above ground level may not be sufficient to be above the depth of water flowing across land.) A more detailed, rigorous system for checking is needed (with specific tick-boxes to be signed off) for each activity and event, to protect property owners. Compliance should agree with the floor levels set for that total subdivision. Better style floodgates where fences are involved. (floating or swinging) smooth on the water side so rubbish is prevented from creating blockages. General improved maintenance of drains and streams. | Regular checking and maintenance. Development, and rigorous use, of a specific checklist for entire sites, taking account of watercourses and drainage elevations. WDC to monitor waterways and floodgates. | This area is outside of a Drainage Rating Area, therefore drains on private property are maintained by the property owner and drains in the road reserve are maintained by Council. A letter has previously been sent to landowners in this location to advise them of their responsibilities. We don’t actively monitor waterways outside of Drainage Rating Areas, but if a service request is lodged we will follow up on the issue. | The general district wide drainage rate should cover the cost of general investigation and remedial work for this project. What private owners are doing (or not doing) is impacting on other properties. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Chapman’s Boundary Rd - and Nth Eyre Road SW corner:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Large hole in ground in old shingle pit but nowhere for water to go if it built up - may get filled in - WIL electric gate - WIL close gate if going to rain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 2 dips and culverts (1 metre deep approx.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fast flowing - a WIL irrigation race – note the large volume of water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Originally a stock water race</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brent Walton (WIL manager) is going to remedy the problem.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expect that this is remedied within 1 month.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We understand via James Ensor that this has now been resolved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiting for Brent Walton (manager WIL) to investigate and take remedial action.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. Chapman’s Boundary Rd / Tram Rd corner (NW corner) - Gartery’s Pit:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Very large quarry pit for shingle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Half-full of water for the last 12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Not linked to Whites Rd pit or Cust Drain, and most likely linked to the Eyre River.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• We’d like to know whether the Eyre River, Gartery’s Pit and the council-monitored well for flooding risk assessment are linked.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Water in the pit has dropped in the last 2 weeks to be almost barely visible at ground level in the pit.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>We’d like to see a graph for last 12 months- Gartery’s Pit Eyre River (at Brown’s Rd) and the well that WDC monitor (unsure where this is). A comparison of the three would be useful to see linkage between the sites.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before meeting- 7th March.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garterys Pit is located This area is outside of a Drainage Rating Area, therefore drains on private property are maintained by the property owner and drains in the road reserve are maintained by Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRA want WDC to be responsible for monitoring all drains – potential impact on other properties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRA ask to see monitoring graph for last 12 months by end April</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Woodfields Rd - Larsens – water storage pond:
   - Storage ponds on the farm are a great fire fighting resource
   - Also the Boundary Road pond on Sparks farm

   | Monitor vacant sections and lifestyle properties for long grass – high fire risk. |
   | Private property owners are responsible for managing fire risk on their own properties. |
   | WDC to monitor vacant sections and lifestyle properties for long grass – high fire risk. |

8. Kennedy’s Rd, past Springbank Rd:
   - Colliers drains – two drains west to east – maintenance required

   | Maintenance of drains is an issue of concern – not being done. |
   | Improve maintenance of drains on Springbank Rd area. |
   | Regular checks and maintenance. |
   | This area is outside of a Drainage Rating Area, therefore drains on private property are maintained by the property owner and drains in the road reserve are maintained by Council. |
   | We don’t actively monitor waterways outside of Drainage Rating Areas, but if a service request is lodged we will follow up on the issue. |
   | The general district wide drainage rate should cover the cost of general investigation and remedial work for this project. What private owners are doing (or not doing) is impacting on other properties. |
9, 10, 11. Turned right into Boundary Rd, right into Two Chain Rd:

- Stockrace on left with a right-angled corner
- WIL race- pond 3 metres deep (no fence) Last accident – person was sucked down to irrigation suction intake – fence still not fixed by WIL or the farmer
- Colliers Creek -ran with water a month or two ago (property not rated) - carries a lot of water. Bridge too high, approaching banks too low. Causing flooding on Two Chain Rd.
- Drain on east side of the road from Colliers Creek to the stock water race was removed in 2004. This affects houses below.
- Lifestyle properties to the east

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maintenance needs to significantly improve.</th>
<th>Fence on WIL race to be reinstated. Dangerous at present – 3 metres deep – to make it safe for the community.</th>
<th>Any water race that requires maintenance should be logged as a service request. WIL will then follow up on behalf of Council.</th>
<th>WIL to more regularly monitor water races.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance poor. Needs to improve.</td>
<td>Bottom of Colliers Creek bridge checked to make sure it is clean and clear, banks above on west side of bridge need to be reinstated to keep water in the race.</td>
<td>The deep irrigation intake pond on Two Chain Road will be reviewed from a health &amp; safety point of view. Note ponds on the water race system are private assets.</td>
<td>We note that this review is to take place. Urgent as this is a significant safety issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fence to be fixed.</td>
<td>Bottom of Colliers Creek bridge checked to make sure it is clean and clear, banks above on west side of bridge need to be reinstated to keep water in the race.</td>
<td>The Colliers Creek culvert on Two Chain Road will be inspected by WDC staff (Drainage and Roading).</td>
<td>Noted. Ensure appropriate follow-up action occurs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Drain reinstated

Drain reinstated

Within next 12 months.
12. Clear View Lane - Lindsay Eason:

- $1,000,000 approx. spent on total replacement of drainage system that had been removed 2004
- Colliers Creek drain
- Original flow was further south - still goes in this path 300mm pipe under the road - too small on own – left side works well
- Right side of road needs culvert at top to prevent houses flooding

| 300mm pipe on n/s side operates well – on the south side needs a route continued from Trudy’s paddock through cul de sac to where the new drain ends. Needs to be at least 450mm to prevent a number of houses getting flooded. |
| South side – route continued from Trudy’s paddock through cul de sac to where the new drain ends. Needs to be at least 450mm. Approximately 100 metres |
| URGENT Within 3 months |
| There were no houses flooded in Clear View Lane in the June 2014 event, but flooding of private property occurred. Upgrades have been put in place to reduce the flooding in future events. The house had no flooding or drainage related service requests lodged since the upgrade. |
| Until the drain is completed all the way to the spring with larger diameter pipes at the end of Clear View Lane there will be properties affected in another flooding event. This may not be directly due to surface water levels. Lindsay Eason’s home had flooding due to the charge from the ground water being pushed up the downpipe risers and gushing down the paths and very close to coming inside. I believe this is still a council issue and should be addressed and the job completed |

13. Pattersons Road:

- On the right a long drive had been replaced by new owners.
- Water comes to the surface and runs down both sides of the new drive.
- Old driveway clay, grass, and shingle scattered on top – sealed by clay - acts like a dam now
- Plans and actions can change - undercurrents change
- Water floods - won’t stay in race

| Swale both sides of new roadway. Possible bunding. |
| Within 12 months. |
| This is a private asset / issue. If a service request is lodged Council will provide advice. |
| MRA support this recommendation |
14. Cameo Drive – approx. 10 metres west of Walkerdons’ place – in neighbour’s property:
  - Ditch deep - requires larger pipes
  - Colliers Creek just above Walkerdons – small pipes and mounded on top – needs to be swaled on top to allow high flows to pass over.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Larger pipes</th>
<th>WDC to set clearer rules around creating bridges - and more closely monitor these problems – by laying larger pipes, removing bridge or creating swale on top to let water go.</th>
<th>Within 3 months.</th>
<th>WDC worked with the landowners to upgrade their private crossings following the June 2014 event. We will follow up with landowners to ensure overflow swales have not been filled.</th>
<th>Please report findings to MRA.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

15. Mandalea Rd - Peter Jessop’s place:
  - Surface flooding from Cameo Drive and Colliers Creek
  - Floodwater floods around Peter Jessop’s house, and other houses.

| If culverts are fixed, this problem will be remedied. Has got worse lately because bridge has been added. | Fix culverts – modify culvert to suit requirements of the area – make same as those upstream. (Match those at Colliers Creek above, to the west.) Bigger pipes needed on west side between Pattersons and Cameo – water running uphill at present. | Urgent | Any future drainage issues in the area should be logged as a service request. | MRA want this fixed urgently. Fix culverts – modify culvert to suit requirements of the area – make same as those upstream. (Match those at Colliers Creek above, to the west.) Bigger pipes needed on west side between Pattersons and Cameo – water running uphill at present. |
16. 17 Dawsons Rd Soak hole:
   - Fence over water exit (it may restrict flow)
   - Des Lines’ idea discussed
   - Groundwater recharge rises up to surface.

<p>| No groundwater rapid recharge with close subdivisions – put clay in bottom to slow down the groundwater recharge and water coming to surface. | 150 mm layer of clay – compacted, with layer of stones on top in large soak-hole. Dawson Rd grills – put clay near the surface on top of the boulder pit. Has WDC got an alternative or better solution? | Very urgent. Dawsons Road SMA is designed to discharge to ground when the groundwater levels permit. During periods of high groundwater, overflow occurs via Wards Road into the Bradleys Road drain. Lining the pond with clay is not an acceptable solution. Upgrades in the Siena Place / Silano place area are planned for this financial year. | If clay is not the solution, what will fix the problem? This area is subject to high groundwater resurgence caused by Eyre River flowing (undercurrent). Groundwater recharge is also a significant problem. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>18, 19. Wards Rd (Millfield West)</th>
<th>Find somewhere for the excess water.</th>
<th>Very urgent.</th>
<th>Managing the excess water will be investigated as part of the Mandeville Resurgence Channel Diversion / Upgrade project which commences in July 2020.</th>
<th>What is the flow rate? Which calculation is correct? MRA want this area investigated within next 3 months and report provided to us, work completed early 2020.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Two Chain Rd bridge - Box culvert bridge is 2m x1m. Original estimate was 2 cumecs with 1 metre travel speed per second | **Millfield West:**  
Wouldn’t need to worry about replacing the 2x150 mm pipes if the following is done: take water down Tram Rd – from Chris England’s - down the walkway. – Nth side of Tram Rd – rejoin the race – thus eliminating flooding for over 20 houses. | Very urgent. Two months. | Upgrades to 1136 Tram Road (England’s property) will be undertaken this financial year as an interim measure. | MRA support this timeline |
| • Another engineer calculated that the quantity of water is 5 cumecs which means that provision needs to be made for a lot more water than originally planned. This needs to be done before it reaches Millfield. | **Millfield East**  
Create a weir by Chris England’s where it crosses Tram Rd. This would take half the water down Tram Rd on peak flows  
**Millfield East – Create an exit to get rid of stagnant water. Swale needs attention. 150 mm pipes changed to 300 mm pipes.** | | | |
| Millfield West:  
• 2x 150mm diameter pipes don’t match the water requirement from above site.  
• Bridges silt up - clearance not enough  
• At least 3 right angles  
• WDC will tidy up swale and clean  
• ‘Box culverts’ if necessary  
• Impacting on property values.  
• Child nearly drowned at the boathouse | | | | |
| Millfield East up road on right:  
• Stagnant water doesn’t run  
• Swale not dug out for 150mm pipes  
• Recharge high | | | | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>20 San Dona:</th>
<th>21 Mandeville Village:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Water has nowhere to go</td>
<td>• Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Trees and plants drowned</td>
<td>• Unsatisfactory drainage plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Water ran over road in Velino Place</td>
<td>• Safety issues - Very serious crash 24/02/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Drain on the left but water can’t go over the road to the right</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lots of properties flooded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Water on roads</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Bad mosquito problems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There’s a water-race behind the swale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Old Sanders Mill site on Bradley’s Rd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Meeting with WDC, MRA and residents scheduled for 16 February 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Successful meeting last Saturday.**

Pleased that WDC staff receptive to residents’ ideas.

Work to be completed by June.

Committee would like to view plans for proposed work before tenders are let.

Do it once, do it right!

Flowing water needed to eliminate mosquito problem.

By June.

**Upgrades in the Siena Place / Silano place area are planned for this financial year.**

Plans will be circulated to the Mandeville Residents Association.

Work underway.

Thank you for prompt attention to this.

MRA happy to see that work will be completed by June 2019.

Look forward to seeing revised plans.

**Offer made by neighbour to improve parking.**

Important to improve safety and visibility.

Des Lines plan to solve drainage issues – would provide year-round protection – excellent safety plan.

Urgent.

Parking safety issues.

**Mandeville Resurgence Channel Diversion / Upgrade project commences in July 2020.**

Roading investigating parking issues.

This is not connected to Mandeville Village. MRA would like to receive copy of Mandeville Village drainage plan.
<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>22. Dawer subdivision – ex Harris block:</strong></td>
<td>Drainage plan needed.</td>
<td>Satisfactory drainage plan needed.</td>
<td>Urgent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Wards Rd water race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>WDC will circulate plan change and subdivision consent drainage information to Mandeville Resident Group.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Drainage concerns - are there plans for drainage in this subdivision?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Note that this is to be provided. Thank you.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>23. Des Lines’s across into 370 Wards and into Wetherfield and Roscrea- Ian Shrimpton:</strong></td>
<td>Des Lines’ plan would fix this, because if any other water-ways on west side fail, this would save properties downstream from any potential flooding issues. This would provide year round protection - excellent safety plan.</td>
<td>Des Lines’ plan to be implemented.</td>
<td>Extreme urgency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Roscrea flooded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>This will be investigated as part of the Mandeville Resurgence Channel Diversion / Upgrade project which commences in July 2020.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Water sat at the corner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>As discussed the Mandeville Residents Association can submit on the Annual Plan regarding the timing of this project.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lane to west of Wetherfield was resurfaced after flood damage. Paid for by residents’ insurers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>MRA ask that this is investigated within 3 months. Report to be provided please to MRA with plans for remediation. Commencement date as suggested 2020 is too far out. The MRA suggests a reassessment of timeline be done so that work is completed by 1 May 2020.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Water came across from Des Lines’ over the paddock (&amp; all the jigsaw bits from upstream contributed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Des Lines’ property flooded about 4 times</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• He has photos of the kids in a dinghy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Water was almost over to Tram Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Drain at old dump (Wards &amp; McHughs) left side of McHugh’s. Waterway was planted on edges.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Mandeville Park - Richard Jackson:</td>
<td>All soak holes need clay base. Wooden bridge on Robert Van Groen’s property needs to be placed upstream to the west (on higher ground) – current bridge is at water level. Main bridge – Mandeville Park Rd – needs a box culvert at either one end or the other of the bridge – to improve the flow of the water, or a small weir for peak flows on the west side of the bridge – needed more than ever, due to the large number of soak holes in Braeburn above.</td>
<td>Within 3 months- before winter 2019.</td>
<td>WDC will follow up on wooden bridge with the landowner. Changes have been made within the Braeburn development to throttle flows at culverts and spill the secondary flow in a south easterly direction away from the Mandeville Park Drive bridge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Water couldn’t get under bridge on road -6 metres inside Richard’s property</td>
<td>• Neighbour to east has a footbridge at east (low end) of property</td>
<td>• Bridge turned the water and flooded neighbours’ houses, garages, septic tanks etc.</td>
<td>• Flow doesn’t get much head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Soak holes have clay pan underneath - when broken, water rises up and goes both ways along the road swales and across the road.</td>
<td>• Drains not clean (Coutts Drive)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Braeburn:</td>
<td>Soak holes need clay base to prevent flooding.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Soak holes</td>
<td>Flood prevention plan needed for those houses at ground level, but below water flow level.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Noted number of houses at ground level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>URGENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Soakpits designed to discharge to ground when the groundwater levels permit. During periods of high groundwater, overflow occurs in a south easterly direction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WDC to check houses with low floor levels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No 10 Road - Des’s Lines’ Plan:</th>
<th>Adopt Des Lines’ plan – costings and timeline needed.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• A drain running along the road (north to south) used to be on west side of road (some still remains)</td>
<td>Plan approved within 3 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Saw old Eyre River channel and Eyre Diversion - noted size of channel for floodwater provision</td>
<td>Mandeville Resurgence Channel Diversion / Upgrade project commences in July 2020. Budgets and timeframe as per presentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MRA support progress being made on this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. West-Denby Subdivision:</td>
<td>Flood gates on the fences to be remedied to prevent blockages. Drain maintenance to be more regular Box culverts – as per Owen Davies’ suggestion V divider at front of culvert pipes to help prevent blockages. Headboards on culverts considerably increases the flow-rates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. No 10 Road Water race along walkway – by old council dumpsite:</td>
<td>Drainage maintenance plan to be adopted. Review bunding. Our committee has concern regarding houses low to ground-WDC to investigate ways of protecting houses - e.g Clay around building may slow down flow rate or seal around the foundation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 28,31 Drain – Des Lines’ Plan:

- West to east drain
- Proposed: a weir (designed by engineers) at the western end, to divert approximately half of the water, at peak flows, down the drain to No 10 Rd, by cleaning, digging, and extending the existing ditch. Follow the diversion down No 10 Rd to old Eyre River
- Channel through Jason Forsyth’s and Ed’s over to No 10 Rd- 20 years ago, the wrong pipes were replaced on No 10 Rd
- Pipes are cracked and they block up (by Jason Forsyth’s)

<p>| Des Lines’ plan | Adopt the Des Lines’ plan - First left bend is preference. | 3 months to investigate the plan. | This will be investigated as part of the Mandeville Resurgence Channel Diversion / Upgrade project which commences in July 2020. As discussed the Mandeville Residents Association can submit on the Annual Plan regarding the timing of this project. | MRA want this investigated within 3 months. Report to be provided please to MRA with plans for remediation. Commencement date as suggested 2020 is too far out. The MRA suggests a reassessment of timeline be done so that work is completed by 1 May 2020. | Stock water race culvert pipe to be replaced with headboards. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Redfern Lane:</th>
<th>Clean out bottom of the Millfield Stream culverts on No 10 Rd. Clean and enlarge the drain. Lower culvert pipes by 600mm. Put a headboard on it to ensure maximum flow through culvert. Gradient flow from No 10 to Tram Rd is needed.</th>
<th>Extreme urgency – completed within 1 month- Be good to do this while dry.</th>
<th>Construction of the No.10 Road / Tram Road overflow diversion to be constructed this financial year. Maintenance of the main channel between No.10 Road and Tram Road will also be undertaken this financial year. Lowering the culvert (and sewer main) at 448 No.10 Road is not proposed at this stage as other works will have more benefit.</th>
<th>MRA happy that this work has been given priority. MRA happy that this work has been given priority. The seasonal rainfall 2019 winter may indicate whether drain needs to be lowered. Residents hope that WDC remediation measures will be effective.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Water in driveways</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tom McBrearty's - water enters from NW corner- waterway behind property (where seat is located)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Undercurrent by feijoa hedge and also water coming out of ground by woodpile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• House was sandbagged a number of times to prevent water entering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbour behind Tom McBrearty's - Steve Danson:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Water flowed down driveway sheeting out on both sides</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Culvert sits too high in the ground - crosses above sewer pipe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- culvert 600 to be above sewer. Before the house and roadway were constructed and culvert installed the open drain did not flood.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Culvert (or new box culvert) with headboard attached, needs to be lowered by approximately 600mm, or the engineer’s gradient level from No10 Rd to Tram Rd, to prevent water build-up behind it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The best solution is to keep water where it wants to go</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Culvert-maintenance by landowner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Street meeting - scheduled for 27th February 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works proposed –</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Opt1] taking half the peak flow along No 10 Rd (east side starting from the Millfield Stream and travelling north to the Tram Rd corner, then turning 90 degrees and meeting the existing drain at Tram Rd crossing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Opt2] water crosses under Tram Rd in a culvert, then heads north into England’s property. A proposed weir at their property boundary would take approximately half of the peak flow water down Tram Rd in a swale to the walkway and join with the existing water in Millfield Stream. A swale with a gentle gradient would act like a high-level overflow, taking any excess water down Tram Rd.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The best solution is to keep the water in the original creek bed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 3x300 mm pipes in Englands driveway = 900mm -too small - constricts flow and driveway continually washed out</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Water through garage etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Replace by bigger culvert to provide better flow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Millfield subdivision over fence – ‘Boathouse’ flooded badly -18 inches to 24 inches around house</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 400 metre walkway- proposed swale from the Tram Rd end to join the other swale in a straight line.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• England’s driveway would be remedied by diversion and satisfactory culverts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee unclear as to WDC proposed plans at present - need to see finalised plans in more detail.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide our committee with opportunity to review plans before work is commenced.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best idea is to fix existing drain and lower the culvert and monitor. With the correct gradient, the overflow plan may not be required. Tram Road crossing may need some attention.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDC to investigate feasibility of swale from Tram Rd to Millfield along walkway, and install if appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need satisfactory culverts and bridge.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDC to investigate from England’s to walkway on north side of Tram Rd diversion to continue to walkway and down walkway. (a priority to save about 20 houses from flooding.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans to be available within 6 weeks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within weeks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This will be investigated as part of the Mandeville Resurgence Channel Diversion / Upgrade project which commences in July 2020.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As discussed the Mandeville Residents Association can submit on the Annual Plan regarding the timing of this project.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrades to 1136 Tram Road (England’s property) will be undertaken this financial year as an interim measure.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withi n 2 mont hs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This needs to be done now while it is dry. Investigation to be completed by June 2019.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRA would hope that this work is completed by June 2019 while there is no flow.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHAT WOULD HAPPEN IF WATER FLOWED OVER TRAM RD- IN TERMS OF DANGER TO TRAFFIC AND PEOPLE ETC.?</td>
<td>CONCERNS REGARDING SAFETY OF TRAFFIC IF SURFACE FLOODING OCCURS.</td>
<td>PROPOSED WORKS SHOULD PREVENT THIS FROM OCCURRING.</td>
<td>WITHIN 6 WEEKS.</td>
<td>IN STORM EVENTS SUCH AS THE JUNE 2014 EVENT MULTIPLE ROADS WERE FLOODED IN THE DISTRICT. FLOODING SIGNS WERE ERECTED TO WARN MOTORISTS. ROAD CULVERTS ARE Sized FOR A 10 YEAR STORM EVENT AND BRIDGES ARE Sized FOR A 100 YEAR STORM EVENT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OTHER DISCUSSION**

- Bigger picture must be given priority – responsible planning for and monitoring of entire area- immediate and long term.
- Percentage of ground water versus surface water was discussed – and impact of both.
- Process of approving subdivisions needs scrutiny - especially in regard to drainage.
- Water quality matters to us all – responsibility for ensuring safe, clean water for all. Concern that those with private wells are needing to monitor their own water quality. Not all doing this and so may not be aware of any threats to health.
- Appreciation of interest shown by WDC staff – and Becareps.
- A considerable amount of work has been undertaken by the Mandeville Residents’ Association Drainage Group to come up with solutions that are essential to solve major flooding issues identified by the community.
Appendix 3 – Mandeville Long Term Upgrade Works – Options Summary
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

MEMO

FILE NO AND TRIM NO: DRA-06-02-01 / 190517069832

DATE: 21st May 2019

MEMO TO: Owen Davies, Drainage Asset Manager; Kalley Simpson, 3 Waters Manager

FROM: Victoria Clark, Consultant Engineer; Amber Murphy, Consultant Engineer

SUBJECT: Mandeville Long-Term Drainage Options

1. **Background**

The purpose of this memo is to describe the long-term drainage upgrade options for the Mandeville area, which has a history of surface flooding, including in the 2014 and 2017 storm events. The area also experiences resurgent groundwater (springs) flows operating periodically, at times on a semi-permanent basis. Long term upgrades were investigated in the report Flooding Mitigation Works and Funding DRA-16-02.01 / 141009110892, 2014. High level options were presented to a community meeting in 2014. Funding was allocated in the 10-year Long Term Plan to progress an option through design and construction. Further investigation, optioneering and consultation work is required.

The western extent of the 'drainage rated' Mandeville catchment (Figure 1) is No. 10 Road, which has a reasonably defined road centreline. No. 10 Road is taken to be the western extent of the 'Bradleys Road catchment' for design purposes for calculating drain and culvert flows (ie the primary catchment). This catchment discharges via the Bradleys Road Drain to the Ohoka Stream. The upslope catchment extends past Earlys Road, which will contribute to overland flows in large rainfall events.

The catchment is very long and narrow when extended to Earlys Road. The ground slopes generally from west to east in the catchment at an approximate grade of 1 in 180. The catchment has few formed drains, with most of the catchment drainage being by channelised overland flow, water races and swales in the rural areas. The overland flow paths have in general been interrupted or altered by road construction and other development. Figure 2 shows the overland flow paths.

2. **Long-term options**

The 2014 options work was based on the concept of the existing channel being retained for primary (5-year) design flow, but considering options for conveyance of expected resurgence flows.

The three main options presented in the 2014 report for addressing the drainage capacity issues in the long term are:

1. Upgrade Main Channel: Upgrade the capacity along the existing channel through Redfern Lane, crossing Tram Road, then through Millfield, San Dona, to Bradleys Road.
2. Diversion: Diversion south down No. 10 Road to the old Eyre River channel and upgrade existing drainage
3. Diversion: Diversion south down Tram Road and then onto Bradleys Road and upgrade existing drainage

Refer to Flooding Mitigation Works and Funding DRA-16-02.01 / 141009110892, 2014 for more details on the proposed options.
Following initial consultation, additional options identified include:

4. Diversion: Diversion south down Tram Road, then along the walkway opposite 1101 Tram Road to existing system on Cullen Avenue

5. Diversion: Diversion south down Two Chain Road to the Eyre River channel

These options are shown in Figure 3. The feasibility, advantages and disadvantages of each option are summarised in Table 1.

Planning for long-term draining schemes in the area needs to consider primary flows, resurgence flows, and overdesign secondary flow paths. The analysis and sizing undertaken in 2014 was based on accommodating the primary flow, and a resurgence flow of 300 l/s. Investigations into secondary flow paths, and determination into suitable diversions and works to reduce risk, are recommended.
Figure 3. Long-term drainage improvement options for Mandsville
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Physical works</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Relative Benefit</th>
<th>Relative Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Upgrade Main Channel: Upgrade the capacity along the existing channel through Redfern Lane, crossing Tram Road, then through Millfield to San Dona and onto Bradleys Road.</td>
<td>• Approx. 3 accessway crossings  • Upgrade approx. 570 m of existing drain through private property</td>
<td>• Utilises the 2014 upgrades to Cullen Avenue and Tristram Road which are adequate for the 5-year rainfall event.  • Spill from the channel in overdesign events, such as high resurgence flow events and large rainfall events, will still present a flood risk to private property. This risk is more significant compared to the other options as the primary drainage path passes through private property, and therefore spill and secondary flow paths will place private property at risk. This includes the ‘boat house’ at 116 Cullen Avenue.  • The drainage path still flows through private property and hence to maintain capacity there is a reliance on property owners to maintain the channel and culverts and remove any restrictions to the flow. This has proved difficult in the past. Property owners would need to be onboard to a) relinquish land to enlarge the drain and b) allow access for construction which would create disruption to property and owners.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>New drain diversion on the west side of No. 10 Road to connect to a redundant/dry branch of the Old Eyre River, which then connects into the Eyre River.</td>
<td>• New 3200 m long drain  • 2 x road crossings  • 13 x accessway crossings  • 5 water race crossings (inverted siphon)</td>
<td>• The main benefit of this option is the drainage path is diverted from private property which reduces the risk of private property flooding and removes the reliance on property owners to adequately maintain the drain and culverts.  • Some improvements to the existing primary flow path would still be required e.g. to the culvert at 1136 Tram Road and minor channel upgrade (from 1160 Tram Road to Cullen Avenue).  • Bunding along the new drain may be required to prevent spillage onto rural land.  • There is adequate space available for the required drain, however the required size to meet design standards is likely to trigger road safety concerns.  • This option will require a consent.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>New drain diversion on the north side of Tram Road to connect to Bradleys Drain at the intersection of Tram Road and Bradleys Road</td>
<td>• New 1760 m long drain  • 4 x accessway crossings  • Possible road crossing required at the intersection with Pinewood Close</td>
<td>• The main benefit of this option is the drainage path is diverted from private property which reduces the risk of private property flooding and removes the reliance on property owners to adequately maintain the drain and culverts.  • There are many services in the road corridor (Fibre, Chorus, water) and at least one Chorus cable would require relocation.  • Some improvements to the existing primary flow path would still be required e.g. to the culvert at 1136 Tram Road and minor channel upgrade (from 1160 Tram Road to Cullen Avenue).  • There is adequate space available for the required drain, however the required size to meet design standards is likely to trigger road safety concerns.  • This option does not divert flow from the properties between No. 10 Road and Tram Road (that Option 2 achieves).</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Moderate-High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>New drain diversion on the north side of Tram Road to 1101 Tram Road, then along the walkway to Cullen Avenue to connect into the existing system on Cullen Avenue.</td>
<td>• New 576 m long drain  • 3 x accessway crossings</td>
<td>• Utilises the 2014 upgrades to Cullen Avenue and Tristram Road which are adequate for the 5-year rainfall event.  • The drainage path is diverted from most private properties, the risk of flooding within these private properties is reduced and removes the reliance on owners to adequately maintain the drain and culverts.  • High flows will no longer flow through 116 Cullen Avenue. There are many services in the road corridor (Fibre, Chorus, water) and at least one Chorus cable would require relocation.  • There is adequate space available for the required drain, however the required size to meet design standards is likely to trigger road safety concerns.</td>
<td>Moderate-High</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>New drain diversion down Two Chain Road and through property to the Eyre River.</td>
<td>• New 4200 m long drain  • 2 x road crossings  • Approx. 8 x accessway crossings</td>
<td>• There is no fall available south along Two Chain Road. In order to get sufficient fall for a new drain it would need to cross private property (most of which is rural farm land).  • Compared to Options 2, 3 and 4, this option does not divert flow from the properties east of Two Chain Road. However, it does intercept the flow earlier and therefore reduces the quantity of flow through private properties east of Two Chain Road.  • The flow would directly discharge to the Eyre River.  • Some improvements to the existing primary flow path would still be required e.g. to the culvert at 1136 Tram Road and minor channel upgrade (from 1160 Tram Road to Cullen Avenue).  • Spill from the channel in overdesign events, such as high resurgence flow events and large rainfall events, will still present a flood risk to private property. The risk is still present in this Option as a significant section of the primary flow path remains through private property and therefore spill and secondary flow paths will place private properties at risk. This includes the ‘boat house’ at 116 Cullen Avenue.  • This option will require a consent.</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Summary

Although these options are presented as discrete options, the preferred solution may be a combination of the options. It is recommended a long-term option for drainage improvements in Mandeville is progressed into design, consultation and consenting.

Based on this assessment Option 2, diversion on the west side of No. 10 Road to connect to a redundant/dry branch of the Old Eyre River, is the preferred long-term option because:

- It reduces the greatest length of drain through private property, minimising the flooding risk to private property and the reliance of property owners to maintain the channel and culverts.
- There is sufficient space and fall available to be technically feasible, and minimal services are impacted along the proposed alignment.

Option 4, diversion on the north side of Tram Road to 1101 Tram Road, then along the walkway to Cullen Avenue to connect into the existing system on Cullen Avenue, has some benefits in the mid-term to mitigate flooding of properties between Tram Road and Millfield.

It is recommended additional evaluation into resurgence flowrates, and secondary flow paths is completed, and options to improve flood risk incorporated into further investigation of the options.
1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose if this report is to provide a request for changes to the Drainage and Stockwater budgets in the Draft 2019-20 Annual Plan.

1.2. Detail on each item is provided in section 3 to 10 of this report. Each item is exclusive of the others so that each item can be considered separately on its own merits.

1.3. The following items are addressed:
- Lehmans Rd Drain Upgrade Stage 1.
- North Brook - Janelle to White.
- Wiltshire / Green Pipework Upgrade.
- Pentecost Road Stormwater Main and SMA.
- Pegasus – Stormwater Minor Improvements.
- Kaiapoi West / Silverstream – Pond areas 1&2; Land purchase.
- Parham Drain Catchment Improvements.
- Feldwick Drain Catchment Improvements.
- Mandeville Resurgence Channel Diversion / Upgrade.
- Stockwater – Syphon Renewals.
- Stockwater – Operational Budgets.

1.4. Additionally, the changes to carryovers from the current 18/19 financial year are presented in Section 14 of this report.

1.5. Significant changes to the Drainage budgets in the Draft 2019-20 Annual Plan have been made following a detailed review of the proposed 19/20 Drainage capital works programme to provide a more realistic and achievable programme in the 19/20 financial year. The changes predominantly include shifting out existing budgets to later years and also some additional budget requests (Lehmans Rd Drain Upgrade Stage 1, Wiltshire / Green Pipework Upgrade, Stockwater – Syphon Renewals and Stockwater – Operational Budgets). The proposed changes will not have a significant impact on level of service, but will provide budget that aligns with a practical delivery programme.

1.6. The total budget for the Drainage and Stockwater capital works programme is now $4,560,540, including the changes recommended in this report. This comparable with the
predicted final forecast expenditure against Drainage and Stockwater capital works projects in 2018/19.

2. **RECOMMENDATIONS**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) *Receives* report No. 190418057971.

**Lehmans Rd Drain Upgrade Stage 1**

(b) *Approves* an additional capital works (LOS) budget of $125,000 in 19/20 for the Lehmans Rd Drain Upgrade Stage 1 project under the District Drainage account.

(c) *Notes* that this with give a total budget of $250,000 for Lehmans Rd Drain Upgrade Stage 1 project, when combined with the existing budget of $125,000 in the 18/19 financial year proposed to be carried forward to the 19/20 financial year.

(d) *Notes* that the additional $125,000 budget would increase the District Drainage rate by approximately 1.8% or $0.38 per property.

**North Brook - Janelle to White**

(e) *Approves* transferring the capital works (LOS) budget of $280,000 in 19/20 to 20/21 for North Brook – Janelle Place to White St under the Rangiora urban drainage account.

(f) *Notes* that this will give a total budget of $560,000, with $150,000 in 19/20 and $410,000 in 20/21.

**Wiltshire / Green Pipework Upgrade.**

(g) *Approves* an additional capital works (LOS) budget of $475,000 in the 21/22 financial year for the Wiltshire / Green Pipework Upgrade Stage 1 to be funded from the Rangiora urban drainage account.

(h) *Notes* that this will give a total budget of $975,000 for the Wiltshire / Green Pipework Upgrade Stage 1 project.

(i) *Notes* that the additional $475,000 budget would increase the Rangiora Drainage rate by approximately 2.5% or $4.89 per property.

(j) *Notes* that the main reason for the increase in budget is to provide capacity within the primary system for the 1 in 50 year level of service from the end of Janelle Place and Wiltshire Court, as there is no secondary flow from these cul-de-sacs.

(k) *Approves* the deferral of the Stage 2 works by three financial years to commence in the 24/25 financial year as follows:

\[ \sum \text{Investigation and consultation in 24/25} = \$72,000 \]

\[ \sum \text{Design and consenting/landowner approval in 25/26} = \$405,000 \]

**Pentecost Road Stormwater Main and SMA**

(l) *Approves* the reallocation of $378,000 from the Pentecost Road Stormwater Main – LOS budget, $102,000 from the Pentecost Road Stormwater Main – Growth budget, $180,000 from the Pentecost Road SMA – LOS budget and $45,000 from the Pentecost Road SMA – Growth, from the 19/20 financial year to the 20/21 financial year.

(m) *Notes* that the remaining budgets in the 19/20 financial year, combined with the planned carryover from 18/19 to 19/20, give a budget of $445,000 in the 19/20 financial year for the
construction of the stormwater main adjacent to the new Rangiora West School and the consenting and detailed design of the remaining works.

(n) **Notes** that the total budget of $1,150,000 for the works remains unchanged and hence has no impact on rates.

(o) **Notes** that staff will bring a report to Council if additional budget is required once the concept design is complete.

**Pegasus – Stormwater Minor Improvements.**

(p) **Approves** the removal of the Pegasus Minor Stormwater Improvements budget of $10,000 per year.

(q) **Notes** that no works have been identified for this budget over the last two financial years.

**Kaiapoi West / Silverstream - Pond Areas 1&2; Land Purchase**

(r) **Approves** the reallocation of $206,250 from 19/20 to 20/21 and $1,856,250 from 20/21 to 21/22 for the Kaiapoi West / Silverstream Pond Areas 1&2; Land Purchase project.

(s) **Notes** that there will be no impact on development contributions as a result of this budget reallocation.

**Parnhams Drain Catchment Improvements.**

(t) **Approves** the transfer of $100,000 from 20/21 to 19/20 for Parnhams Drain Catchment Improvement project.

(u) **Notes** that if approved the budgets for Parnhams Drain Catchment Improvement will be $300,000 in 19/20 (was $200,000), $700,000 in 20/21 (was $800,000) and $3,000,000 in 21/22 (unchanged).

**Feldwick Drain Catchment Improvements.**

(v) **Approves** the reallocation of $200,000 from 19/20 to 20/21 and $3,600,000 from 20/21 to 21/22 for Feldwick Drain Catchment Improvement project.

(w) **Notes** that if approved the budgets for Feldwick Drain Catchment Improvement will be $200,000 in 19/20 (was $400,000), $200,000 in 20/21 (was $3,600,000) and $3,600,000 in 21/22 (was $0).

**Mandeville Resurgence Channel Diversion / Upgrade.**

(x) **Approves** bringing forward the investigation budget for the Mandeville Resurgence Channel Diversion / Upgrade project of $20,000 in 20/21 by one financial year to 19/20.

(y) **Notes** that the budgets for design and consent of $100,000 and construction of $550,000 will remain in 21/22 and 22/23 respectively.

(z) **Notes** that this change will have no impact on rates.

(aa) **Notes** that staff will report back to Council on any further changes to budgets for this project as part of the proposed draft 20/21 Annual Plan in January 2020.

**Stockwater – Syphon Renewals**

(bb) **Approves** a new capital works (renewals) budget of $60,000 in 19/20 for the renewal of stockwater syphons under the Stockwater account.
(cc) **Notes** that as this work is funded from the stockwater renewals fund, there will be no impact on rates.

**Stockwater – Operational budgets**

(dd) **Approves** an increase to the stockwater operating budget of $22,860, comprising of a $3,500 increase in the asset management (operations) budget, $2,000 increase in the public education budget and a $17,360 increase in the maintenance budget.

(ee) **Notes** that as this additional operational budget will increase the stockwater race rates by approximately 6.4% $16.07 per property on average.

**Carryovers from 18/19**

(ff) **Approves** the additional carryover of the following budgets from the 18/19 financial year to the 19/20 financial year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No.</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>18/19 Budget</th>
<th>Carryover to 19/20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100551</td>
<td>North Brook Enhancement Work</td>
<td>$184,400</td>
<td>$184,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101266</td>
<td>Lehmans Rd Drain Upgrade Stage 1</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100645</td>
<td>Rangiora West / Townsend Fields - Land Purchase Pond 5, Culverts, Swales</td>
<td>$2,280,000</td>
<td>$855,000 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100846</td>
<td>North Brook - Janelle to White</td>
<td>$280,000</td>
<td>$280,000 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100849</td>
<td>Wiltshire / Green Pipework Upgrade</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101262</td>
<td>Flaxton Road Urbanisation</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100631</td>
<td>Parnhams Drain PS Upgrade &amp; Access</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100561</td>
<td>Oxford Drainage Upgrade Non Scheduled</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101012</td>
<td>Mill Road SMAs</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>$350,000 (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Includes $565,000 carryover to 19/20 and $290,000 carryover to 20/21.
(2) Includes $100,000 carryover to 19/20 and $180,000 carryover to 20/21.
(3) Includes $50,000 carryover to 19/20 and $300,000 carryover to 20/21.

(gg) **Notes** that the Tuahiwi Stream Capacity Upgrades and the Kaiapoi – Pump Station Renewals projects no longer need to be carried forward to the 19/20 financial year.

(hh) **Notes** that the McIntosh Drain Upgrade, Pentecost Rd Stormwater Main and Pentecost Road SMA projects are planned carryovers from the 18/19 financial year already approved as part of the LTP.

(ii) **Circulates** this report to the Community Boards for their information.

3. **LEHMANS RD DRAIN UPGRADE STAGE 1, DISTRICT DRAINAGE**

**REASON IT WAS NOT INCLUDED IN THE DRAFT ANNUAL PLAN**

3.1. The detailed design and engineer’s estimate for the works were not known at the time of setting the draft AP budgets. This work has since been completed and the final scope and estimate for the work is higher than was previously anticipated.

**RISK OF NOT ADOPTING THE RECOMMENDATION**

3.2. There will be insufficient budget to complete the drainage upgrades proposed at the Lehmans Road / Oxford Road intersection.

3.3. This was the location of flooding during the June 2014 flood event, which resulted in flooding of the Rangiora Vet Clinic. These works will reduce the future likelihood of flooding in this area.
ISSUES AND OPTIONS

3.4. Upgrades to the Lehmans Road drainage system were identified flooding the June 2014 flood (refer TRIM 141009110892). The first stage of these works included upgrading the drain and accessway culverts on the west side of Lehmans Road, upgrading the culvert capacity under Oxford Road and improving the swale capacity on the east side of Lehmans Road between Oxford Road and Johns Road.

3.5. The works have been progressed to the detailed design stage and have been integrated with both the planned intersection upgrades at the Oxford Road / Lehmans Road intersection and also the urbanised of Oxford Road between Lehmans Road and Charles Upham Drive.

3.6. The scope of the drainage improvement works has increased due to the following factors:

- Land purchase is required at the south east corner of the intersection (i.e.: a corner splay is required) to enable the construction of the culvert and connection of the existing water race into the drain.
- A new fence offset back from the current alignment is required on Council land (89 Oxford Road) to enable the construct of the swale on the eastern side of Lehmans Road.
- The accessway culverts to 161 Lehmans Road are required to be box culverts rather than circular pipes in order to achieve the required capacity without deepening this existing drain.

3.7. The above factors combined with the more accurate estimate of the works means that the budget estimate has increased to $250,000.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineer’s estimate for physical works (based on detailed design, refer TRIM 190401047133)</td>
<td>$170,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land purchase</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional fees (15%)</td>
<td>$27,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project contingency (20%)</td>
<td>$43,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$250,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.8. Additional budget of $125,000 is requested to enable the drainage upgrades proposed at the Lehmans Road / Oxford Road intersection to be completed, noting that there is an existing budget of $125,000 in the 18/19 financial year proposed to be carried forward to the 19/20 financial year (refer Section 14 of this report).

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

COMMUNITY VIEWS

Groups and Organisations

3.10. No community groups have been consulted on this matter.

Wider Community

3.11. The community were previously consulted on the proposed flood mitigation works following the June 2014 floods. This project is part of the recommended upgrades to the area to the west of Rangiora.
FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

Financial Implications

3.12. The additional $125,000 budget would increase the District Drainage rate by approximately 1.8% from $25.02 to $25.40 or $0.38 per property.

Community Implications

3.13. This project will reduce the likelihood of flooding in this area in the future and assist with improving road safety during future rainfall events.

Risk Management

3.14. There is a risk of further flood events which could cause damage to property.

Health and Safety

3.15. The project will undergo a ‘safety in design’ audit procedure to ensure the final design meets WDC Health and Safety standards.

CONTEXT

Policy

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

Legislation

3.17. The Local Government Act 2002 sets out the power and responsibility of local authorities, including the Council’s role in providing drainage services.

Community Outcomes

3.18. There is a healthy and sustainable environment for all.

3.19. Core utility services are provided in a timely and sustainable manner.

Delegations

3.20. As this is unbudgeted capital expenditure, Council approval of the budget through the AP, is required for this work to proceed.

4. NORTH BROOK - JANELLE TO WHITE

REASON IT WAS NOT INCLUDED IN THE DRAFT ANNUAL PLAN

4.1. The investigative works had not been carried out at the time the Annual Plan was prepared. The work to date has still not progressed far enough to develop an estimate with any confidence. However, the likely scenario is clearer, and so an allowance for a higher estimate is recommended.

RISK OF NOT ADOPTING THE RECOMMENDATION

4.2. The North Brook has flooded at this location previously. If the work is not progressed, it is likely that this will continue to occur.
ISSUES AND OPTIONS

4.3. The Council has identified an issue relating to the capacity of the section of North Brook between Janelle Place and White Street. There was significant surface flooding in this area in the 2014 flood event.

4.4. The Council has allowed $280,000 in 2018/19 and $280,000 in 19/20 for this activity.

4.5. During 2018/19, Council staff have appointed a consultant to carry out inspections, and to consider options to address the issue. Work on the options is just beginning. However it is likely that the actual cost of this work will be in the order of the $560,000 already allowed.

4.6. This work is behind programme due to other commitments and priorities.

4.7. Note that a carryover of the $280,000 from the 18/19 financial year to be partially included in 19/20 and partially in 20/21 financial years is covered in Section 14 of this report. Therefore the further $280,000 currently budgeted in 19/20 is required to be transferred to 20/21 to complete the works.

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

COMMUNITY VIEWS

Groups and Organisations

4.9. The neighbouring landowners have been written to noting that the planning for this work is underway. A further meeting is planned once the options have been developed.

Wider Community

4.10. The community were previously consulted on the proposed flood mitigation works following the June 2014 floods. This project is part of the recommended upgrades to the area to the west of Rangiora.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

Financial Implications

4.11. There are no financial implications as there is no increase in funding requested.

Community Implications

4.12. This project will reduce the likelihood and impact of flooding in this area in the future.

Risk Management

4.13. There is a risk of further flood events which could cause damage to property.

Health and Safety

4.14. Safety in Design will be formally considered and documented as part of the detailed design stage for any construction works.

CONTEXT

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

Legislation

4.16. The Local Government Act 2002 sets out the power and responsibility of local authorities, including the Council’s role in providing drainage services.

Community Outcomes

4.17. There is a healthy and sustainable environment for all.

4.18. Core utility services are provided in a timely and sustainable manner.

Delegations

4.19. Council approval to move the current budgets is required for this work to proceed.

5. WILTSHE / GREEN PIPEWORK UPGRADE

REASON IT WAS NOT INCLUDED IN THE DRAFT ANNUAL PLAN

5.1. The Council has approved some funding for Wiltshire / Green pipework improvements. However it was based on a level of service (LOS) of piped a 1 in 5 year event. Due to the lack of a suitable overland flow path, this needs to be increased to piping a 1 in 50 year event.

RISK OF NOT ADOPTING THE RECOMMENDATION

5.2. If the budget is not increased, then the pipework will be installed to match the originally intended LOS of a 1 in 5 year event. This would mean that any event greater than this would cause flooding of private property in an acceptable manner.

ISSUES AND OPTIONS

5.3. The Council has identified an issue relating to flooding of properties in the Janelle Place / Wiltshire Court area following the June 2014 Flood (refer TRIM 141009110892). There was significant surface flooding in this area in the 2014 flood event.

5.4. After investigating the issue, the Council split the work into two stages, being Stage 1 (Janelle Place to Parkhouse Reserve, and Wiltshire Court to Parkhouse Reserve) and Stage 2 (Parkhouse Reserve along Parkhouse Drive, Treffers Avenue and Johns Road to Green Street) – refer TRIM 141010111299.

5.5. The budgets for the Wiltshire / Green Pipework Upgrade Stage 1 works currently included in the LTP are:

$\sum$ Design in 18/19 - $120,000
$\sum$ Construction in 20/21 - $380,000

5.6. The basis for these budgets was that a piped solution to cater for a 1 in 5 year event was assumed (which is the Council’s normal design criteria). During 2018/19 and the development of the concept design, Council staff have been considering the issue, and have now revised the approach.

5.7. One of the critical issues raised is the lack of an overland flow path, which would normally take flows between a 1 in 5 year and a 1 in 50 year event. Therefore it is deemed appropriate
to design the pipes to take the 1 in 50 year flows. (Note this is only through the critical sections where there is no practical overland flow path. Below this section, we can utilise overland flow through road reserve as per usual, and so the pipes downstream will be designed to take 1 in 5 year flow as usual).

5.8. The effect of this change in approach is a significantly more expensive solution. The costs of Stage 1 construction alone are now estimated at approximately $500,000 and the total budget requirement has increased to $975,000.

Table 5.1 – Wiltshire / Green Pipework Upgrade Stage 1 Budget Estimate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineer’s estimate for physical works (based on concept design, refer TRIM 190418057950. Note includes a 10% construction contingency not 30% as per report)</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easements and access compensation</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional fees (15%)</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project contingency (30%)</td>
<td>$225,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$975,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.9. It is proposed that this project is staged over the next three financial years as follows:

∑ Consultation and detailed design 19/20 - $120,000
∑ Construction (Janelle Place to Parkhouse Reserve) 20/21 - $380,000
∑ Construction (Wiltshire Court to Parkhouse Reserve) 21/22 - $475,000

5.10. Note that the carryover of the $120,000 from the 18/19 financial year to the 19/20 financial year is covered in Section 14 of this report and the budget of $380,000 already exists in 20/21 as per the LTP budget.

5.11. It is therefore recommended that an additional (LOS) budget of $475,000 be approved in the 21/22 financial year under the Rangiora urban drainage account.

5.12. The budgets for the Wiltshire / Green Pipework Upgrade Stage 2 works currently included in the LTP are:

∑ Investigation and consultation in 21/22 - $72,000
∑ Design and consenting/landowner approval in 22/23 - $405,000

5.13. It is recommended that these works are deferred by three financial years to offset the increase in scope of the stage 1 works.

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

COMMUNITY VIEWS

Groups and Organisations

5.15. The local landowners affected by this proposal have not yet been consulted. It is intended that this will occur early in the new financial year.

Wider Community
5.16. The community were previously consulted on the proposed flood mitigation works following the June 2014 floods. This project is part of the recommended upgrades to the area to the west of Rangiora.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

Financial Implications

5.17. It is expected the additional budget will be loan funded from the Rangiora drainage account, and this will result in a $4.89 increase in the Rangiora Drainage rate, which is about a 2.5% increase in rates.

Community Implications

5.18. This project will reduce the likelihood and impact of flooding in this area in the future.

Risk Management

5.19. There is a risk of further flood events which could cause damage to property.

Health and Safety

5.20. Safety in Design will be formally considered and documented as part of the detailed design stage for any construction works.

CONTEXT

Policy

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

Legislation

5.22. The Local Government Act 2002 sets out the power and responsibility of local authorities, including the Council’s role in providing drainage services.

Community Outcomes

5.23. There is a healthy and sustainable environment for all.

5.24. Core utility services are provided in a timely and sustainable manner.

Delegations

5.25. Council approval of the budget is required as this would increase the previously approved capital expenditure in later years.

6. PENTECOST ROAD STORMWATER MAIN AND SMA

REASON IT WAS NOT INCLUDED IN THE DRAFT ANNUAL PLAN

6.1. The need to reallocate some of this budget is that the design of the stormwater main and stormwater management area (SMA), has not progressed as far as expected in the 18/19 financial year and is unlikely to be fully constructed in the 19/20 financial year.

RISK OF NOT ADOPTING THE RECOMMENDATION
6.2. If the budget is not reallocated, then it is likely that a carryover to the 20/21 financial year will be required.

ISSUES AND OPTIONS

6.3. An external consultant was engaged to undertake the concept design, consenting and detailed design of the proposed stormwater main on the west side of Pentecost Road and the proposed SMA at the southern end of Pentecost Road, just north of the South Belt Headworks site. It was anticipated that this work would have been completed and the tendering of the works commenced by the end of the current financial year.

6.4. The works have only progressed to the concept design phase, with consenting and detailed design still to be undertaken. The reasons for the delay have been due to a combination of factors including scope clarification, internal staff changes and external consultant performance.

6.5. It is considered unlikely that the works will be fully constructed next financial year, given that the consent from Environment Canterbury has not been obtained yet. There is however a need to construct at least the section of the stormwater main outside of the new Rangiora West School which will open in 2020.

6.6. It is therefore recommended that the budgets for these two projects be reallocated as shown in table 6.1 below.

Table 6.1 – Pentecost Road Stormwater Main and SMA Budgets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Current Budget</th>
<th>Proposed Budgets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18/19</td>
<td>19/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pentecost Road Stormwater Main - LOS</td>
<td>$72,000</td>
<td>$648,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pentecost Road Stormwater Main - Growth</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td>$162,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pentecost Road SMA - LOS</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pentecost Road SMA - Growth</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$115,000</td>
<td>$1,035,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$1,150,000</td>
<td>$1,150,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Includes the planned carryovers from 18/19 as set out in Section 14 of this report.

6.7. It is noted that additional budget may be required which will not be confirmed until the concept design is completed. A separate report will be brought to Council if additional budget is required.

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

COMMUNITY VIEWS

Groups and Organisations

6.9. No community groups have been sought on this matter.

Wider Community

6.10. The community have not been consulted on this matter.
6.11. There would be an expectation in the community that urbanisation of the road, including the installation of the stormwater main, would occur prior to the opening of the school.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

Financial Implications

6.12. As this is a budget reallocation there is no impact on rates.

Community Implications

6.13. There would be an expectation in the community that urbanisation of the road, including the installation of the stormwater main, would occur prior to the opening of the school.

Risk Management

6.14. This project has been identified as a key drainage project to progress and accordingly a project control group has been established with the Manager of Utilities and Roading as the chair to ensure the project remains on track going forward.

Health and Safety

6.15. Standard health and safety measures will be used as part of the design and construction of the stormwater main and SMA. It is anticipated that a Safety in Design (SiD) workshop will be had for the SMA to consider risks for staff and the public.

CONTEXT

Policy

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

Legislation

6.17. The Local Government Act 2002 sets out the power and responsibility of local authorities, including the Council’s role in providing drainage services.

Community Outcomes

6.18. Core utility services are provided in a timely and sustainable manner.

Delegations

6.19. Council approval is required to remove this budget as it was previously approved capital expenditure.

7. PEGASUS – STORMWATER MINOR IMPROVEMENTS

REASON IT WAS NOT INCLUDED IN THE DRAFT ANNUAL PLAN

7.1. The need to remove this budget had not been confirmed at the time of setting the draft 19/20 AP budgets.

RISK OF NOT ADOPTING THE RECOMMENDATION
7.2. If the budget is not removed, the project will be at risk of being reported as incomplete in the capital works financial reports if not works are not identified.

ISSUES AND OPTIONS

7.3. An annual budget for minor stormwater improvements was included in the 2016/17 budgets for Rangiora, Kaiapoi, Woodend, Oxford and Pegasus.

7.4. The budget for the Pegasus minor improvement works of $10,000 per year has not been needed in the last two financial years, given that the infrastructure is relatively new and most of the initial issues at the private / public interface have now been resolved.

7.5. It is therefore recommended that this annual budget of $10,000 be removed from the Pegasus drainage budget.

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

COMMUNITY VIEWS

Groups and Organisations

7.7. No community groups have been sought on this matter.

Wider Community

7.8. The community have not been consulted on this matter.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

Financial Implications

7.9. As this budget was funded from the Pegasus drainage renewals fund, there will be no impact on rates.

Community Implications

7.10. None anticipated.

Risk Management

7.11. Nil.

Health and Safety


CONTEXT

Policy

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

Legislation

7.14. The Local Government Act 2002 sets out the power and responsibility of local authorities, including the Council’s role in providing drainage services.
Community Outcomes

7.15. Core utility services are provided in a timely and sustainable manner.

Delegations

7.16. Council approval is required to remove this budget as it was previously approved capital expenditure.

8. KAIAPOI WEST / SILVERSTREAM – POND AREAS 1&2; LAND PURCHASE

REASON IT WAS NOT INCLUDED IN THE DRAFT ANNUAL PLAN

8.1. The Silverstream development north east of Island Road has not progressed as fast as expected at the time of setting budgets for the Draft 2019-20 Annual Plan.

RISK OF NOT ADOPTING THE RECOMMENDATION

8.2. If the budget is not reallocated, then it is likely that a carryover to the 20/21 financial year may be required.

ISSUES AND OPTIONS

8.3. The Silverstream development north east of Island Road is currently being progressed by the developer Silverstream3 Limited. Council staff are working with the developer to setup a heads of agreement for the funding of stormwater infrastructure for this part of the development. As this agreement is not yet in place and the progress of development is dependent on external factors, Council staff cannot be sure that this budget will be required next financial year.

8.4. It is therefore recommended that the budgets in 19/20 and 20/21 are pushed out by one financial year as shown in Table 8.1 below.

Table 8.1 – Silverstream – Pond Areas 1&2; Land Purchase Pentecost Budgets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Current Budget</th>
<th>Proposed Budgets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19/20</td>
<td>20/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pentecost Road Stormwater Main - LOS</td>
<td>$206,250</td>
<td>$1,856,250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.5. If the development occurs quicker than anticipated the staff will bring a report back to Council to request budget to be brought forward.

8.6. It is noted that the need for this budget will be reviewed following the establishment of the heads of agreement as the full budget may not be required depending on the agreed funding approach.

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

COMMUNITY VIEWS

Groups and Organisations

8.8. No community groups have been sought on this matter.

Wider Community
8.9. The community have not been consulted on this matter.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

**Financial Implications**

8.10. As this is a budget reallocation there is no impact on the development contributions.

**Community Implications**

8.11. This project will provide stormwater infrastructure as part of the development of land, which will provide growth in the Kaiapoi area.

**Risk Management**

8.12. Risks will be managed through the heads of agreement and though standard subdivision consenting and engineering plan approval processes.

**Health and Safety**

8.13. Standard health and safety measures will be used by the developer with Council’s input as part of the design and construction of the stormwater system.

**CONTEXT**

**Policy**

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

**Legislation**

8.15. The Local Government Act 2002 sets out the power and responsibility of local authorities, including the Council’s role in providing drainage services.

**Community Outcomes**

8.16. Core utility services are provided in a timely and sustainable manner.

**Delegations**

8.17. Council approval is required to reallocate this budget as it was previously approved capital expenditure.

9. **PARNHAMS DRAIN CATCHMENT IMPROVEMENTS**

**REASON IT WAS NOT INCLUDED IN THE DRAFT ANNUAL PLAN**

9.1. Consideration of the issues and options surrounding the Parnhams Drain catchment, and how those options best coordinate with further development of Silverstream is still being carried out. This has advanced somewhat since the draft Annual Plan was prepared.

9.2. The recommendation is to move some of the funding around in order to better match the likely spend profile.

**RISK OF NOT ADOPTING THE RECOMMENDATION**
9.3. The risk of not adopting is relatively low as staff are only requesting a reshuffle of spend.

9.4. Please note that as the investigation and optioneering process continues, a better idea as to whether the total budget is sufficient will emerge, and therefore a further application on funding may be necessary.

ISSUES AND OPTIONS

9.5. The Parnhams Drain has historically caused significant flooding issues during heavy rainfall events. This flooding has occurred both in rural land to the south of Ohoka Road, and in the urban Kaiapoi area especially around Sneyd Street west of the motorway and Otaki Street east of the motorway.

9.6. Significant flooding occurred during the June 2014 event in the Island Road, Ohoka Road and Sneyd Street areas. The following works have been undertaken since that event to improve the drainage system:

∑ Parnhams Drain Pump Station Capacity Upgrade – Completed.
∑ Parnhams Drain Access Upgrade – Completed
∑ Island Road Drain Upgrades – Completed.
∑ Parnhams Drain Inlet Screen Upgrade – Currently being tendered.

9.7. The Parnhams Drain Catchment Improvements is the final project to implement a long term solution to reduce flood risk in the catchment. It involves developing options to divert the western part of the catchment (west of the motorway) directly into the Kaiapoi River (refer TRIM 141008110252).

9.8. The Council is currently looking into the options to provide drainage improvements, as well as options to coordinate works with the next phase of the Silverstream development in order to take advantage of any efficiencies.

9.9. This work has not yet progressed to the point of fully understanding the options, developing cost estimates and determining the preferred option.

9.10. The Council has currently budgeted $200,000 in 19/20, $800,000 in 20/21, and $3,000,000 in 21/22. It is recommended that these budgets are reallocated to provide $300,000 in 19/20, $700,000 in 20/21, and $3,000,000 in 21/22, based on the expected timeframe for this project.

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

COMMUNITY VIEWS

Groups and Organisations

9.12. Communication is being carried out with the developers of Silverstream regularly to look for opportunities for efficiencies. As yet no communication or consultation has been carried out with other groups. But targeted consultation will occur with the locally affected landowners as the work progresses.

Wider Community

9.13. The wider community were consulted following the June 2014 flood event. Further community consultation will be required as part of developing the preferred solution for Parnhams Drain.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS
Financial Implications

9.14. Very minor as only moving budgeted funds forward a year.

Community Implications

9.15. The planned work will benefit the community.

Risk Management

9.16. The planned work will assist mitigating the risk of flooding.

Health and Safety

9.17. Safety in Design will be formally considered and documented as part of the detailed design stage for any construction works.

CONTEXT

Policy

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

Legislation

9.19. The Local Government Act 2002 sets out the power and responsibility of local authorities, including the Council’s role in providing drainage services.

Community Outcomes

9.20. There is a healthy and sustainable environment for all.

9.21. Core utility services are provided in a timely and sustainable manner.

Delegations

9.22. Council approval of the budget is not required as this is previously approved capital expenditure.

10. FELDWICK DRAIN CATCHMENT IMPROVEMENTS

REASON IT WAS NOT INCLUDED IN THE DRAFT ANNUAL PLAN

10.1. The development of the Feldwick / McIntosh strategy, including the integration Kaiapoi East regeneration works, development and flood alleviation work, is still being carried out. This has advanced somewhat since the draft Annual Plan was prepared.

10.2. The recommendation is to move some of the funding around in order to better match the likely spend profile.

RISK OF NOT ADOPTING THE RECOMMENDATION

10.3. The risk of not adopting is relatively low as staff are only requesting a reshuffle of spend.

ISSUES AND OPTIONS
10.4. In the June 2014 flooding occurred in the Kaiapoi East area, including Bracebridge Street, Blackwell Crescent, Gray Crescent, Kalmia Place, Kanuka Place and Ellen Place (refer TRIM 141010111221).

10.5. Short term upgrades have been implemented since the June 2014 event. Additionally the Council has approved a budget for a long term solution of $400,000 in 19/20 and $3,600,000 in 20/21.

10.6. The Feldwick / McIntosh strategy is still being developed and has not yet progressed to the point of fully understanding the options, developing cost estimates and determining the preferred option.

10.7. It is therefore recommended that these budgets are reallocated to provide $200,000 in 19/20, $200,000 in 20/21, and $3,600,000 in 21/22, based on the expected timeframe for this project.

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

COMMUNITY VIEWS

Groups and Organisations

10.9. This work will need to be integrated with the development of the eastern part of the Kaiapoi East Regeneration area once the preferred solution has been determined.

Wider Community

10.10. The wider community were consulted following the June 2014 flood event. Further community consultation will be required as part of developing the preferred solution for Feldwick Drain and McIntosh Drain catchments.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

Financial Implications

10.11. The reallocation of budgets has no impact on rates.

Community Implications

10.12. The planned work will benefit the community by reducing flooding in the east Kaiapoi area.

Risk Management

10.13. The planned work will assist mitigating the risk of flooding.

Health and Safety

10.14. Safety in Design will be formally considered and documented as part of the detailed design stage for any construction works.

CONTEXT

Policy

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

10.16. The Local Government Act 2002 sets out the power and responsibility of local authorities, including the Council’s role in providing drainage services.

Community Outcomes

10.17. There is a healthy and sustainable environment for all.

10.18. Core utility services are provided in a timely and sustainable manner.

Delegations

10.19. Council approval of the budget is not required as this is previously approved capital expenditure.

11. MANDEVILLE RESURGENCE CHANNEL DIVERSION / UPGRADE

REASON IT WAS NOT INCLUDED IN THE DRAFT ANNUAL PLAN

11.1. Council staff have been working with the Mandeville Residents Association on drainage issues in the wider Mandeville area in this first part of 2019. A key part of the submission to the draft 19/20 AP from the Mandeville Residents Association, Ohoka Drainage Advisory Group and Oxford-Ohoka Community Board is to request that planning for the long term solution to manage the resurgence channel flow through Mandeville commence as soon as possible. This section addresses this request and a separate report has been prepared to address the submission made (refer TRIM 190517069694).

RISK OF NOT ADOPTING THE RECOMMENDATION

11.2. It will be a further year before staff have funding to commence the investigation of the Mandeville Resurgence Channel Diversion / Upgrade which may not be acceptable to the community.

ISSUES AND OPTIONS

11.3. The budgets for the Mandeville Resurgence Channel Diversion / Upgrade currently included in the LTP are:

- Investigation and consultation in 20/21 - $20,000
- Design and consenting/landowner approval in 21/22 - $100,000
- Construction in 22/23 - $550,000

11.4. These budgets were originally placed in year 10 of the 2016/17 budget (i.e.: in year 25/26) following the June 2014 flood work, but were subsequently brought forward by Council staff as part of the 2018-28 LTP based on feedback from the Mandeville Residence Association and the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board (refer TRIM 180514052798).

11.5. The options available are to either leave the budgets as per the current LTP or to bring forward the budgets one financial year to commence the investigation work in 19/20.

11.6. It is recommended that the investigation budget of $20,000 be brought forward to 19/20 to enable this initial work to commence. This will enable staff to undertake options development, scoping of the consultation approach and budget refinement prior to reporting back to Council as part of the Draft 20/21 Annual Plan.

11.7. The Management Team has reviewed this report and supports the recommendations.
COMMUNITY VIEWS

Groups and Organisations

11.8. Extensive consultation has occurred with the Mandeville Residence Association and the Drainage team over the past year, but particularly in early 2019. This has included van tour around approximately 30 sites of interest to the Mandeville Residents Association. The main relief sought by the Mandeville Residents Association is to progress the long term solution to manage the resurgence channel flow through Mandeville as soon as possible.

Wider Community

11.9. The wider community were consulted following the June 2014 flood event. Further community consultation will be required as part of developing the preferred solution for Mandeville.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

Financial Implications

11.10. There are no budget implication with bring this work forward.

Community Implications

11.11. It is expected that there would be support in the wider community to look at progressing this work as soon as possible.

Risk Management

11.12. The risks associated with this project will need to be carefully managed, in particular with respect to ensuring the solution meets the communities expectations and also ensuring the diversion of flood waters does not increase flooding elsewhere.

11.13. The objective of the project is to reduce the level of flood risk in the Mandeville area.

Health and Safety

11.14. Safety in Design will be formally considered and documented as part of the detailed design stage for any construction works.

CONTEXT

Policy

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

Legislation

11.16. The Local Government Act 2002 sets out the power and responsibility of local authorities, including the Council’s role in providing drainage services.

Community Outcomes

11.17. There is a healthy and sustainable environment for all.

11.18. Core utility services are provided in a timely and sustainable manner.
Delegations

11.19. Council approval of the budget is not required as this is previously approved capital expenditure.

12. STOCKWATER – SYPHON RENEWALS

REASON IT WAS NOT INCLUDED IN THE DRAFT ANNUAL PLAN

12.1. The need to undertake the renewals of these syphons was identified since setting the draft 19/20 AP budgets.

RISK OF NOT ADOPTING THE RECOMMENDATION

12.2. If the additional funding is not approved in the 19/20 Annual Plan the renewal work will not progress. If the syphons fail it will result in loss of supply to stockwater users.

ISSUES AND OPTIONS

12.3. The Council’s water race maintenance contractor, Waimakariri Irrigation Limited (WIL), has identified that the following syphons need replacing:

∑ West Eyreton School Road Syphon
∑ West Eyreton West Syphon

12.4. The budget estimate for undertaking these works is detailed in the following table.

Table 9.1 – Stockwater Syphons Renewals Budget Estimate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicative quote for physical works (based on information from maintenance contractor)</td>
<td>$47,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional fees (10%)</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project contingency (15%)</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$60,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12.5. Two other syphons, the Dockey Creek syphon at Lillys Road and the West Eyreton East syphon, were replaced in 2018/19 from the culvert renewals budget, which is $25,000 per year.

12.6. One option is to continue to replace syphons from the culvert renewals budget over the next two financial years. This is not recommended as it will mean that the culvert renewal programme will be delayed by 3 years, given that no culvert replacements were undertaken in 18/19.

12.7. Additional budget of $60,000 is requested to enable the syphon replacements to be undertaken in the 19/20 financial year.

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

COMMUNITY VIEWS

Groups and Organisations

12.9. No community groups have been sought on this matter.
Wider Community

12.10. The community have not been consulted on this matter.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

Financial Implications

12.11. The proposed renewals will be funded from the stockwater renewals fund, therefore there will be no impact on rates.

Community Implications

12.12. The renewals will ensure that no loss of supply to stockwater users occurs as a result of the failure of one of these syphons.

Risk Management

12.13. The risks associated with this project are low and can be managed through standard project and contract practices.

Health and Safety

12.14. The works will be undertaken by the stockwater race maintenance or the drainage maintenance contractor under an approved health and safety management plan.

CONTEXT

Policy

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

Legislation

12.16. The Local Government Act 2002 sets out the power and responsibility of local authorities, including the Council’s role in providing water race services.

Community Outcomes

12.17. Core utility services are provided in a timely and sustainable manner.

Delegations

12.18. As this is unbudgeted capital expenditure, Council approval of the budget through the LTP, is required for this work to proceed.

13. STOCKWATER – OPERATIONAL BUDGETS

REASON IT WAS NOT INCLUDED IN THE DRAFT ANNUAL PLAN

13.1. The need to change the operational budgets has arisen out of the revised Stockwater Race Bylaw 2019 and also a recent signal from Waimakariri Irrigation Limited that they will be seeking to increase the base payment for maintenance. The implications of both these factors was not known at the time of setting the draft 19/20 Annual Plan budgets, although they were signalled in the commentary (refer 181127139551).
RISK OF NOT ADOPTING THE RECOMMENDATION

13.2. If the additional funding is not approved in the 19/20 Annual Plan it is likely that the accounts will be overspent at the end of next financial year.

ISSUES AND OPTIONS

13.3. The new Stockwater Race Bylaw 2019 has resulted in two outcomes that will impact on operational budgets. Firstly, the requirements for changes to stockwater races, such as closures and diversions, is now more robust and requires additional steps to enable the race to be changed. Secondly, Council staff agreed that additional educational and guidance material would be developed relating to fencing, planting and maintenance of water races on private property.

13.4. To accommodate for this additional work it is proposed to increase the asset management (operations) budget by $3,500 and the public education budget by $2,000.

13.5. Waimakariri Irrigation Limited (WIL) have also indicated that they will be seeking to increase the base payment for maintenance in the 19/20 financial year. The base payment was last revised in 2015 and the Agreement in Relation to Management of Water Race System makes provisions for the base payment to be revised every three years. We are yet to receive a formal request to revise the payment, including the justification for any increase, but WIL have indicated that they consider a 16% increase would be fair and warranted.

13.6. Increasing the base payment for maintenance by 16% would take the annual maintenance fee from $206,436 to $239,465. The current budget allowance for maintenance is $242,640 made up of $212,070 of standard maintenance and $30,570 of additional maintenance not specifically covered by the agreement (refer Table 10.1 below).

13.7. The budget allowance for non-standard work was included following the June 2014 flood event where a significant amount of additional maintenance work was undertaken to reduce the likelihood of future flooding as opposed to supplying stock drinking water. The amount of non-standard work undertaken has reduce slightly in recent years (approximately $12,800 has been undertaken in the 18/19 financial year to date).

13.8. Staff therefore recommend making an allowance for the potential increase by increasing the allowance for standard maintenance work and reducing the allowance for non-standard work. This will result in an overall increase in the maintenance budget by $17,360 or approximately 7% (refer Table 10.1 below).

Table 10.1 – Stockwater Maintenance Budgets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fixed maintenance fee</td>
<td>$212,070</td>
<td>$240,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-standard maintenance allowance</td>
<td>$30,570</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$242,640</td>
<td>$260,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13.9. The combined implications of the changes to the asset management (operations) budget ($3,500), public education budget ($2,000) and maintenance budget ($17,360), is an increase in the operating budget of $22,860.

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

COMMUNITY VIEWS
Groups and Organisations

13.11. No community groups have been sought on this matter.

Wider Community

13.12. The community have not been consulted on this matter.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

Financial Implications

13.13. The proposed additional operational budgets will increase the stockwater race rate by approximately 6.4%.

13.14. It is noted that the stockwater race rate is already increasing by 4% in the 19/20 financial year (refer 181127139551), as a result of increased Council rate charges resulting from the change to a capital value based rating approach. Therefore this will mean the net effect of approximately a 10% increase in stockwater race rates compared to the 2018/19 financial year.

Community Implications

13.15. The additional budget will help improve the information available to the community on the maintenance of stockwater races and also the improve the actual physical maintenance of the races.

Risk Management

13.16. The risks associated with this additional operational work are low and can be managed through standard practices.

Health and Safety

13.17. The works will be undertaken by the stockwater race maintenance contractor. A separate project is underway that considers the health and safety and traffic management aspects of requiring private landowners to maintain stockwater races in the road reserve in front of their properties.

CONTEXT

Policy

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

Legislation

13.19. The Local Government Act 2002 sets out the power and responsibility of local authorities, including the Council’s role in providing water race services.

Community Outcomes

13.20. Core utility services are provided in a timely and sustainable manner.

Delegations
13.21. Council approval is required to obtain this additional budget as part of the Annual Plan process.

14. **CARRYOVERS FROM 18/19**

**REASON IT WAS NOT INCLUDED IN THE DRAFT ANNUAL PLAN**

14.1. Most of the additional carryovers were signalled in the draft 19/20 AP budgets, with the exception of the Lehmans Rd Drain Upgrade Stage 1 and the Rangiora West / Townsend Fields - Land Purchase Pond 5, Culverts, Swales project.

**RISK OF NOT ADOPTING THE RECOMMENDATION**

14.2. If the funding is not approved to be carried over to the 19/20 Annual Plan then these project will not be able to be completed.

**ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

14.3. The table below details the proposed additional carryovers from the 18/19 financial year.

*Table 14.1 – Proposed Additional Carryovers from 18/19*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No.</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>18/19 Budget</th>
<th>Carryover to 19/20</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100551</td>
<td>North Brook Enhancement Work</td>
<td>$184,400</td>
<td>$184,400</td>
<td>The scale and complexity of this work has been greater than anticipated, and so progress has been slower.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101266</td>
<td>Lehmans Rd Drain Upgrade Stage 1</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>Works delayed to align with Roading works to upgrade Oxford Road / Lehmans Road intersection and urbanise Oxford Road between Lehmans Road and Charles Upham Drive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100645</td>
<td>[Rangiora West / Townsend Fields] Land Purchase Pond 5, Culverts, Swales</td>
<td>$2,280,000</td>
<td>Carry over $565,000 to 19/20, and $290,000 to 20/21</td>
<td>This project is developer led. While most of the works have been completed and capitalised, the land for the SMA will not transfer to WDC until next FY ($565k) and there is allowance for E/O on pipework yet to be constructed in west part of the development ($290k).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100848</td>
<td>North Brook - Janelle to White</td>
<td>$280,000</td>
<td>Carry over $150,000 to 19/20, and $130,000 to 20/21</td>
<td>This project has been delayed due to internal resourcing constraints. A consultant has now been engaged and is working towards developing a concept design by June 2019. Consultation and detailed design is planned to occur in 19/20. Construction is expected to occur in 20/21.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100849</td>
<td>Wiltshire / Green Pipework Upgrade</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>The solution has been progressed but will require substantial consultation with</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
directly affected landowners. Note that consultation and detailed design is planned to occur in 19/20 and construction is budgeted to occur in 20/21.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No.</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>18/19 Budget</th>
<th>Carryover to 19/20</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101262</td>
<td>Flaxton Road Urbanisation</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>Budget has been carried over to align with the Roading urbanisation works in this area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100631</td>
<td>Parnhams Drain PS Upgrade &amp; Access</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>This project has been delayed due to internal resourcing constraints. The works are close to being tendered and are expected to be constructed this coming summer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100561</td>
<td>Oxford Drainage Upgrade Non Scheduled</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>The Weka/Tui soakpits were design and prices were sought from a single contractor, however the price was significantly higher than expected. It is proposed to carryover this budget to align with the Flannigans Drain Upgrade budget in 19/20 and tender the work as part of a larger package of works comprising of the Weka/Tui soakpits and pipework and the Kowhai Ave overflow in the Flannigans Drain catchment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101012</td>
<td>Mill Road SMAs</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>Carry over $50,000 to 19/20, and $300,000 to 20/21</td>
<td>Work is progressing with the landowner to come to an acceptable agreement on the area to be purchased and the purchase price. There is a risk that the current budget may not be adequate and that staff may need to bring a report back to Council to seek additional budget for this land purchase.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14.4. The above additional carryovers are requested as the projects have not been completed in the 18/19 financial year.

14.5. The table below details the additional carryovers included in the draft 19/20 AP budgets are no longer required.

*Table 14.2 –Additional Carryovers from 18/19 Not Required*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No.</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>18/19 Budget</th>
<th>Carryover to 19/20</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101206</td>
<td>Tuahiw Stream Capacity Upgrades</td>
<td>$240,000</td>
<td>$120,000 $0</td>
<td>The scope of the work has been reviewed and subsequently reduced. Sicon and Ongrade Drainage have been engaged to complete these works.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101266</td>
<td>Kaiapoi – Pump Station Renewals</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td>$140,000 $0</td>
<td>The pump station renewal strategy and Bowler Street pump</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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replacement works are on programme to be completed by the end of this financial year.

14.6. The table below details the planned carryovers to the 19/20 financial year.

Table 14.3 – Planned Carryovers from 18/19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No.</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>18/19 Budget</th>
<th>Carryover to 19/20</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100133</td>
<td>McIntosh Drain Upgrade</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>This work is behind programme due to the complexity of considering the multiple issues and options relating to the two catchment solutions (i.e.: interactions between the Feldwick and McIntosh Drain catchments), and integration with earthquake recovery and flood mitigation works. However it was always intended that this project would be carried forward to the 19/20 financial year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101159</td>
<td>Pentecost Rd Stormwater Main</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>Design budget in 18/19 planned to be carried over to 19/20 to align with construction budget. Note that some of the construction budget has been pushed out to 20/21 as per Section 6 of this report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101168</td>
<td>Pentecost Road SMA</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14.7. It is noted that at this stage the extent and cost of the total amount of work for the McIntosh Drain Upgrade and Feldwick Catchment Improvement Works remains unclear, and so there may be a further request for additional budget as this project develops.

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

COMMUNITY VIEWS

Groups and Organisations

14.9. No community groups have been sought on this matter.

Wider Community

14.10. The community have not been consulted on this matter.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

Financial Implications

14.11. The financial impact of the carryovers will be minimal, with a slight reduction due to the delay in expenditure and hence delay in the need to raise a loan.

Community Implications
14.12. The renewals will ensure that no loss of supply to stockwater users occurs as a result of the failure of one of these syphons.

Risk Management

14.13. The risks associated with this work will be managed on a project by project basis.

Health and Safety

14.14. The health and safety issues associated with this work will be managed on a project by project basis.

CONTEXT

Policy

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

Legislation

14.16. The Local Government Act 2002 sets out the power and responsibility of local authorities, including the Council’s role in providing drainage services

Community Outcomes

14.17. Core utility services are provided in a timely and sustainable manner.

Delegations

14.18. This budget has approved by Council through the LTP, but approval is required to carryover the budgets to the 19/20 financial year.
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT FOR DECISION

FILE NO and TRIM NO: EXT-01-35 / 190501061992

REPORT TO: Council

DATE OF MEETING: 28-30 May 2019

FROM: Sophie Allen – Water Environment Advisor

SUBJECT: Waimakariri Water Zone – Recommendation for Option A

SIGNED BY: Department Manager Chief Executive

1. SUMMARY

1.1 This report summarises submissions received in the Draft Annual Plan 2019-20 consultation period for the section ‘Waimakariri Water Zone - Zone Implementation Programme Addendum’.

1.2 The majority of submissions (29 out of 44 submitters, equivalent to 66%) supported Option A – the preferred option of the Council. Some of the reasons given for support of Option A were for improved water quality and biodiversity, and with the staffing and resources to support the work to be undertaken.

1.3 Option A is equivalent to Option 2, which as presented in detail in a 29 January 2019 report to Council (TRIM 181217148924). Option B is equivalent to Option 1, and Option C is equivalent to Option 3.

1.4 Option B was supported by 32% of submitters due to reasons such as the higher cost of Options A and C to ratepayers. Some submissions did not state a preference for an option.

Attachments:
i. ZIPA recommendations role and funding (Trim EXT-01-35 / 181217148924)

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 190501061992.

(b) Adopts Option A for the Waimakariri Water Zone – Zone Implementation Programme Addendum, as presented in the Draft Annual Plan. Option A is for Council to play a coordination role, in addition to the role of educator and advisor, and also the creation of a Biodiversity Officer role.

(c) Notes that Option A was supported by 66% of submitters to the Draft Annual Plan for the Waimakariri Water Zone topic.

(d) Approves the funding of Option A: Implementation of the ZIPA with a budget of $205,000 for 19/20 and 20/21 from the general rate, for inclusion in the Annual Plan. This comprises
3. BACKGROUND

3.1 A report was presented on 29 January 2019 to Council, seeking a decision on the role of WDC in ZIPA implementation, staff resourcing, and funding of projects (refer to TRIM 181217148924). Three options were presented to Council.

3.2 Option A, called Option 2 in the report, was adopted as the preferred option of the Council for the Draft Annual Plan, with an allocation of an additional $205,000 for two years for 2019/20 and 2020/21, in addition to $100,000 per annum that was already allocated in the Long Term Plan.

3.3 Option B, for less funding and a smaller role of the Council only operating as an advisor and educator, and Option C for a higher level of funding and staff resourcing, were also presented in the Draft Annual Plan consultation document for submission from the public (refer to TRIM 181217148924).

4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

4.1. The Draft Annual Plan consultation did not raise any significant new issues. Previously identified issues and options were detailed in the January 2019 report to Council (181217148924).

4.2. A new activity is recommended to be created in the Revenue and Financing Policy, entitled the ‘Land and Water (Waimakariri Water Zone)’ under the category of general rate. This is to ensure greater clarity to ratepayers about which activities the general rate is allocated to.

4.3. A correction to the funding for the Biodiversity Officer role has been identified. It is now proposed that the 50% apportionment of the role to carry out District Plan functions, such as protection of Significant Natural Areas, should be funded from a Greenspace Operations account, rather than from the earlier-signalled District Drainage account (refer to 181217148924). Therefore, $55,000 per annum for 2019-20 and 2020-2021 is proposed to be added to the Greenspace Operations account (50% of the Biodiversity Officer role costs, including overheads.) The remaining 50% of the role ($55,000 per year for 2019-20, and 2020-2021) is recommended to remain with the District Drainage account for ZIPA implementation. This results in no change to overall funding for the role.
4.4. The Management Team have reviewed this report and support the recommendations.

5. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

5.1. **Groups and Organisations**

5.1.1. Environment Canterbury

Environment Canterbury is strongly supportive of Option A and the proposed funding increase for ZIPA implementation. It also applauds the proposal to increase the Council’s capability and capacity for biodiversity work.

5.1.2. Federated Farmers

Federated Farmers supports Option A and the employment of a Biodiversity Officer.

5.1.3. Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board

The Board supports Option B, sighting the cost of the other options as too high. The board views current staff resourcing sufficient with the creation of the Water Environment Advisor role and availability of consultants to undertake work. The Board requests for funding and resourcing for biodiversity to be revisited with the launch of the New Zealand Biodiversity Strategy next year.

5.1.4. Woodend-Sefton Community Board

The Board supports Option A, however is concerned with how roles will be clearly established between Environment Canterbury and Waimakariri District Council. It also sought more information on where the funding will be spent.

5.1.5. Oxford-Ohoka Community Board

The Board did not state which Option it prefers. It supports native riparian planting along waterways to be extended, and to work with Drainage Boards.

5.1.6. Rangiora-Ashley Community Board

This Board did not state directly which Option they prefer, but did state that they ‘support the Council to play a coordination role on top of educator and advisor’ (as offered by Options A and C).

5.2. **Wider Community**

5.2.1. Individual comments from multiple submitters included questioning cost and value for money and/or defining the roles of WDC and Environment Canterbury clearly. Specific questions were raised around issues such as; terrestrial biodiversity, algal blooms in Lake Pegasus, protecting the Cust River, supporting private well owners with guidance, and looking after soil health.

6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**

6.1.1. Financial implications were detailed in the 29 January 2019 report to Council (181217148924). An increase of rates is calculated to be $9.48 per average rateable property for Option A.

6.1. **Community Implications**

6.1.1. Option A: There will be more visible WDC restoration projects, such as înanga spawning area improvement and for fish passage, which will improve ecosystem values, and increase awareness of biodiversity issues in the District.
6.1.2. There will be a sustained increase from 19/20 onwards in rates for the ratepayer, either through a WDC general rate increase.

6.2. **Risk Management**

6.2.1. The legislative framework for freshwater management and biodiversity is in a transitional phase. Therefore it is recommended to plan for the implementation of the ZIPA only in the short term, with a review after two years.

6.3. **Health and Safety**

6.3.1. The creation of the new role of WDC Biodiversity Officer could raise health and safety considerations, such as fieldwork in remote areas, which are addressed by the existing WDC ‘Safe Working in the Field’ manual.

### Context

#### Policy

7.1. **Policy**

7.1.1. This matter is a matter of significance in terms of the Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy, and therefore was presented for public submissions in the Draft Annual Plan 2019-20 consultative process.

#### Legislation

7.2. **Legislation**

7.2.1. Resource Management Act (RMA 1991, Sections 30 and 31). The RMA defines the roles of regional councils and territorial authorities in regards to freshwater management.

#### Community Outcomes

7.3. **Community Outcomes**

7.3.1. There is a healthy and sustainable environment for all

- Harm to the environment from the impacts of land use, use of water resources and air emissions is minimised.
- Cultural values relating to water are acknowledged and respected.
- The demand for water is kept to a sustainable level.
- Harm to the environment from the spread of contaminants into ground water and surface water is minimised.

7.3.2. There are areas of significant indigenous vegetation and habitats for indigenous fauna

- Conservation and restoration of significant areas of vegetation and/or habitats is encouraged.

7.3.3. Public spaces and facilities are plentiful, accessible and high quality

- People enjoy clean water at our beaches, rivers and lakes.
- 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.

#### Delegations

7.4. **Delegations**

7.4.1. The Council has authority to include service level budget provision in the Annual Plan.
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT FOR DECISION

FILE NO and TRIM NO: EXT-01-35 /181217148924

REPORT TO: Council

DATE OF MEETING: 29 January 2019

FROM: Gerard Cleary – Manager Utilities and Roading
       Chris Brown – Manager Community and Recreation

SUBJECT: Zone Implementation Programme Addendum (ZIPA) implementation – WDC role and funding options

1. SUMMARY

1.1 This report outlines options for Waimakariri District Council (WDC) to fund and resource its contribution to the recently adopted Waimakariri Water Zone Implementation Plan Addendum (ZIPA) recommendations. The option of providing for a Biodiversity Officer is also included.

1.2 The Waimakariri District Council is identified as a contributing party in a number of the recommendations in the ZIPA. There are three options for roles that WDC could play outlined in this report as follows:

- Option 1 is for a primary role of educator and advisor, with limited new projects coordinated and delivered by WDC. This is the option that is currently allowed for in the WDC Long Term Plan (LTP).

- Option 2 is a coordination role, in addition to the role of educator and advisor. Leadership of the majority of ZIPA implementation would sit with Environment Canterbury, and/or other agencies. This option includes allowing funding to employ a Biodiversity Officer.

- Option 3 is an expanded coordination role, with more staffing resourcing and project funding. Leadership of the majority of ZIPA implementation would still sit with Environment Canterbury, and/or other agencies. A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for funding from Environment Canterbury is recommended if this option is pursued. This option includes funding for the Biodiversity Officer as well as an additional Water Environment Advisor.

1.3 The rating impact of each option is an increase of $4.51, $13.77 and $32.27 per average rateable property per year for Options 1, 2, and 3 respectively.

1.4 The recommended option is Option 2, at a total cost of $305,000 per annum, be funded for ZIPA Implementation, with a review after two years.

1.5 A budget of $100,000 in 19/20 and $100,000 in 20/21 was approved in May 2018, in the Long Term Plan (LTP), under the District Drainage account (previously referred to as the...
Flood Response account) for minor capital works (TRIM 180514052798). Therefore an additional $205,000 is requested in the 19/20 Annual Plan.

Attachments:

i. Improving Council’s approach to biodiversity- Report to District Planning and Regulation Committee, 11 December 2018. (Trim 181029126064)

ii. Waimakariri ZIPA final recommendations WDC role and funding (Excel spreadsheet, Trim 181207145168)

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 181217148924.

(b) Adopts Option 2 presented in this report for consultation as part of the 19/20 Annual Plan. This is primarily for WDC to provide an education/advisor role, with a limited coordination role for ZIPA implementation. A primary leadership role in implementation is to taken by Environment Canterbury and/or other agencies.

(c) Approves the funding of Option 2: Implementation of the ZIPA at an additional cost of $205,000 for 19/20 and 20/21 from the general rates, for inclusion in the Draft Annual Plan.

(d) Notes $100,000 per annum for 19/20 and 20/21 for ZIPA Implementation has already been approved from the District Drainage account in the Long Term Plan, which is funded from the general rates.

(e) Notes Option 2 funding would bring the total ZIPA implementation funding to a total of $305,000 per year for the 2019-21 financial years. Option 2 additional funding includes primarily creation of the role of a WDC Biodiversity Officer, who would have a dual role i.e. also implementation of biodiversity regulations under the WDC District Plan.

(f) Notes that WDC will continue an existing leadership role for drainage maintenance, urban waterway education and monitoring, and stockwater race management (ZIPA Recommendations 1.4 (j),1.14, 1.25 and 4.12.)

(g) Endorses WDC approaching Environment Canterbury to discuss an agreement mechanism, which could include a Memorandum of Understanding, in which WDC would receive funding for ZIPA implementation, if a targeted rate for Waimakariri ZIPA implementation was under consideration, or levied, by Environment Canterbury.

(h) Endorses a review within two years of the ZIPA funding allocation and resourcing, in line with Long Term Plan and Annual Budget processes, to reassess the role of the Council and whether ZIPA objectives are being met.

(i) Notes that a report on the governance and operational structure for the on-going implementation of the ZIPA will be presented to Council before the end of this Financial Year.

(j) Circulates this report to Community Boards and Waimakariri Water Zone Committee.

3. BACKGROUND

Role of WDC in freshwater management

3.1. The Resource Management Act (RMA, 1991) defines the roles of Regional Councils and Territorial Authorities in regards to freshwater management. Both authorities have a role, which could be argued to be overlapping in the legislation. A function of the Territorial
Authority is ‘the establishment, implementation, and review of objectives, policies, and methods to achieve integrated management of the effects of the use, development, or protection of land and associated natural and physical resources of the district’, as well as ‘the control of any actual or potential effects of the use, development, or protection of land, including for the purpose of the maintenance of indigenous biological diversity’ (Section 31). The RMA states that it is the function of the Regional Authority ‘to control the use of land for the purpose of the maintenance and enhancement of ecosystems in water bodies’ (Section 30).

3.2. The National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management (NPS-FM, amended in 2017), states it is the role of Regional Councils to maintain or improve water quality within Freshwater Management Units (FMU). The NPS-FM is currently under review, with an amended version due in 2020. This latest amendment is examining the inclusion of urban contaminants management, such as copper and zinc, which could be potentially a role of Territorial Authorities as well as Regional Councils.

3.3. For this report, the 3 Waters has led internal WDC discussions with Policy and Strategy (Geoff Meadows and Veronica Spittal), Development Planning Unit (Shelley Milosavljevic), and Green Space (Chris Brown) regarding the role of WDC, and implementation of the ZIPA, particularly regarding the protection and enhancement of indigenous biodiversity.

ZIPA Development

3.4. The Canterbury Water Management Strategy (CWMS) Waimakariri Zone Committee developed a Zone Implementation Programme in 2011, and has now, after both extensive consideration of the best available science and extensive consultation with the public, developed an addendum (ZIPA). This ZIPA, or alternatively named the Waimakariri Land and Water Solutions Package, with both statutory and non-statutory recommendations for action, is aimed at setting water quantity and water quality limits to improve the condition of fresh water resources in the Zone.

3.5. The Waimakariri Water Zone Committee approved the final ZIPA on the 19 November 2018. WDC Council approved the ZIPA on the 4 December 2018, and Environment Canterbury (Canterbury Regional Council) approved the ZIPA on the 13 December 2018.

3.6. The ZIPA Recommendations are divided into five chapters:
   3.6.1. Improving Stream Health;
   3.6.2. Protecting and Enhancing Indigenous Biodiversity;
   3.6.3. Reducing Nitrates;
   3.6.4. Managing Surface water – Flows and Allocations;
   3.6.5. Managing Groundwater – Allocations.

3.7. The ZIPA chapters with the majority of Recommendations for WDC are ‘Improving Stream Health’ and ‘Protecting and Enhancing Indigenous Biodiversity. For example, there is a specific Recommendation regarding increasing resourcing of WDC biodiversity capability and capacity (Recommendation 2.2).

Wider Biodiversity Considerations

3.8. The national policy context for indigenous biodiversity is under review, with the current development of a new national biodiversity strategy and a draft National Policy Statement on Indigenous Biodiversity (NPS-IB).
3.9. The Canterbury Biodiversity Strategy, released in 2008, established a strategic approach to biodiversity in the region, with a vision to protect, maintain and restore Canterbury’s indigenous biodiversity. The 19 signatories include Environment Canterbury, eight district councils (including WDC), two central government departments, Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu, and others. The Strategy sets out a series of goals and targets that aim to halt the decline of biodiversity across the region. This strategy is currently undergoing a refresh, with support sought for this from the Mayoral Forum.

3.10. The Development Planning Unit (Shelley Milosavljevic) reviewed the Council approach to biodiversity in a report to the District Planning and Regulation Committee on 11 December 2018 (TRIM 181029126064). There are wider considerations for biodiversity, under the current and draft District Plans, such as terrestrial biodiversity, that were addressed in that report. Tool 3 in the December biodiversity report identified the role for a Biodiversity Officer, which is allowed for in Options 2 and 3 of this ZIPA implementation funding report.

4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

4.1. With adoption of the ZIPA by Council, the status quo role of the WDC and funding for freshwater management is required to be reviewed by WDC staff to ensure its successful implementation. Three options are presented here; Options 1, 2, and 3. Note that the Option 1 could be considered as the status quo, due to funding already allocated from the Drainage budget within the Long Term Plan process in 19/20 and 20/21.

4.2. No prioritisation or ranking is given between the ZIPA Recommendations. Therefore, the Recommendations that are funded in each Option is based on WDC staff assessment of relative priorities.

4.3. WDC will continue to lead for certain Recommendations that are currently led by WDC; namely 1.14: drainage maintenance in WDC areas, 1.4 (j) and 1.25: education and monitoring of urban stormwater, and 4.12 changes to the stockwater race network.

Option 1

4.4. Option 1: WDC would take on primarily an educator and advisor role, with existing staffing resources, and limited CAPEX projects. This option does not require additional funding as $100,000 per annum for 19/20 and 20/21 for ZIPA Implementation has been approved from the District Drainage account in the Long Term Plan.

4.5. These proposed CAPEX projects are:

4.5.1. Fish passage projects, such as possible weir remediation and trout barrier installation, $20,000 (Recommendation 1.8).

4.5.2. Drainage maintenance for instream and biodiversity values in particular, such as habitat creation of riffles and pools, $20,000 (Recommendation 1.14).

4.5.3. Fencing and amenity improvements along waterways on WDC land (e.g. walkway creation) and biodiversity works, $40,000 (Recommendation 1.26).

4.5.4. Tidal planting on the Kaiapoi River for earthquake effects mitigation, $10,000 (Recommendation 1.27).

4.5.5. Īnanga (whitebait) spawning area development, $10,000 (Recommendation 2.11).

Option 2

4.6. Option 2: WDC would coordinate partial implementation of the ZIPA, however leadership would sit with Environment Canterbury and other agencies, at a total cost to WDC of...
$305,000 per annum. This comprises the existing $100,000 allocation along with an additional $205,000 of new funding.

4.7. Option 2 includes projects in Option 1, plus the additional projects listed below:

4.7.1. A review report on drainage maintenance practices (both chemical and physical) and recommendations for improvements, $10,000 (Recommendation 1.7).

4.7.2. Urban waterway education and publication creation, $20,000 (Recommendation 1.25).

4.7.3. Fencing and amenity improvements along waterways on WDC land (e.g. walkway creation) and biodiversity works, an additional $30,000 (Recommendation 1.26).

4.7.4. Biodiversity Officer role creation and overheads, $110,000 (Recommendation 2.2).

4.7.5. Report on incorporating climate change impacts on indigenous biodiversity, $10,000 (Recommendation 2.4).

4.7.6. Ecological support for staff and contractors e.g. for survey work, $10,000 (Recommendation 2.5).

4.7.7. Water quality testing in private wells (i.e. for nitrate) – partial programme support only, and production of guidance information for well-owners, $10,000 (Recommendation 3.16).

4.7.8. Technical guidance of well depth and well head security to provide better water quality protection, $5,000 (Recommendation 3.17).

4.8. Option 2 would provide a substantial commitment from the Waimakariri District Council to the implementation of the ZIPA. There would be increased benefits, including provision of biodiversity capability and capacity, through a Biodiversity Officer, that could be utilised across many departments, such as Greenspace, Utilities and Roading, Development Planning Unit and Plan Implementation Unit.

4.9. The Biodiversity Officer role would help to build relationships with landowners and public by providing advice and support. The Biodiversity Officer would be able to work across Council departments to support biodiversity initiatives, and also coordinate efforts with relevant agencies to raise the profile of Biodiversity. This would also have the potential to generate funding (for example via applications to Central Government), with the potential to fast track a number of already existing biodiversity initiatives on Council land and provide additional resource to implement new initiatives.

4.10. The WDC Biodiversity Officer role is intended to complement, not supersede current biodiversity resourcing, such as the Environment Canterbury Biodiversity Officer role for the Waimakariri Zone. With this intent, the functions to be carried out by the role on behalf of the WDC Council would be clearly defined.

4.11. Part of the Biodiversity Officer role would be active monitoring of Significant Natural Areas (SNAs). To date, without this monitoring, there has been a decline and loss in these areas as outlined in the December 2018 report (TRIM 181029126064) to the District Planning and Regulation Committee.

Option 3

4.12. Option 3 WDC would coordinate implementation of the ZIPA, however leadership would sit with Environment Canterbury and other agencies, at a total cost to WDC of $705,000 per annum.
4.13. Option 3 includes projects in Options 1 and 2, plus the additional projects listed below:

4.13.1. Catchment management plan partial funding, $50,000 (Recommendation 1.1).

4.13.2. Enhanced urban stream monitoring, $20,000 (Recommendation 1.4).

4.13.3. Fish passage projects, such as possible weir remediation and trout barrier installation, an additional $20,000 (Recommendation 1.8).

4.13.4. Drainage maintenance for instream and biodiversity values, such as habitat creation of riffles and pools, $20,000 (Recommendation 1.14).

4.13.5. Education and guidance for landowners on riparian setbacks and planting on drains and waterways managed by WDC, $10,000 (Recommendation 1.18).

4.13.6. Support implementation, as required for Territorial Authorities, of the National Environmental Standard for Plantation Forestry, such as on WDC forestry land and working with the wider forestry sector to identify, and mitigate, high-risk periods for earthworks and harvesting, $20,000 (Recommendation 1.19).

4.13.7. Water quality and biodiversity projects in the Upper Ashley / Rakahuri catchment, including Lees Valley, for example of any Significant Natural Areas and wetland protection, $20,000 (Recommendation 1.24).

4.13.8. Urban waterway education and publication creation, an additional $20,000 (Recommendation 1.25).

4.13.9. Fencing and amenity improvements along waterways on WDC land (e.g. walkway creation) and biodiversity works, an additional $60,000 (Recommendation 1.26).

4.13.10. Water Environment Advisor role expansion (1 FTE role creation) and overheads $130,000 (Recommendation 2.2).

4.13.11. Waimakariri Biodiversity Action Plan (partial support for development), $10,000 (Recommendation 2.3).

4.13.12. Provision of support, such as administrative support, coordination with WDC and technical advice, to community groups, $20,000 (Recommendation 2.8).

4.13.13. Publication of education material for landowners regarding biodiversity, $10,000 (Recommendation 2.9).

4.14. Option 3 would provide comprehensive support for the WDC toward the implementation of the Zone Committee recommendations. The benefits from the additional Option 3 funded items include those listed in Option 2 along with a number of other benefits. With a Biodiversity Officer and two Water Environment Advisors the WDC would have dedicated capacity and capability to carry out further initiatives.

4.15. The December 2018 biodiversity report to the District Planning and Regulation Committee (TRIM 181029126064) identified the need to take a strategic approach to the taking of esplanades and the management of them in order to provide for the opportunity ecological corridors and enhanced biodiversity values. Option 3 would provide significant resourcing ($60,000 per annum) to enable this.

4.16. Option 3 would also provide partial support for implementation planning such as Catchment Management Plans and the Waimakariri Biodiversity Action Plan.

Additional funding considerations

4.17. Option 4, for the full implementation of the ZIPA recommendations relevant to WDC, is not presented in this report, however has been estimated at a cost of around $1 million/year for WDC.
4.18. Options 2 and/or 3 could be progressed only on the condition of an enduring MOU with Environment Canterbury for funding, for example through an Environment Canterbury targeted rate for the District. The intention of this would be to minimise rate increases for ratepayers long-term. A funding MOU has not been explored as a possibility with Environment Canterbury to-date, and is recommended in this report for WDC to progress.

Staff resourcing

4.19. For Option 1, there are with current staff resources within 3 Waters, Planning, Policy and Greenspace. However, dedicated staff resourcing for implementation of ZIPA recommendations would only be available through the Water Environment Advisor role, within the 3 Waters team. Option 2 maintains current staff resources within 3 Waters, Planning, and Policy teams. Dedicated staff resourcing for implementation of ZIPA recommendations would continue to be through the Water Environment Advisor role, and with creation of a Biodiversity Officer role, recommended to sit within the Green Space team. The creation of this position is supported by ZIPA recommendation 2.2 (c). It is recommended for Green Space and 3 Waters teams to coordinate closely, to ensure clarity of roles and responsibilities.

4.20. The proposed Biodiversity Officer role would be a permanent full-time contract commencing after 1 July 2019. The funding for the Biodiversity Officer, requiring a qualified and experienced ecologist, with organisational overheads and costs would be in the order of approximately $110,000 per annum. After discussion within WDC Departments, the Biodiversity Officer is recommended to sit within the Green Space team.

4.21. A Biodiversity Officer role has also been proposed by the Development Planning Team (TRIM 181029126064) for responsibilities under the District Plan, namely protection and monitoring of Significant Natural Areas, and coordination with other agencies, such as Environment Canterbury and the Department of Conservation. It is recommended that the Biodiversity Officer is a suitably trained ecologist, for capacity to be able to carry out monitoring of SNAs. These role functions align well with functions to implement the ZIPA. The apportionment of this role to District Plan functions and ZIPA implementation is recommended to be 50:50.

4.22. Option 3 proposes the extension of the Water Environment Advisor role from 1 full-time equivalent (FTE) to 2 FTE. This second FTE would be a permanent full-time contract commencing after 1 July 2019. The funding for the role, with organisational overheads and costs, would be in the order of approximately $130,000 per annum. This additional Water Environment Advisor is recommended to sit within the 3 Waters team.

4.23. The Management Team have reviewed this report and support the recommendations. Noting that the Council has the discretion to decide what is the appropriate level of funding, and subsequently how much commitment WDC should provide to the ZIPA implementation.

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. Groups and Organisations

5.1.1. The Waimakariri Water Zone Committee (WWZC) drafted the ZIPA through a collaborative process with appointed community members. Though there was not always agreement, a consensus viewpoint was reached, which was adopted as the final ZIPA by the WWZC.

5.2. Wider Community
5.2.1. The ZIPA version that was released for public feedback in September 2018 has been amended by the Zone Committee in relation to a range of matters raised in feedback from the public including minimum flows, target dates for achieving reduction in nitrates to groundwater, and improving stream health.

5.2.2. The community has shown strong support for protecting and enhancing biodiversity in the Waimakariri District via the District Development Strategy and District Plan Review 'Issues and Options' consultation feedback in 2017.

6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1. Financial Implications

6.1.1. $100,000 per annum for two years (19/20 and 20/21) has already been allocated in the Long Term Plan process. Funding for each Option is per annum (to be adjusted for inflation) under the end of the Canterbury Water Management Strategy in 2040. See Table 1 for the rating impact for each Option.

6.1.2. Table 1: Rates impact of funding options 1-3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Option 1 (default option already allowed for in the LTP)</th>
<th>Option 2 (recommended option)</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost per annum</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$305,000</td>
<td>$715,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in rates for the average rateable property per annum (incl. GST)</td>
<td>$4.51</td>
<td>$13.77</td>
<td>$32.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rates increase (based on FY19 rates)</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>0.35%</td>
<td>1.04%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2. Community Implications

6.2.1. Option 1 & 2: There will be more visible WDC restoration projects, such as īnanga spawning area improvement and for fish passage, which will improve ecosystem values, and increase awareness of biodiversity issues in the District.

6.2.2. Option 3: There will be significantly visible WDC restoration projects. There would be more support available from the Council, such as ZIPA implementation planning, educational materials and technical advice, particularly for indigenous biodiversity for landowners with water bodies on, or bordering, their properties.

6.2.3. There would be a sustained increase from 19/20 onwards in rates for the ratepayer, either through a targeted Environment Canterbury rate and/or a WDC general rate increase.

6.3. Risk Management

6.3.1. The legislative framework for freshwater management and biodiversity is in a transitional phase, with current drafting of a National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity, and also further amendments to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management. With this shifting environment, it is therefore recommended to plan for the implementation of the ZIPA only in the short term, with a review after two years.
6.3.2. The is a risk that increased funding by WDC for ZIPA implementation may lead to an unintentional consequence of decreased funding and resources allocation by other agencies. This risk has been mitigated, for example, by the adoption of the ZIPA by Environment Canterbury Council, however should continue to be actively mitigated with inter-agency discussions and clear definition of roles and responsibilities of each agency.

6.3.3. There is a risk, through lack of financial investment that the ZIPA will not be implemented sufficiently for freshwater outcomes to be met, after much planning investment by community members, Environment Canterbury and WDC staff. Example of objectives that might not be met include protection and enhancement of mahinga kai species and restoration of special places such as the Cam River.

6.4. **Health and Safety**

6.4.1. The creation of the new role of WDC Biodiversity Officer could raise health and safety considerations, such as fieldwork in remote areas, which are addressed by the existing WDC ‘Safe Working in the Field’ manual.

7. **CONTEXT**

7.1. **Policy**

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

7.2. **Legislation**


7.2.2. National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management (2011, with amendments in 2014 and 2017) outlines the process for setting community objectives for freshwater (i.e. the National Objectives Framework) and sets National Bottom Lines for water quality attributes.

7.2.3. New Zealand Biodiversity Strategy (2000, currently under review) and National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity (in draft) set the policy framework for biodiversity management in New Zealand.

7.3. **Community Outcomes**

There is a healthy and sustainable environment for all

7.3.1. Harm to the environment from the impacts of land use, use of water resources and air emissions is minimised.

7.3.2. Cultural values relating to water are acknowledged and respected.

7.3.3. The demand for water is kept to a sustainable level.

7.3.4. Harm to the environment from the spread of contaminants into ground water and surface water is minimised.

There are areas of significant indigenous vegetation and habitats for indigenous fauna

7.3.5. Conservation and restoration of significant areas of vegetation and/or habitats is encouraged.

Public spaces and facilities are plentiful, accessible and high quality

7.3.6. People enjoy clean water at our beaches, rivers and lakes.
7.3.7. There is a wide variety of public places and spaces to meet people’s needs.
7.3.8. There are wide-ranging opportunities for people to enjoy the outdoors.

7.4. **Delegations**

7.4.1. The Council has delegation to include service level budget provision in the Draft Annual Plan.
1. SUMMARY

This report: (a) outlines options for how Council could improve its approach to maintaining the Waimakariri District’s indigenous biodiversity. It sets out the context for this, the current approach taken by Council, and the various tools that could be used to improve this current approach (including benefits and costs of each) and form a Council biodiversity management programme.

(b) Provides background for the Committee to consider and give direction on the options it would like further investigated (and included in the budgetary considerations as part of the Annual Plan process) in order to improve the Council’s approach to biodiversity.

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Committee:

(a) Receives report No. 181029126064.

(b) Endorses the approach of continuing to protect Significant Natural Areas as part of the District Plan Review.

(c) Endorses staff to further consider regulatory approaches to protecting and enhancing indigenous biodiversity (within and outside of Significant Natural areas) as part of the District Plan Review.

(d) Notes that national and regional policy in relation to indigenous biodiversity is likely subject to significant change and the Council’s role and resourcing in this area will likely be subject to external direction in coming years.

(e) Notes that the full impact of the Waimakariri Water Zone Committee Zone Implementation Programme Addendum (ZIPA) has yet to be assessed and will require consideration beyond Draft 2019/20 Annual Plan preparation in January 2019.

(f) Notes that subject to consideration and direction from the Committee on the non-regulatory tools it wishes to be investigated further, staff will bring another report in January 2019 for Annual Plan budgetary purposes.
3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1 A number of reports have indicated that, similar to the rest of New Zealand, the District's indigenous vegetation and habitat for fauna has been significantly destroyed or modified over time and what is left is potentially threatened.

3.2 The community showed strong support for protecting and enhancing the Waimakariri District's biodiversity via during the draft District Development Strategy (DDS) and District Plan Review 'Issues and Options' consultation in 2017.

3.3 Section 6(c) of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) requires the ‘protection of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna’ as a matter of national importance. Section 31(1)(b)(iii) states a function of territorial authorities includes ‘the control of any actual or potential effects of the use, development, or protection of land, including for the purpose of the maintenance of indigenous biological diversity’.

3.4 A proposed National Policy Statement on Indigenous Biodiversity (NPS IB) was released in October 2018 and sets out a policy framework to significantly improve current approaches to maintaining indigenous biodiversity. Consultation is planned for mid to late 2019, with the NPS IB expected to come into effect in March 2020. District Plan’s must give effect to national policy statements. The release of the proposed NPS IB indicates that indigenous biodiversity is a matter of national significance that must be addressed by Councils. The draft NPS IB contains relatively detailed objectives and policies that aim to maintain indigenous biodiversity while recognising the kaitiaki role of Māori with indigenous biodiversity management.

3.5 Environment Canterbury is gearing up as an organisation to improve biodiversity, making it one of its top priorities. The Canterbury Biodiversity Strategy (which WDC is a signatory to) is currently being reviewed, with particular focus on the implementation plan. An updated version is expected in late 2019. Throughout the Waimakariri District, Environment Canterbury has a number of biosecurity projects underway, along with the ‘Immediate Steps’ programme which involves a range of biodiversity projects. Relevant objectives of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement 2013 (CRPS) include halting the decline of Canterbury’s ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity, restoration or enhancement of ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity, and protection of significant indigenous vegetation and habitats. The Waimakariri District Plan must give effect to the CRPS.

3.6 The Waimakariri Water Zone Committee released the draft ZIPA in September 2018. Following consideration of public comments, a final version was released on 8 December 2018. A number of non-regulatory initiatives for protecting and enhancing indigenous biodiversity are included, which WDC will be involved in implementing. Note that this report does not outline the relevant biodiversity initiatives in the final version of the ZIPA as it was released after the agenda for this report was published.

---


4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

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

4.2. There are a number of regulatory and non-regulatory mechanisms available to help achieve Council’s function of maintaining indigenous biodiversity. Table 1 below outlines the various mechanisms that form Council’s current approach to maintaining biodiversity.

Table 1: Council’s current approach to biodiversity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tool</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Waimakariri District Plan</strong></td>
<td>There are currently 111 Significant Natural Areas (SNAs) listed in the operative District Plan (called ‘Vegetation &amp; Habitat Sites’). These areas were listed by landowners voluntarily. The District Plan has rules that restrict the reduction of vegetation cover, earthworks, planting, access tracks and the reduction of the health and abundance of certain rare plants within SNAs. There are also general rules regarding the clearance of indigenous vegetation anywhere in the district. A review of the District Plan's effectiveness in 2016 indicated that most monitoring relating to SNAs was not carried out, primarily due to resourcing constraints. As part of the District Plan Review process, aerial photos were reviewed in early 2018 to identify which SNAs were still present. This exercise showed that four sites had clearly disappeared. Site V117 which was cleared by Netherland Holdings Ltd; whom WDC prosecuted in the Environment Court. The three other sites (V103, V116 and V137) have been passed on to Council Compliance &amp; Enforcement Team to investigate. A total of 62 sites were selected where it was unclear whether the site was still there in its entirety. These 62 sites are being reviewed by ecologists at present. The remaining 45 SNA sites, which aerial photos showed to clearly be still present, will be rolled over into the new District Plan. The District Plan also has rules allowing Council to take (if it wishes) esplanades strips or reserves during subdivision from land adjoining ‘priority waterbodies’ or from created lots less than 4ha adjoining rivers with a width of at least 3m wide. Esplanades can be taken for a range of purposes including the protection of conservation values. A strategic approach to the taking of esplanades and the management of them is needed in order to better provide for the opportunity of ecological corridors and enhanced biodiversity values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Regulatory)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northern Pegasus Bay</strong></td>
<td>Restricts certain activities (e.g. 4WD vehicles) thereby protecting biodiversity values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bylaw</strong> (Regulatory)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contestable Fund</strong></td>
<td>Contestable funding of $15,500/year for District Plan listed ‘Vegetation and Habitat’ sites (SNAs), Heritage Items and Notable Plants (protected trees). Current balance of account is $143,679. Changed to discretionary fund in June 2017. Not actively publicised however will be soon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Non-regulatory)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Council-Community partnership planting** | • Taranaki Reserve – native stream side plantings ($2k per year).  
  • Kaiapoi Lakes – minor additional native plantings.  
  • Kaiapoi Regeneration area – Honda Forest will commence planting next autumn. Total of 15,400 native seedlings to be planted in Honda |
### Initiatives (Non-regulatory)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tool</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Forest (additional to the retention basin plantings being undertaken by the Council 3 Waters team). | - Pegasus Bay dune plantings – minor areas planted to encourage dune stabilisation.  
- Te Kohaka o Tuaitara Trust - plantings along Tuhaitara Trail including areas of pines recently harvested.  
- Silverstream - Matariki Tu Rakau (Te Uru Rakau Forestry NZ) 660 kanuka planted in 2018 to have enrichment plantings once established. Also Million Metres Streams Project raised $20k for 1.5ha of riparian planting.  
- Whites Road (ex-quarry) – school planting project. |

| Enviroschools (Non-regulatory) | Involves a sustainability education programme. There are 16 Enviroschools within the Waimakariri District. Council is a funding partner. |

| Drain management biodiversity considerations (Non-regulatory) | Incorporating stream/drain bank planting, along with methods for drain cleaning that reduce impact on instream fauna, into Council’s lowland streams and drain maintenance work. |

4.3. As shown in Table 1, there are a number of mechanisms in place at Council to maintain biodiversity however given the indications that biodiversity is declining, they are clearly not sufficient to address the biodiversity challenge. These current mechanisms form a good basis for maintaining biodiversity so should be continued, provided they are deemed to be working as effectively as possible. Additional regulatory and non-regulatory tools are recommended to enhance the effectiveness of Council’s approach to maintaining biodiversity and better meet statutory obligations.

4.4. Table 2 below outlines additional regulatory and non-regulatory tools for consideration, which could be used to improve Council’s approach to maintaining and enhancing biodiversity.
Table 2: Additional regulatory and non-regulatory tools to improve biodiversity for consideration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tool</th>
<th>Costs &amp; Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. District Plan incentives (Regulatory)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Provide development bonus incentives such as a bonus lot of any size (so could be below the zone’s minimum lot size for subdivision) with opportunity to build a dwelling on the created lot for:  
- Protection (legal and physical) of an SNA;  
- Enhancement and protection (legal and physical) of an SNA; or  
- Enhancement of an area within an ‘Ecological Corridor Priority Area’ or other such identified area.  
Ecological management or enhancement plans would be required. | **Benefits:**  
- Help to switch the perception of SNAs being a burden to being an asset.  
- Biodiversity gains.  
- Encourages protection of remnants which is a top priority.  
- Bonus lot provisions could help increase property values.  
**Costs:**  
- Potential for fragmentation of rural areas, and increased density (effects on character, servicing, transport, rural settlement patterns) however this would be on a very small scale.  
- Introduction of domestic pets that could predate on native fauna.  
- Monitoring requirements (regularised monitoring would be required e.g. by a Council Biodiversity Officer) and the fact that the biodiversity benefit needs ongoing monitoring while the bonus lot incentive is one-off.  
- Changes in land ownership can bring issues with ongoing management requirements. |
| **2. Require ecological protection or enhancement as resource consent conditions (Regulatory)** |  |
| Either via direct resource consent conditions, covenants, consent notices or bonds where possible to do so (conditions must relate to managing the effects of an activity). | **Benefits:**  
- Applicant funded.  
**Costs:**  
- Monitoring requirements. |
| **3. Council Biodiversity Officer (Non-regulatory)** |  |
| Key functions would be:  
- Working with landowners (particularly landowners of SNAs) to educate them on biodiversity values and management practices.  
- Coordinating efforts with other agencies (ECan, DoC, QEII, Forest & Bird etc)  
- Providing general support and advice to the public regarding protecting and enhancing biodiversity values. | **Benefits:**  
- Build relationships with landowners and the public by providing advice and support.  
- Coordinated efforts with relevant agencies.  
- Raise profile of biodiversity.  
- Implement biodiversity initiatives on the ground.  
- Potential to generate more funding (via applications) for protection or enhancement works.  
- Active monitoring of SNAs. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tool</th>
<th>Costs &amp; Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Monitoring SNAs (and any enhanced Ecological Corridor Priority Areas if present). Applying for funding for protection or enhancement works. Undertaking protection works (e.g. fencing) enhancement works (e.g. plantings). | Costs:  
• Full-time, permanent salaried employee.  |

| 4. Funding (additional to contestable fund currently available) (Non-regulatory) | Benefits:  
• Incentivises protection and enhancement works.  
• Encourages good will in the community by rewarding biodiversity efforts.  
Costs:  
• Cost of additional funding.  
• Staff time to administer fund. |

| 5. Rates rebates for landowners with SNAs (Non-regulatory) | Benefits:  
• While the actual rebate may be minimal, it is an effective way of providing an ongoing incentive for protection that provides a more direct linkage.  
• Acknowledges the restrictions landowners face on the use of their land covered by an SNA.  
Costs:  
• Loss of rates on areas of land covered by SNAs. |

| 6. Biodiversity initiatives on Council land (Non-regulatory) | Benefits:  
• Council takes the lead on showing the importance of indigenous biodiversity on its reserves.  
Costs:  
• Some members of the public prefer exotic plantings (e.g. oak trees). |

Examples:
- The coastal strip (administered by Council) between Mean High Water Springs and the Te Kohaka O Tuhaitara Trust land could be actively enhanced with dune plantings.
- Auckland Council has a ‘Design Manual Guide for Parks’ with the following motto: ‘Plants are great, natives are better, eco-sourced is best’.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tool</th>
<th>Costs &amp; Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>plantings (currently Council only restricts 4WD use).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. Council strategy on taking of esplanades in order to prioritise ecological corridor linkages</strong> (Non-regulatory)</td>
<td><strong>Benefits:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish a strategic, district-wide approach to riparian management and ecological linkages. Such a strategy would have the aim of closing gaps, and prioritising esplanades where Council should focus its land purchases when they become available via subdivision, or by working with landowners.</td>
<td><strong>Costs:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8. Council Urban Forest Strategy and/or District wide canopy cover % goal</strong> (Non-regulatory)</td>
<td><strong>Benefits:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9. Council nursery with discounted indigenous plants of local provenance</strong> (Non-regulatory)</td>
<td><strong>Benefits:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10. Community biodiversity initiatives - increased involvement and financial contribution to community projects</strong> (Non-regulatory)</td>
<td><strong>Benefits:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11. Provide free ecological assessments to landowners</strong> (Non-regulatory)</td>
<td><strong>Benefits:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tool</th>
<th>Costs &amp; Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Community 'Biodiversity Awards' (Non-regulatory) to celebrate successes

**Benefits:**
- Celebrates successes.
- Incentivises community initiatives.

**Costs:**
- Cost of awards and associated communications.

---

4.5. **Recommended approach**

Overall, this report recommends that Council improve its overall approach to maintaining indigenous biodiversity through a formal and coordinated biodiversity management programme. Utilising a combination of regulatory and non-regulatory tools is the best way to achieve this.

Improving the role of regulatory tools, such as the District Plan, is important, however this can come with its own set of challenges. Many other territorial authorities do not go this far, however this will likely change when the NPS IB comes into effect. There are broad range of non-regulatory tools available, as outlined in Table 2. If the recommendations of this report are adopted, staff will consider the relative merits of these tools in more detail in order to develop a recommended tool combination that can form a Council biodiversity management programme.

---

5. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

5.1. **Groups and Organisations**

The potential role of a Biodiversity Officer at Council was discussed with Chris Brown, Manager Community & Recreation. It was determined that there would be a wide range of responsibilities for such a position. Possible biodiversity initiatives on Council reserves were also discussed.

The role of regulatory and non-regulatory tools for improving biodiversity was discussed with Chris Keeling, Team Leader Strategy & Planning at Environment Canterbury. Chris emphasised the importance of early engagement with key stakeholders such as Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society and Fish and Game.

5.2. **Wider Community**

As noted above, the community has shown strong support for protecting and enhancing the Waimakariri District's biodiversity via DDS and District Plan Review 'Issues and Options' consultation feedback in 2017.

---

6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**
Once direction is given for what approaches the Committee would like to pursue, the budget implications can be estimated and outlined in a report for January 2019 in order to align with Annual Plan requirements.

It should also be noted that $100,000 per annum for the next three years has been included in the Long Term Plan to assist implementation of the ZIPA.

6.2. Community Implications

The potential implications for the community would be a greater level of protection and enhancement of biodiversity values within the Waimakariri District. However there would potentially be rates increases associated with this. As noted above, the extent of any such increase can be estimated once direction is given on the various additional tools Council would like to pursue.

6.3. Risk Management

There are no risks associated with the recommendations of this report which do not in themselves bind the Council to a changed course of action.

6.4. Health and Safety

There are no health and safety implications associated with the recommendations of this report.

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

As noted above, Section 6(c) & Section 31 of the Resource Management Act 1991 are relevant.

7.3. Community Outcomes

The following community outcomes are relevant to this matter:

- There are areas of significant indigenous vegetation and habitats for indigenous fauna. Conservation and restoration of significant areas of vegetation and/or habitats is encouraged.

7.4. Delegations

The District Planning and Regulation Committee has delegated authority for this matter as it relates to resource management.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Coordinate</th>
<th>Educate and advise</th>
<th>Option 1 Current LTP funding/ per annum (K) 19/20, 20/21</th>
<th>Option 2 Low WDC funding (K)</th>
<th>Option 3 Medium WDC funding (K)</th>
<th>Option 4 High WDC funding (K)</th>
<th>WDC Notes</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>That Environment Canterbury and the Waimakariri District Council support the Waimakariri Water Zone Committee to prioritise catchments and develop at least two Catchment Management Plans per year. These plans will provide specific catchment management goals and actions, priorities and monitoring programmes to support the implementation of ZIP Addendum recommendations.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>All</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>That Environment Canterbury implement a comprehensive waterway monitoring plan for the Waimakariri Water Zone, including: a. Monitoring water quality and ecological health of waterways. b. State of the Takiwā monitoring, including the health and wellbeing of māhinga kai species. c. Measuring diversity and distributions of freshwater fish, invertebrates and aquatic vegetation throughout the zone. d. Identifying critical sources areas and measuring deposited sediment extent and character, particularly in spring-fed plains streams. e. Including important bathing sites in Schedule 6 of the Land and Water Regional Plan and assessing primary recreational water quality at: – Ashley River/Rakahuri at Barge – Ashley River/Rakahuri at Bangira-Lodum Bridge – Ashley River/Rakahuri at State Highway 1 – Kaipara River at Kaipara township – Putorusuke Lake at Motu-Quay – Cam River at Bremley Rd f. Continuing to share information and integrating monitoring programmes between organisations, and promoting community-based monitoring of waterways (citizen science) and education initiatives. g. Investigating the ecosystem health of hill country waterways to identify issues and catchment-specific management options as required. h. Supporting ongoing research into emerging contaminants, including endocrine disruptors, in the Waimakariri Water Zone. i. Investigating tidal waterbodies related to: i. Sediment deposition and soft water intrusion in: – Ashley River/Rakahuri – Saltwater Creek Estuary – Tidal reaches of Kaipara River, Saltwater Creek and Taranaki Creek ii. Aquatic habitat shifts associated with climate change and sea level rise, including changes in inanga spawning areas. j. Monitoring water quality and ecological health in urban streams and rivers in conjunction with Waimakariri District Council.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>(j) only Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3 Waters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>That Environment Canterbury and Waimakariri District Council investigate the impact of commercial forestry practices and wilding pines on downstream freshwater ecosystems.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y?</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 Waters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>That Environment Canterbury, Waimakariri District Council, and Ngāi Tūāhuriri review the waterway management and maintenance methods used in the Zone. The review which should be publicly reported, would include: a. Preparation of an inventory of the main methods, including chemicals and mechanical methods, used by public and private land and water managers in the Zone; b. The findings of recent work by EPA, MPI or other relevant New Zealand organisations reviewing the potential effects of the listed chemicals on waterway ecosystem health and of other methods; c. An assessment of the risk to soil biodiversity and waterway ecosystem health in the Zone from use of chemicals or other methods.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 Waters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>That Environment Canterbury, Waimakariri District Council, and Ngāi Tūāhuriri review the waterway management and maintenance methods used in the Zone. The review which should be publicly reported, would include: a. Preparation of an inventory of the main methods, including chemicals and mechanical methods, used by public and private land and water managers in the Zone; b. The findings of recent work by EPA, MPI or other relevant New Zealand organisations reviewing the potential effects of the listed chemicals on waterway ecosystem health and of other methods; c. An assessment of the risk to soil biodiversity and waterway ecosystem health in the Zone from use of chemicals or other methods.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 Waters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- Need to scope cost and scope of Catchment Management Plans First before funding.
| 1.8 | That Environment Canterbury, Waimakariri District Council, Department of Conservation, Fish and Game, and Ngāi Tūāhuriri review the presence and effects of barriers to indigenous and introduced fish migration on waterways in the Zone in consultation with stakeholders and land owners. The review should:
   a. Identify locations where there are barriers to migrating indigenous fish and salmonids
   b. Consider the purpose of specific barriers (e.g. tidal control, fixed management, drainage)
   c. Determine and prioritise options for removing or retrofitting barriers appropriate to different species at specific sites.
   N Y Y 20 0 20 0 3 Waters Fish passage projects e.g. Trout barrier on North North Brook, Hunter River at Boundary Road weir |
| 1.14 | That Environment Canterbury and Waimakariri District Council ensure waterway management and maintenance activities minimise contaminant losses to downstream waterbodies and loss of aquatic life, while maintaining flood carrying capacity.
   N Y Y 20 0 20 0 3 Waters WDC under waterway consent. Funding for habitat creation, animal salvage works, erosion and sediment controls above BAU. ECan lead as the
| 1.18 | That Environment Canterbury and the Waimakariri District Council support landowners with education and guidance on appropriate riparian set-back distances and plantings for different situations.
   N Y 0 0 10 0 3 Waters Publication material production and printing provided by ECan. BAU with 70 hours Water Environment Advisor / Biodiversity Officer |
| 1.19 | That Environment Canterbury and Waimakariri District Council work with forestry sector and MPI to:
   a. Identify high risk periods over the next 5 years when earthworks and harvesting will take place within the Waimakariri Water Zone.
   b. Ensure that implementation of the NES is effective within the Zone. N Y Y 0 0 20 0 Planning?
| 1.22 | That Environment Canterbury and the Waimakariri District Council recognize the Ashley River/Rakahuri for its important natural landscape values, braided river characteristics, and braided river bird (nesting and feeding) habitat.
   N Y Y 0 0 0 0 0 External Through Biodiversity Officer role with 30 hours/year? Braided river work currently funded by ECan. WDC Bylaw through Policy and Planning to
| 1.25 | That Environment Canterbury and Waimakariri District Council support projects that have enduring benefits for improved stream health, Ngāi Tūāhuriri values, and improved recreational amenity in the North Waimakariri River tributaries.
   Y Y Y 0 20 20 30 All Fencing, walkways on WDC land. Biodiversity and stream health projects |
<p>| 1.26 | That Environment Canterbury and the Waimakariri District Council investigate options to fund plants for riparian or wetland planting on land managed in accordance with an FEP or a Management Plan. (see also Rec 2.9) N N Y Y 30 0 0 0 3 Waters Support Environment Canterbury to find funding could be external funding.|
| 2.1 | The zone committee recommends that Environment Canterbury and the Waimakariri District Council work with Ngāi Tūāhuriri, landowners, and stakeholders to integrate indigenous biodiversity into a whole of waterway, Ni Uta ki Tai, approach to managing catchments in the Waimakariri Water Zone. N Y Y 0 0 0 0 Planning Captured in District Plan and Catchment Management Plans |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.2</th>
<th>The Waimakariri Water Zone Committee endorses and supports the implementation of the Canterbury Regional Biodiversity Strategy as it applies in the Waimakariri Water Zone. In particular: a. The zone committee recommends that Environment Canterbury support the appointment of a regional co-ordinator for the Canterbury Regional Biodiversity Strategy. b. The zone committee recommends that Environment Canterbury ensure Waimakariri District Council increase its biodiversity capability and capacity. c. The zone committee recommends that Waimakariri District Council increase its biodiversity capability and capacity.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y (c) only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 X Biodiversity Officer at 80k/yr plus 30k overheads, 1 X Water Environment Advisor (new role) at 90k plus 40k overheads</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.3</th>
<th>The zone committee recommends implementing the Canterbury Biodiversity Strategy, at the water zone level, with a Waimakariri Biodiversity Action Plan to enable the following actions:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No support for Waimakariri Biodiversity Action Plan until scoped further?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.4</th>
<th>That Environment Canterbury and the Waimakariri District Council consider climate change and sea level rise impacts on indigenous biodiversity in the Waimakariri Water Zone.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget for reporting. BAU with Water Environment Advisor/ Biodiversity Officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.5</th>
<th>That Environment Canterbury and Waimakariri District Council integrate indigenous biodiversity and instream ecological values into council’s planning and operational activities, including in work carried out by consultants or contractors.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecology surveys to assist planning and operational. Relates to rec. 1.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.6</th>
<th>That Environment Canterbury and Waimakariri District Council investigate further ways to protect braided river-bed breeding bird habitat and bird populations from the impacts of vehicles.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAU Planning tools e.g. Bylaw</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.7</th>
<th>That Environment Canterbury, Waimakariri District Council and the Department of Conservation work with, and support, Ngāi Tūāhuriri Fenton Reserve Trustees in the Land and Water Solutions Programme project to reconnect coastal ecosystems between the Lower Ashby River/Bakahuri, the estuary and Te Aka Aka Fenton Reserve to provide for mahinga kai benefits for Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support with scope for funding later</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.8</th>
<th>That Environment Canterbury and the Waimakariri District Council work with community groups to address indigenous biodiversity protection and enhancement by means such as:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funded through Rec 1.26 partially already</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.9</th>
<th>That Environment Canterbury and the Waimakariri District Council work with Ngāi Tūāhuriri, Department of Conservation and other agencies to assist landowners/land managers by:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funded through Rec 2.2 already. Publication materials 30K. 70 hours (10K) Water Environment Advisor/ Biodiversity Officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.1</th>
<th>Policy, Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BAU Planning tools e.g. Bylaw</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.2</th>
<th>Policy, Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BAU Planning tools e.g. Bylaw</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.3</th>
<th>Policy, Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BAU Planning tools e.g. Bylaw</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.4</th>
<th>Policy, Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BAU Planning tools e.g. Bylaw</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.5</th>
<th>Policy, Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BAU Planning tools e.g. Bylaw</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.6</th>
<th>Policy, Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BAU Planning tools e.g. Bylaw</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.7</th>
<th>Policy, Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BAU Planning tools e.g. Bylaw</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.8</th>
<th>Policy, Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BAU Planning tools e.g. Bylaw</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.9</th>
<th>Policy, Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BAU Planning tools e.g. Bylaw</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>That Environment Canterbury and the Waimakariri District Council explore consenting options to enable landowners to undertake indigenous biodiversity initiatives including, but not restricted to: • habitat protection and enhancement • wetland creation or restoration • predator control of high value sites • revegetation projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>The zone committee recognises the importance of the tidal reaches of waterways as īnanga habitat and recommends that Environment Canterbury and the Waimakariri District Council support the development of habitat at īnanga spawning sites and riparian planting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>That Environment Canterbury, Waimakariri District Council and Canterbury District Health Board work together to: a. develop a programme for testing and reporting of water quality in private drinking water supply wells, and b. raise awareness of health impacts from high nitrates in drinking water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>Environment Canterbury and Waimakariri District Council should consider provision of guidance and information regarding a minimum depth for new drinking water supply wells and well-head security, to provide better water quality protection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>The Environment Canterbury and Waimakariri District Council explore a funding stream and management structure to deliver the significant improvements in stream health and biodiversity, and māngai kai diversity and abundance for the Waimakariri Water Zone over the next 5-10 years. The notion of Targeted Rating Districts should be explored by Environment Canterbury. Industry and government funding partners should also be sought.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>That Environment Canterbury and Waimakariri District Council engages with small block owners to increase awareness and uptake of good management practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>That Environment Canterbury and the Waimakariri Water Zone Committee support industry groups to provide sector, and catchment-specific support to landowners implementing Good Management Practice (GMP), including: a. sub-catchment groups working to reduce contaminant losses. b. increasing education and awareness of the Farm Environment Plan audit and accreditation process amongst wider community. c. educating and supporting landowners to protect catchment-specific ecological, biodiversity and Ngāi Tūāhuriri values by: - Preparing catchment management plans to implement on-the-ground waterway remediation projects at sites identified as priorities. - Providing workshops in vulnerable hotspots (i.e. high value or high contaminant loss) areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>That Environment Canterbury and the Waimakariri District Council explore a funding stream and management structure to deliver the significant improvements in stream health and biodiversity, and māngai kai diversity and abundance for the Waimakariri Water Zone over the next 5-10 years. The notion of Targeted Rating Districts should be explored by Environment Canterbury. Industry and government funding partners should also be sought.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>That Environment Canterbury engages with small block owners to increase awareness and uptake of good management practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>That Environment Canterbury recommends that ashley estuary (Te Aka Aka) as a taonga within the Waimakariri Water Zone be subject to wider consideration by Environment Canterbury and Waimakariri District Council, given the existing benefits of race losses in diluting nitrate concentrations, and supporting groundwater levels and stream flows.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>That Environment Canterbury work with Ngāi Tūāhuriri and Department of Conservation to identify the locations and types of activities and controls needed to protect the habitat of important indigenous species including but not limited to: • Freshwater crayfish/kōura • Freshwater mussels/kākahi • Lamprey/kanakana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>That Environment Canterbury support catchment management plans that implement on the ground projects targeted at rehabilitating the wetland, freshwater or estuarine habitats of threatened species or species of high value to Ngāi Tūāhuriri.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>That Environment Canterbury support further assessment of the issue of lost ecological and cultural values resulting from waterway realignments for consented and permitted activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>That Environment Canterbury promotes actions that improve bank stabilisation and reduce sediment inputs to spring-fed plains waterways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>That Environment Canterbury strengthens the UWRP rules on stock exclusion to exclude intensively farmed stock from: • All springheads that permanently or intermittently contain water; and • All open drains and other artificial watercourses, (including but not restricted to irrigation canals and water races) with surface water in them that discharge into a stream, river or lake.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>That Environment Canterbury strengthens the UWRP rules on stock exclusion to exclude non-intensively farmed cattle and deer on the plains from: • All waterways and their tributaries, • All springheads that permanently or intermittently contain water; and • All open drains and other artificial watercourses, (including but not restricted to irrigation canals and water races) with surface water in them that discharge into a stream, river or lake.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>That Environment Canterbury educate horse owners to exclude grazing horses from access to waterways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>That Environment Canterbury prioritise on the ground projects for Tarariki Creek, given its significant value to Ngāi Tūāhuriri and proximity to Kaipori PA, particularly those related to: • reducing and removing sources and legacy of deposited fine sediment • improving the quality of habitat for mahi kai species • removing barriers to native fish passage • removal of invasive fish species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>That Environment Canterbury investigate funding for projects to address key environmental issues in consultation with LINZ and Department of Conservation for the Ashley River/Rakahuri, particularly the removal of woody weeds above the confluence with the Oiho River.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>That Environment Canterbury undertake a programme of investigations and monitoring in the Ashley Estuary (Te Aka Aka) to provide information for the deliberations of the working group identified in Rec 2.12 and the group implementing Rec 2.7. The programme should include: • Determination of eutrophication susceptibility. This requires determining the flushing potential, the dilution potential, nutrient inputs and nutrient load susceptibility. • Development and implementation of a programme to assess current trophic state and to monitor trophic state over time (important considerations are location of sites, parameters to be measured, frequency of sampling, seasonality of sampling) • Annual mid-summer broad-scale monitoring to assess the occurrence of macro-algae. • Monthly water quality monitoring for ecosystem health at the site near the estuary mouth. • Five-yearly monitoring of sediment quality at two sites – present site adjacent to Saltwater Creek and downstream from SH1 and a site in proximity to where Tarariki Creek flows into the Ashley Estuary (Te Aka Aka). • Monitoring of zoos and zips from sites in the estuary to assess contaminant levels in shellfish fleets. • Establish stations at various locations in the estuary and begin to monitor sedimentation. • Annual monitoring of the sediments and macrofauna at one site within the estuary. • Baseline surveys of the fish and bird populations of this estuary.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.1 That Environment Canterbury reflect in the Waimakariri section of the Land and Water Regional Plan a staged approach to reduce nitrate losses over time in the Waimakariri Water Zone.

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 Water quality management areas are proposed; a Nitrate Priority Management Area and a Runoff Priority Management Area.

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3 The zone committee recommend that farmers in the Runoff Priority Management Area are not required to achieve beyond Baseline GMP reductions. The expectation is that landowners in this area will focus on minimizing overland flow of contaminants such as sediment, phosphate, nitrate and pathogens.

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4 The Waimakariri Water Zone Committee proposes Baseline GMP as the starting point for nitrate reductions from 1 July 2020 (at the onset of expiry of land use consents). Baseline GMP is the average nitrogen loss rate, estimated by the Farm Portal, for the farming activity carried out during the baseline period of 2009-2013, if operated at good management practice.

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5 Dairy in the Nitrate Priority Management Area should achieve a 15% beyond Baseline GMP reduction by 2020.

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.6 All other consented farming activities in the Nutrient Priority Management Area should achieve a 5% beyond Baseline GMP reduction by 2020.

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.7 The zone committee encourage industry and local authorities to provide incentives to achieve nutrient reductions greater than the recommended reductions in this ZIP Addendum.

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.8 When approved in a Waimakariri plan review process, the nitrate loss reductions in sections 3.5 and 3.6 above should be repeated until:

- a. the nitrate reductions necessary to achieve the plan limits have been met, or
- b. the science information available shows the plan limit is likely to be met in the future without the need for further reductions.

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.9 The zone committee recommends the plan change includes policy criteria that allow for and guide consideration of extensions to the 2030 target date for beyond baseline GMP reductions in exceptional circumstances.

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.10 Investigate and implement a nitrate "floor" to exclude low nitrogen emitters from having to make further reductions in nitrogen loss beyond Baseline GMP within the Nitrate Priority Management Area.

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.11 The Waimakariri Water Zone Permitted Activity winter grazing allowances should be reduced across the whole Waimakariri Water Zone to minimise the potential for further nitrate increases in streams and groundwater. The following winter grazing PA property size thresholds should be implemented:

- Property sizes:
  - Less than 5 ha do not require consent for winter grazing;
  - Between 5 ha and 100ha can use up to 5ha of property for winter grazing without triggering a consent requirement; and
  - Between 100ha and 1,000 ha can use up to 5% of property size for winter grazing without triggering a consent requirement; and
  - Greater than 1,000 ha can use up to 50 ha for winter grazing without triggering a consent requirement.

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.12 That Environment Canterbury runs an education campaign (including workshops) promoting good management practice, and proactively checks progress.

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.13 The zone committee recommends that the Waimakariri sub-region plan boundary in Section 8 of Land and Water Regional Plan is amended to incorporate land bordering the Waimakariri River.

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.14 That Plan Change 5 nutrient allocation zone rules for "red zones" are used as a foundation for managing nutrients across the whole Waimakariri Water Zone, combined with amendments to the permitted activity winter grazing consent thresholds, and additional nitrate loss reductions in the Nitrate Priority Management Area described in other recommendations.

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.15 That Environment Canterbury reflect in the Waimakariri section of the Land and Water Regional Plan the nitrate limits in the drinking water supply wells of Waimakariri-Water Zone as set out in the table below.

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.16 That Environment Canterbury reflect in the Waimakariri section of the Land and Water Regional Plan the nitrate limits in the streams and rivers of the Waimakariri Water Zone as set out in the tables below.

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3.19 | That Environment Canterbury makes sufficient resources available to enable significant improvements to continue to be made in the understanding of the Waimakariri Water Zone groundwater system and its connection with the Christchurch aquifer and spring-fed streams. The outcome of this work should be an updated assessment of the direction of travel and likely future nitrate concentrations provided to the committee, partners and stakeholders in 2025. The key areas for improvement of understanding include:
   a. Lag times between land use change and nitrate concentration changes in wells and spring-fed streams
   b. Past and present rates of nitrate discharge to ground within the zone and trends in nitrate concentrations
   c. Transport pathways between land and key receptors such as spring-fed streams, community water supply wells and the Christchurch aquifer system, so that recharge zones can be defined with more certainty
   d. Nitrate attenuation
   e. The effectiveness of actions (regulatory and non-regulatory) being taken.
   f. Nitrate discharges to Ashley Estuary (Te Aka Aka)
   g. Nitrate concentrations in private water supply wells |

| 3.20 | That Environment Canterbury commences a review of the Waimakariri section of the Land and Water Regional Plan in 2030 to incorporate new information and understanding of:
   - how social, cultural, economic and environmental systems have responded;
   - whether we are on track to meet the plan nitrate limits. |

| 3.21 | That farming land use consents are granted to have common expiry dates to align with plan review steps. |

| 3.22 | That Environment Canterbury works with the Waimakariri community and Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga, to respond accordingly to new information, emerging opportunities and technology, and review the Waimakariri section of the Land and Water Regional Plan at least once every 10 years. |

| 3.23 | That Environment Canterbury continues to work with sector and research groups to encourage the further development and implementation of tools and techniques to reduce nitrate leaching. |

| 3.24 | That the Zone Committee support the investigation and assessment of on-the-ground actions to address nitrate issues (for example, Managed Aquifer Recharge, targeted stream augmentation, woodchip injectors, wetland creation, and water storage), including:
   a. That Environment Canterbury undertake a zone-wide study to assess the feasibility, costs and measures required to implement appropriate actions (to be completed by the end of 2019) to inform the development of sub-catchment management plans.
   b. That the Waimakariri section of the Land and Water Regional Plan should be assessed to ensure that these activities are enabled where appropriate in the Waimakariri Zone. |

| 3.25 | In over-allocated Surface Water Allocation Zones, that Environment Canterbury uses the methods set out in Rec 4.2 to reduce and where possible eliminate the over-allocation by 2032. |
4.2 That Environment Canterbury use the following suite of options to recover over-allocation, prioritising those options which reduce paper allocation:

- a. Prohibit any abstraction, other than for community drinking water supplies; and exception made for only one abstraction permitted per group of water users, where no abstraction for any other use is permitted, for a total of no more than 10% of the maximum available water allocation; or
- b. Reduce the abstraction limit to the minimum amount required to supply community drinking water, and other permitted uses determined by the plan, in the same manner as managed in the High Peak and Waiau irrigated areas, including the Clyde River, for the minimum period of 5 days, and only within the Waimakariri Water Zone.

4.3 That Environment Canterbury apply LWRP requirements for partial restrictions and requires that pro-rata restrictions be applied to all surface water takes, and stream-depleting groundwater takes which require a minimum flow in the zone.

4.4 That Environment Canterbury adopt the methodology for classifying stream-depleting groundwater takes laid out in Schedule 9 of the Land and Water Regional Plan.

4.5 That Environment Canterbury remove B allocation blocks from all spring-fed rivers unless further investigations indicate that sustainable B blocks can be supported.

4.6 That Environment Canterbury extend existing SWAZ and/or introduce new SWAZ to ensure that there are no gaps in the environmental flow regime framework which manages the Waimakariri Water Zone.

4.7 In currently under-allocated catchments, that Environment Canterbury cap the allocation at the currently allocated amount, so no further surface water can be allocated.

4.8 That Environment Canterbury support water users to set up water user groups such that the available water resource can be best managed, particularly in times of restriction.

4.9 Environment Canterbury investigate how takes for community supplies (and, back-up supplies) are incorporated into the allocation block system, such that they do not unnecessarily impact on the reliability of takes by other users.

4.10 The zone committee will prioritise over-allocated catchments in its catchment management plan programme and actively promote the use of non-statutory mitigations to offset the effects of over-allocation.

4.11 That Environment Canterbury ensure:

- a. The Plan Change to section 8 of the Land and Water Regional Plan (Waimakariri) includes policies and rules that adequately address the potential for over-allocation, including consideration of potential impacts of over-allocation; and
- b. Investigations undertaken to the extent required to determine the factors involved in any decision-making with other relevant stakeholders regarding water used in the zone for augmentation purposes.

4.13 The zone committee recommends that Environment Canterbury allocates resources to improve monitoring of permitted surface water irrigation takes for compliance with limits in the Land and Water Regional Plan.
<p>| | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|4.14 | That in any year it chooses within the date range below, Environment Canterbury considers, prioritises and may undertake a review of water permits to align with any revised environmental flow and allocation regime following the Waimakariri plan change becoming operative.  
- Ashley River/Teakahuri Catchment – between 2026 and 2027  
- Northern Waimakariri Tributaries – between 2028 and 2029 | N | N | N | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|4.15 | For the Ashley River/Teakahuri B and C blocks, that Environment Canterbury designate an allocation for mahinga kai enhancement purposes equal to 50% of the water available within the existing block system at plan notification. This allocation would be included in, and subject to, the prevailing management rules for that block (minimum flow and restriction regime). | N | N | N | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|4.16 | That Environment Canterbury adopt the minimum flow and allocation recommendations in Table 4.5 | N | N | N | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| In all zone committee proceedings and documentation, the local naming convention is to be adopted:  
- The term ‘Silvertree River’ will be used to define the section of watercourse from the three streams confluence to the three streams confluence.  
- The term ‘Kaiapoi River’ will be used to define the section of watercourse from the three streams confluence to the Waimakariri River confluence. | N | N | Y | acknowledged | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|4.18 | That Environment Canterbury adopt the minimum flow and allocation recommendations in Table 4.6. | N | N | N | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|4.19 | Environment Canterbury investigate further actions necessary to reverse the degraded features of the water quality and habitat of the ‘Kaiapoi River’ that detract from its vision of being ‘New Zealand’s best Rivertown’. | N | N | N | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|4.20 | Environment Canterbury, along with Ngāi Tūāhuriri, Waimakariri Irrigation Limited and other stakeholders, investigate the potential to create an enduring flow regime for the Cust River. This is to be given effect in the upcoming Waimakariri sub-regional plan change, as part of the minimum flow and allocation recommendations, detailed in Table 4.6, under Para 4.18. The regime would provide for improved stream health and habitat availability, noting that:  
- 230 GLs of allocation from the Waimakariri River is already reserved for such purposes in the Waimakariri River Regional Plan  
- Such a flow regime may result in an increased minimum flow. | N | N | N | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|4.21 | That Environment Canterbury investigate a sustainable B allocation limit for the Cust River prior to plan notification. | N | N | N | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|5.1 | The Waimakariri Water Zone Committee proposes within the Kowai Groundwater Allocation Zone to:  
- Cap the current allocation volume,  
- Allow an extra 10% (based on current allocation volume) for additional groundwater takes that are not stream-depleting and  
- Provide an allocation for the substitution of existing surface water and stream-depleting groundwater takes for non-stream-depleting groundwater, provided the existing take is surrendered and the new groundwater take is abstracted from the same property as the surrendered surface water or stream-depleting groundwater take, and there is no increase in the proposed rate of take or annual volume. | N | N | N | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|5.2 | The Waimakariri Water Zone Committee proposes within the Ashley Groundwater Allocation Zone to:  
- Cap the current allocation volume,  
- Allow an extra 10% (based on current allocation volume) for additional groundwater takes that are not stream-depleting and  
- Provide an allocation for the substitution of existing surface water or stream-depleting groundwater takes for non-stream-depleting groundwater, provided the existing take is surrendered and the new groundwater take is abstracted from the same property as the surrendered surface water or stream-depleting groundwater take, and there is no increase in the proposed rate of take or annual volume. | N | N | N | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
That the Waimakariri Water Zone Committee proposes within the Loburn Groundwater Allocation Zone to:

a. cap the current allocation volume,
b. allow an extra 10% (based on current allocation volume) for additional groundwater takes that are not stream-depleting and
c. provide an allocation for the substitution of existing surface water or stream depleting groundwater takes for non-stream depleting groundwater takes, provided

i. the existing take is surrendered and
ii. the new groundwater take is abstracted from the same property as the surrendered surface water or stream depleting groundwater take, and there is no increase in the proposed rate of take or annual volume.

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

That the Waimakariri Water Zone Committee proposes within the Cust Groundwater Allocation Zone to:

a. cap the current allocation volume,
b. allow an extra 10% (based on current allocation volume) for additional groundwater takes that are not stream-depleting and
c. provide an allocation for the substitution of existing surface water or stream depleting groundwater takes for non-stream depleting groundwater, provided

i. the existing take is surrendered and
ii. the new groundwater take is abstracted from the same property as the surrendered surface water or stream depleting groundwater take, and there is no increase in the proposed rate of take or annual volume.

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

That the Waimakariri Water Zone Committee proposes to create a Lees Valley Groundwater Allocation Zone. Within the proposed Lees Valley Groundwater Allocation Zone, cap the current allocation volume, allow an extra 10% (based on current allocation volume) for additional groundwater takes that are not stream-depleting.

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

That Environment Canterbury extend the Groundwater Allocation Zone boundaries further inland, to the edge of surface water catchment boundary.

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

That Environment Canterbury allocate resources to improve monitoring of permitted groundwater irrigation takes for compliance with limits in the LWRP. The proposed GAZ boundaries are shown on Map X4.

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>100</th>
<th>205</th>
<th>410</th>
<th>280</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL (K per year)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accumulative TOTAL (K per year)</td>
<td>$4.51</td>
<td>$13.77</td>
<td>$32.27</td>
<td>$44.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating impact per average rateable property</td>
<td>0.23%</td>
<td>0.70%</td>
<td>1.64%</td>
<td>2.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of rates increase (based on 2019 Financial Year)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT FOR DECISION

FILE NO and TRIM NO: LTC-03-15 / 190502062858
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1. SUMMARY

   1.1. This report is to provide a request for changes to the Solid Waste budgets for the 2019-20 Annual Plan.

   1.2. Table 1 shows the income and operational items that are proposed to change.

   1.3. All but one of the items relate to the higher uptake of the new rubbish and organics bin services. The key points regarding the recommendations for changes are:

       a. The final letters to property owners, sent in February and which had a response deadline of 1 March, resulted in requests for an additional 1,984 rubbish bins and 1,193 organics bins over the numbers that were originally estimated for use in the draft Annual Plan budgets.

       b. This increase in the number of serviced properties will increase both income and costs for collection and disposal of refuse and organics.

       c. Staff have reduced the forecast bin uptake during the year, which reduces new bin supply and delivery costs. This reduces the overall contract costs for refuse and organics.

       d. The cost savings to kerbside recycling from the truck variation have been included.

       e. The targeted kerbside rates as set are sufficient to fund this overall increase in costs.

       f. The increased uptake in kerbside bins will impact on the Disposal Account costs and incomes owing to an increase in refuse and greenwaste collected at the kerbside, but this has little impact on the forecast account surplus in that account.

   1.4. Staff recommend that the proposed rates, bag charges and fees & charges be retained but with the addition of discounted fees for replacing a set of bins at a property. In the case where more than one bin has been reported missing from a property, staff propose that the replacement fee for additional bins being delivered with the initial bin be discounted to allow for the fact that only a single delivery is being made.
Table 1: Proposed Changes to 2019-20 Solid Waste Budgets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account</th>
<th>Budget Name</th>
<th>2019-20 Draft Budget Amount</th>
<th>2019-20 Adjusted Budget Amount</th>
<th>Change in Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collection (Income)</td>
<td>Kerbside Collection Rates (Opt-In)</td>
<td>$1,427,261</td>
<td>$1,742,565</td>
<td>+ $315,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wheelie bin fees</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$85,820</td>
<td>+ $85,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total change in Income</td>
<td>$3,588,194</td>
<td>$3,989,318</td>
<td>+ $401,124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection (Expenditure)</td>
<td>Kerbside Collection management &amp; promotions</td>
<td>$135,580</td>
<td>$146,840</td>
<td>+ $11,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disposal Charges Refuse</td>
<td>$655,500</td>
<td>$781,170</td>
<td>+ $125,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disposal Charges Organics</td>
<td>$241,590</td>
<td>$283,560</td>
<td>+ $41,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Landfill Levy</td>
<td>$29,585</td>
<td>$35,257</td>
<td>+ $5,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contract Payments – Refuse Collection</td>
<td>$479,236</td>
<td>$412,752</td>
<td>- $66,484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contract Payments – Recycling</td>
<td>$414,245</td>
<td>$411,316</td>
<td>- $2,929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contract Payments – Organics</td>
<td>$508,537</td>
<td>$464,885</td>
<td>- $43,652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Change in Direct Operating Expenditure</td>
<td>$3,242,525</td>
<td>$3,602,396</td>
<td>+ $350,871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection Change to operating surplus</td>
<td></td>
<td>$68,815</td>
<td>$138,633</td>
<td>+ $386,922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disposal (Income)</td>
<td>Southbrook Gate Sales</td>
<td>$2,858,585</td>
<td>$2,674,135</td>
<td>- $184,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Refuse Collection Charges</td>
<td>$655,500</td>
<td>$781,170</td>
<td>+ $125,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total change in Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- $58,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disposal (Expenditure)</td>
<td>Refuse to Landfill</td>
<td>$1,660,657</td>
<td>$1,646,572</td>
<td>- $14,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Green Waste</td>
<td>$246,460</td>
<td>$214,949</td>
<td>- $31,511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>$558,365</td>
<td>$547,060</td>
<td>- $11,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Change in Expenditure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- $56,901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disposal Change to operating surplus</td>
<td></td>
<td>$117,062</td>
<td>$119,564</td>
<td>+ $2,502</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.5. Staff forecast that the budgeted income for the Collection Account will be sufficient to fund collection and ongoing recycling processing costs with a reasonable operating surplus. We would still expect a significant uptake in bins during this first year, followed by a slower rate of uptake in future years, which impacts on contract operating costs. There is still a level of uncertainty about the weight of refuse and organics that we will be collecting from each property, however the forecast surplus in the Collection Account will be sufficient to fund additional disposal costs.

1.6. The proposed budgetary changes do not warrant any changes to kerbside collection rates or gate fees in 19/20 year.

Attachments:

i. Nil

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 190424059253.
(b) **Approves** amending the budget allowances in the Collection Account as follows:

i. Kerbside Collection Rates (Opt-In) income increase from $1,427,261 to $1,742,565

ii. Wheelie Bin Fees income increase from $0 to $85,820

iii. Kerbside Collection management & promotions expenditure from $135,580 to $146,840

iv. Disposal Charges Refuse expenditure increase from $655,500 to $781,170

v. Disposal Charges Organics expenditure increase from $241,590 to $283,560

vi. Landfill Levy expenditure increase from $29,585 to $35,257

vii. Contract Payments – Refuse Collection expenditure decrease from $479,236 to $412,752

viii. Contract Payments – Recycling expenditure decrease from $414,245 to $411,316

ix. Contract Payments – Organics expenditure decrease from $508,537 to $464,885

(c) **Approves** amending the budget allowances in the Disposal Account as follows:

i. Southbrook Gate Sales income decrease from $2,858,585 to $2,674,135

ii. Refuse Collection Charges income increase from $655,500 to $781,170

iii. Refuse to Landfill expenditure decrease from $1,660,657 to $1,646,572

iv. Green Waste expenditure decrease from $246,460 to $214,949

v. Transportation expenditure decrease from $558,365 to $547,060

(d) **Approves** the new charges for the delivery of additional replacement bins when a set of bins is being replaced at a property at one time, to be recovered through the Council’s Debtors system, as follows:

i. Delivery of an additional 80 litre bin $89.60

ii. Delivery of an additional 140 litre bin $98.40

iii. Delivery of an additional 240 litre bin $108.00

(e) **Notes** that the remaining fees and charges and the targeted rates approved for the draft Annual Plan budgets will not be adjusted.

(f) **Notes** that the Collection Account is funded by targeted rates, refuse bag sales and wheelie bin fees.

(g) **Notes** that the Disposal Account is funded by general rates and gate fees, and that the gate fees for refuse and greenwaste disposal are set at a level that fully funds the handling, transport and disposal costs of these materials.

(h) **Notes** that the updated bin numbers, and the effect on costs and revenue, were not available at the time the draft Annual Plan Budgets were prepared.

(i) **Circulate** report No. 190424059253 to the Community Boards.
3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1. The solid waste budgets were prepared using the number of bins ordered as at the end of October 2018, with a small allowance for an increase in bin numbers by 1 July 2019. Letters were sent to property owners in February seeking final confirmation of their required bin type and size, which has resulted in a reasonably significant increase in bin numbers. The updated bin number information was received and compiled after the Council approved the draft Annual Plan for consultation.

3.1 The number of properties wanting to retain bags remains at around 30% of respondents.

3.2 Table 2 shows the number of bins estimated for the draft 19/20 Annual Plan budget and the number of bins currently being delivered based on responses received up to mid-March 2019. Note that since that time the Council continues to receive requests for new bins and bin changes, however this number is not significant in comparison to the confirmed bin numbers as below, and the budgets allow for a jump in bin uptake during the 19/20 year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bin type and size</th>
<th>Numbers in Draft 19/20 Annual Plan Budgets</th>
<th>Numbers in Final 19/20 Annual Plan Budgets</th>
<th>Increase in bin numbers over budgeted numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80 litre refuse</td>
<td>3,218</td>
<td>3,754</td>
<td>536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140 litre refuse</td>
<td>4,758</td>
<td>6,206</td>
<td>1,448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total refuse bins</td>
<td><strong>7,976</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,960</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,984</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 litre organics</td>
<td>2,353</td>
<td>2,813</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140 litre organics</td>
<td>2,483</td>
<td>2,951</td>
<td>468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240 litre organics</td>
<td>1,747</td>
<td>2,012</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total organics bins</td>
<td><strong>6,583</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,776</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,193</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3 A variation has been approved for Waste Management to utilise a year-old truck for the recycling collection, which will result in an overall cost-saving to the Council of $20,500 over the first seven years of the contract period.

3.4 Staff have discussed charges for replacing bins that have been reported as missing, which include bin supply and delivery charges. In all other cases the delivery or removal charge was a set fee regardless of the number of bins delivered to or removed from a property (for example bin swaps and new bin deliveries). It was considered appropriate to discount the replacement cost for additional bins in the event that more than one missing bin was being replaced at one property at one time.

3.5 It should be noted that bin replacement charges will only apply in specific situations, generally when there is a delay in the resident reporting the bin as missing or when a bin has been damaged as a result of the resident’s negligence. There will be no replacement charge made for bins reported as missing within the specified 24 hour period or for bins damaged by other factors (not negligence).

4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1. The higher uptake of bins, which are currently being delivered, will result in an increase in the targeted opt-in collection rates in 2019/20.

4.2. Staff budgeted for a reasonably high uptake of bins during the 19/20 year, which will not be funded through rates in that year but will be funded through the debtors system. This has now been included as an income stream under the Wheelie Bin Fees item.
4.3. The increase in the number of bins that was forecast to be delivered during the 19/20 year has been moderated, given the high uptake for the initial bin roll-out. There will therefore be a significant reduction in costs for new bin deliveries: these are included in the Contract Payment costs item.

4.4. The higher number of bins in service as at 1 July will result in an increase in the weight of refuse and organic waste collected at kerbside and disposed of at the appropriate facilities, and also in bin collection costs. Collection and disposal costs have been adjusted upwards to account for this change. The increase in contract collection costs for both rubbish and organics have however been substantially offset by the reduction in new bin delivery costs, as discussed in 4.3 above.

4.5. The contract for collection of kerbside recycling have been reduced by $2,929 as a result of the variation to utilise a one-year-old collection truck for this service, rather than provide a new vehicle. This will be an annual discount that applies for 7 years, and is based on a total cost saving to the Council of $20,500.

4.6. Staff have developed processes for the delivery of new bins, a bin swap (change of bin sizes), and for replacement of missing or damaged bins. The bin replacement charges approved in the draft the Annual Plan budgets include the delivery charge. During discussions we determined that there should be a reduction in costs in the case where more than one bin is reported missing from a property and a ‘set’ of bins is replaced at one time, rather than charge the full bin replacement cost for each bin.

4.7. Table 3 shows the proposed additional bin replacement fees which would be charged when more than one bin is being replaced to one property at the same time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Charge for additional bin, when replacing a set of bins</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Replacement bin – 80 litre</td>
<td>$112.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$89.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement bin – 140 litre</td>
<td>$123.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$98.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement bin – 240 litre</td>
<td>$135.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$108.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.8. There will be a flow-on effect on the quantities of rubbish and green waste disposed of at Southbrook resource recovery park (SRRP) from the increased uptake of bins. Council will collect and dispose of more rubbish, and an adjustment has been made to the rubbish quantities from other customers to accommodate this change. Greenwaste quantities have also been adjusted down to allow for the uptake of organics bins which will reduce the amount of greenwaste coming to SRRP and also further reduce rubbish quantities.

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

5. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

5.1. **Groups and Organisations**

5.1.1. We have previously consulted local groups and organisations and the wider community in relation to the new kerbside collection services, through Waste Management & Minimisation Plan and Long Term Plan consultations.

5.2. **Wider Community**

5.2.1. Council has contacted all owners of properties inside the collection area to seek confirmation of their preferred services, with the most recent letters sent in February 2019. The deadline for responses was 1 March 2019, to allow the contractor time to develop a
6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1. Financial Implications

6.1.1. The proposed changes to budgets are summarised in Table 4.

Table 4: Proposed Changes to 2019-20 Solid Waste Budgets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account</th>
<th>Budget Name</th>
<th>2019-20 Draft Budget Amount</th>
<th>2019-20 Adjusted Budget Amount</th>
<th>Change in Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collection (Income)</td>
<td>Kerbside Collection Rates (Opt-In)</td>
<td>$1,427,261</td>
<td>$1,742,565</td>
<td>+ $315,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wheelie bin fees</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$85,820</td>
<td>+ $85,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total change in Income</td>
<td>$3,588,194</td>
<td>$3,989,318</td>
<td>+ $401,124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection (Expenditure)</td>
<td>Kerbside Collection management &amp; promotions</td>
<td>$135,580</td>
<td>$146,840</td>
<td>+ $11,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disposal Charges Refuse</td>
<td>$655,500</td>
<td>$781,170</td>
<td>+ $125,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disposal Charges Organics</td>
<td>$241,590</td>
<td>$283,560</td>
<td>+ $41,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Landfill Levy</td>
<td>$29,585</td>
<td>$35,257</td>
<td>+ $5,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contract Payments – Refuse Collection</td>
<td>$479,236</td>
<td>$412,752</td>
<td>- $66,484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contract Payments – Recycling</td>
<td>$414,245</td>
<td>$411,316</td>
<td>- $2,929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contract Payments – Organics</td>
<td>$508,537</td>
<td>$464,885</td>
<td>- $43,652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Change in Direct Operating Expenditure</td>
<td>$3,242,525</td>
<td>$3,602,396</td>
<td>+ $350,871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection</td>
<td>Change to operating surplus</td>
<td>$68,815</td>
<td>$138,633</td>
<td>+ $386,922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disposal (Income)</td>
<td>Southbrook Gate Sales</td>
<td>$2,858,585</td>
<td>$2,674,135</td>
<td>- $184,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Refuse Collection Charges</td>
<td>$655,500</td>
<td>$781,170</td>
<td>+ $125,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total change in Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- $58,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disposal (Expenditure)</td>
<td>Refuse to Landfill</td>
<td>$1,660,657</td>
<td>$1,646,572</td>
<td>- $14,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Green Waste</td>
<td>$246,460</td>
<td>$214,949</td>
<td>- $31,511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>$558,365</td>
<td>$547,060</td>
<td>- $11,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Change in Expenditure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- $56,901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disposal</td>
<td>Change to operating surplus</td>
<td>$117,062</td>
<td>$119,564</td>
<td>+ $2,502</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.1.2. Staff forecast that the budgeted income will be sufficient to fund collection and ongoing recycling processing costs with a reasonable operating surplus.

6.1.3. We still expect a significant uptake in bins during this first year, followed by a slower rate of uptake in future years, which impacts on contract operating costs but this is funded through the debtors system. A budgetary allowance has been made for this income stream.

6.1.4. The adjustments to rubbish and greenwaste being disposed of at Southbrook RRP affect both income and expenditure in the Disposal Account, but the changes are balanced and there is little effect on the projected budget surplus.

6.2. Community Implications

6.2.1. The adjustments to operational budgets will not impact the community, as we are not proposing to change the rates, fees and charges from the draft Annual Plan. The proposed...
additional bin replacement fees for additional bins delivered as a set are lower than a single bin replacement fee, and will provide some savings for residents and will continue to fund Council’s costs for bin replacements

6.3. Risk Management

6.3.1. There is still a level of uncertainty about the weight of refuse and organics that we will be collecting from each property, however the forecast surplus in the Collection Account will be sufficient to fund additional disposal costs.

6.4. Health and Safety

6.4.1. The increased uptake of bins will improve the safety of the district’s kerbside collection services.

7. CONTEXT

7.1. Policy

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

7.2. Legislation

7.2.1. Waste Minimisation Act 2008

S52(1): A territorial authority may undertake, or contract for, any waste management and minimisation service, facility, or activity…

S54: A territorial authority that provides a service that collects waste, or any person who collects waste on behalf of a territorial authority, must do so promptly, efficiently, and at regular intervals.

7.3. Community Outcomes

7.4. The following community outcomes are relevant in this matter:

k. Core utility services are provided in a timely and sustainable manner

Σ Council sewerage and water supply schemes, and drainage and waste collection services are provided to a high standard.

Σ Waste recycling and re-use of solid waste is encouraged and residues are managed so that they minimise harm to the environment.

7.5. Delegations

7.6. The Council has the delegated authority to add or amend budgets.

Kitty Waghorn
Solid Waste Asset Manager
1. SUMMARY

1.1 The purpose of this report is to inform Council of recent feedback from the Mana Waitaha Trust agent in regard to Roading financial contributions applied to a resource consent for Cluster housing on Topito Road.

1.2 A report was taken to Council on 5 March 2019 to inform Council of progress of the sewer extension project along Tuahiwi and Topito Roads to service development including cluster housing and to seek approvals for water and sewer budgets. (Trim 190220019715)

1.3 Within this report there was discussion regarding the upgrading of Topito Road carriageway to service two cluster housing developments.

1.4 Topito Road formation width is unsuitable for development along Topito Road without upgrading to a suitable standard. Works proposed include widening to 5m and chip sealing Topito Road from the end of the seal to the proposed access at 80 Topito Road. The cost of upgrading the road is $253,000 excluding GST ($290,950 including GST).

1.5 As development cannot proceed without the road upgrade, it was proposed that a 30% contribution be levied as a Roading Financial Contribution toward the cost of the upgraded, which is consistent with Council policy. A consent has been issued with a condition requiring this contribution to be paid.

1.6 The applicant has advised that an objection to this condition will be lodged as it is considered this approach is not aligned with the Memorandum of Understanding between Council and Runanga.

Attachments:

i. Topito Road Carriageway Upgrade Aerial Photograph
ii. Report to Council 5 March 2019 - Request Authorisation for Additional Funding for a Water Reticulation Extension and Reallocation of Funding for Sewer Extensions, (Trim 190220019715)
2. **RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report number 190501062382;

(b) **Advises** the Runanga that Council will fund 70% ($177,100 excluding GST) of the cost subject to developers funding the remaining 30% share ($75,900 excluding GST);

(c) **Notes** that obtaining additional road reserve width along Topito Road will not be pursued at this time and that this matter will be discussed with Runanga in terms of the ongoing development in MR873;

(d) **Circulates** this report to the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board for information.

3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1 Council have entered into an agreement with Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga to provide for the extension of services along Tuahiwi and Topito Roads, to service proposed cluster housing developments.

3.2 Since project inception, Council has received two applications for resource consent for cluster housing developments which require access from Topito Road.

3.3 Topito Road is sealed for approximately the first 330m southwest of the Tuahiwi Road intersection, with a minimum formed width of approximately 5m. Beyond this point Topito Road is unsealed and decreases to a minimum width of approximately 3m in the vicinity of the road frontage at 80 Topito Road. Refer to Appendix i) for an aerial photograph showing the road.

3.4 The upgrading of Topito Road is considered necessary to facilitate the proposed cluster developments at 80 Topito Road and 233 Tuahiwi Road, which is to be accessed via Topito Road. The current road formation is not considered adequate to safely and effectively accommodate the vehicle movements associated with the proposed developments.

3.5 The Topito Road corridor is limited in width being approximately 10m at its narrowest. Typically road reserve should be a minimum width of 15m, therefore enabling the required carriageway formation, verge, and associated drainage to be effectively accommodated within the road reserve.

3.6 In addition there are substantial open stormwater drains along either side of Topito and power poles are located within or in close proximity of the road formation. Both of these factors further limit the space available for carriageway widening and associated infrastructure to be effectively accommodated.

3.7 The legal boundary along Topito Road is not straight, stepping in to adjoining properties at certain locations, and hence increasing the width of the road corridor. The acquisition of land adjacent to Topito Road, 5m on the northern side, would increase width to the preferable 15m minimum. This could be achieved with Council incrementally purchasing or having vested the land as part of subdivision, noting that this appears to have been previously done at 40 and 50 Topito Road. The ownership of the land adjacent to Topito Road is fragmented, and hence the purchasing of all the required land could take a considerable length of time or may not be possible.

3.8 Staff previously recommended that obtaining additional road reserve width along Topito Road not be pursued at this time and that this matter be discussed with Runanga in terms of the ongoing development in MR873.
3.9 Council staff have undertaken an assessment of options for the upgrade of Topito Road including:

Option 1) Widen and seal Topito Road from the end of the seal to the proposed access at No. 80 Topito Road;

Option 2a) Upgrade the length of Topito Road between the access to 233 Tuahiwi Road & the proposed access to No. 80 Topito Road to a width of 4m in accordance with the Engineering Code of Practice Standard Drawing 600-273 (Issue D);

Option 2b) Widen Topito Road to 5m from the end of seal to the access to 233 Tuahiwi Road;

3.10 On 23 April 2019 a memo was taken to Management Team recommending the upgrade works include widening to 5m and chip sealing Topito Road from the end of the seal to the proposed access at 80 Topito Road. The cost of upgrading the road is $253,000 excluding GST ($290,950 including GST).

3.11 As development cannot proceed without the road upgrade, it was proposed that a 30% contribution be levied as a Roading financial contribution toward the cost of the upgraded portion of road leading to each development, which is consistent with Council policy. The proposed financial contributions were forwarded to both applicants agents.

3.12 As part of discussion pertaining to the 233 Tuahiwi Road consent conditions and prior to issuing the decision, a request was received to remove the financial contribution condition, justified in the following statement: ‘Our Client considers the decision by Council to adopt a policy regarding a 50% contribution was undertaken unilaterally by Council without consultation with our Client, in a manner contrary to the terms and the spirit of the Memorandum of Understanding between our Client and Council.’

3.13 It is noted that the 50% contribution specified above is incorrect and that this should read 30% developer funded and therefore Council to fund the remaining 70%. This was an error in the original correspondence with the developer.

3.14 The agent also requested Council insert an advice note as follows:

‘The Consent Holder is advised that Waimakariri District Council has recently adopted a policy regarding financial contributions relating to the upgrade of a Council road, such as Topito Road, in circumstances whereby the upgrade is considered necessary for safe access / egress of a development. However, Council also recognises a Memorandum of Understanding with the Consent Holder and the Land Owner. Accordingly, Council proposes negotiating an Agreement with the Consent Holder and the Land Owner relating to a financial contribution to the upgrade of Topito Road prior to occupation of the first new habitable dwelling on the property.’

3.15 Subsequently, resource consent RC195034 decision has been issued with the road upgrade financial contribution condition. It is important to note that the financial contribution condition is required to mitigate the effect of the proposed development. Feedback from the applicant’s agent is that an objection will be lodged to the Roading financial contribution. As the consent decision has been issued construction on the first cluster housing development can and has begun.
3.16 Design and construction of the upgrading of Topito Road from the end of seal to the access at 233 Tuahiwi Road needs to commence as soon as possible however it is noted that any sealing would not be able to be undertaken until after winter. The Council funded portion of these works will need to be covered by the Roading Subdivision Contribution budget and has been allowed for in 2019/20 year.

3.17 Council staff will need undertaken further investigate to assess further Roading upgrades that may be required to facilitate future cluster housing developments within Maori Reserve 873.

4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1. Land Use Recovery Plan Action 21 directed the Council to change its District Plan in 2015 to facilitate residential development on Maori land in Maori Reserve 873. This includes provision for phased cluster housing on conforming rural zoned properties.

4.2. Cluster housing creates small but highly concentrated areas of development (up to seven dwelling units per a 5,000m² lot in accordance with Rule 31.34.1 of the District Plan, Revision 18th of October 2018) in rural areas where effective servicing is not necessarily present. Hence, the costs and challenges of enabling such developments may be considerable.

4.3. It is standard practice for the Developer/Consent Holder to cover a 30% cost share for Roading upgrades required to service a new development. This is covered within the current policy for seal extensions.

4.4. The Council will need to continue to work with Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga, and property owners to determine future requirements to service development for the wider Maori Reserve 873 area.

4.5. An option available to Council would be to provide additional funding over and above the standard 70% Council share, should they wish to help facilitate development within MR873.

4.6. This issue was not raised during the draft annual plan process as it had not been identified at the time.

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

5. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

5.1. **Groups and Organisations**

Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga work collaborated with Council and regular liaison meetings are held.

5.2. **Wider Community**

No wider community views have been sought.

6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**

It is proposed that the upgrade and sealing of Topito Road be funded partly by the development occurring (30%) and the remaining 70% by Council from the subdivision contribution budget (Refer to Report 190413055719). Reach 30% contributions will trigger the seal extension policy.
6.2. **Community Implications**

6.3. That development of cluster housing initiatives be supported in the wider Maori Reserve 873 area.

6.4. **Risk Management**

Growth distribution of cluster housing in particular within Tuahiwi offers challenges in terms of overall servicing given the unexpected or out of sequence development that could occur. A Master Planning exercise is planned to ascertain future serving of Tuahiwi.

7. **CONTEXT**

7.1. **Policy**

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

7.2. **Legislation**

The Land Transport Management Act is the relevant legislation in this matter.

7.3. **Community Outcomes**

This report relates to the following community outcomes:

- **Effect is given to the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi**
  - The Council in partnership with Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga, continue to build our relationship through mutual understanding and shared responsibilities.

- **There is a safe environment for all**
  - Harm to people from natural and man-made hazards is minimised.
  - Our district has the capacity and resilience to quickly recover from natural disasters and adapt to the effects of climate change.
  - Crime, injury and harm from road crashes, gambling, and alcohol abuse are minimised.

- **Transport is accessible, convenient, reliable and sustainable**
  - The standard of our District’s roads is keeping pace with increasing traffic numbers.
  - Communities in our District are well linked with each other and Christchurch is readily accessible by a range of transport modes.
Appendix i): Topito Road Roading Upgrades

Figure 1: Topito Road, (Sealed Green Line, Distance to frontage of No. 233 Orange Line, & Distance to the frontage of No. 80 Red Line)
1. **SUMMARY**

1.1 The purpose of this report is to inform Council of the progress of the sewer extension project along Tuahiwi and Topito Roads to service development including proposed cluster housing and also seek approvals for water and sewer budgets.

1.2 It is proposed that Council reallocates both the Tuahiwi sewer level of service (LOS) budget ($58,748 excluding GST) and the Tuahiwi sewer renewals budget ($58,748 excluding GST) to the Tuahiwi growth budget for the current 2018/19 financial year. Reallocation of the LOS and renewals budgets will increase the Tuahiwi growth budget from $125,852 excluding GST to $243,348 excluding GST, providing adequate budget to extend the sewer mains in Topito Road and Tuahiwi Road. Note that the sewer LOS and renewals budgets were intended for this project, however should have been allocated as growth budgets.

1.3 It is proposed that Council provide budget of $14,000 excluding GST in the current financial year to extend the water main in Topito Road. This extension has not previously been proposed to Council, however, is required to facilitate the proposed cluster housing development at 80 Topito Road.

**Attachments:**

i. Report to Council 7 November 2017 - Tuahiwi Sewerage Extension, Trim 171020113861
ii. Report to Council 3 April 2018 - Request Authorisation to Bring Forward Funding for Reticulation Extension, Trim 180219017018
iii. Appendix A: Maps Showing Previously Proposed Works
iv. Appendix B: Maps Showing Currently Proposed Works
v. Appendix C: Topito Road Carriageway Upgrades
2. **RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report TRIM number 190220019715.

(b) Approves the reallocation of the 2018/19 sewer level of service budget 101067.000.5113 of $58,748 excluding GST and 2018/19 sewer renewals budget 101067.000.5114 of $58,748 excluding GST to the growth budget 101067.000.5115 to facilitate the installation of a sewer main extensions in Topito Road and Tuahiwi Road.

(c) Approves a budget of $14,000 excluding GST for the current 2018/19 financial year to install a water main extension in Topito Road.

(d) Notes that water and sewer main extension contract for Tuahiwi and Topito Roads is currently being tendered.

(e) Notes that Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga will contribute $57,391.30 excluding GST toward the cost of the sewer extensions with Council funding the balance of $157,270.70 excluding GST.

(f) Notes that Council funding (existing and reallocated budgets) for the sewer extensions shall be recovered partly via Financial Contributions in the 2018/19 and 2019/20 financial years, partly from Development Contributions in the 2018/19 and 2019/20 financial years and in full with Development Contributions from 2020/21.

(g) Notes that Council funding for the water extension shall be recovered partly via Financial Contributions in the 2018/19 and 2019/20 financial year, and then via Development Contributions in the 2020/21 financial year and future years.

(h) Notes that staff are completing further investigation into funding options for infrastructure upgrades in the Maori Reserve 873 to enable future cluster housing developments.

3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1 Council have entered into an agreement with Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga to provide for the extension of sewer mains along Tuahiwi and Topito Roads, to service proposed cluster housing developments and properties along these portion of road.

3.2 Since project inception, Council has received a resource consent application, RC185168, for a 7 unit cluster housing development at 80 Topito Road. This property is not serviced for water and sewer and is at the western end of Topito Road. Leading to the proposed development, the Topito Road road reserve width is 10m for the majority of its length and the road carriageway unsealed for 465m, is 3m wide, bounded by two drains either side, and is limited to its current use without upgrading of the road. It is also important to note that 80 Topito Road lies outside of the previously reported extent of sewer main extension however, both water and sewer can be extended to the property.

3.3 Council has also received resource consent application, RC195034, from Mana Waitaha Trust for a 6 unit Papakainga cluster housing development at 233 Tuahiwi Road. It is intended that this development be serviced by the proposed sewer extension and water from Topito Road. The water supply is available to connect to the development without further extension. As with 80 Topito Road, for 275m of the 465m reported above, the road is unsealed and is limited to its current use without upgrading of the road.

3.4 Sewer
3.5 At its meeting 7 of November 2017 (Trim 171020113861), Council approved a budget of $95,191 excluding GST ($109,470 including GST) for the construction of a pressure sewer main in Tuahiwi Road from Topito Road to Waikoruru Road. Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga will contribute $28,696 excluding GST ($33,000 including GST) towards this. Appendix A shows the location and extent of the proposed works. This report also sought approval for a connection charge of $2,250 including GST be levied per dwelling unit for the first ten units that would connect to the sewer along the length of Tuahiwi Road serviced by the new main.

3.6 At its meeting 3 of April 2018 (Trim 180219017018), Council approved $35,720 excluding GST of funding be bought forward from the 2018/19 financial year, as budgeted in the Draft Long Term Plan, to the then current financial year of 2017/18 for the design and partial construction of the main extension in Tuahiwi Road. The cost of implementing the Topito Road portion of sewer main at $74,877 excluding GST ($86,109 including GST), of which Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga would contribute $28,696 excluding GST ($33,000 including GST), was also budgeted for the 2018/19 financial year. Also, an additional budget of $8,908 excluding GST was approved for the 2017/18 financial year to design a wastewater main extension in Topito Road from Tuahiwi Road to 61 Topito Road. Appendix A of this report shows the location and extent of the proposed works.

3.7 To accelerate the servicing of wastewater, a funding contribution of $57,391 excluding GST ($66,000 including GST) was put forth by the Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga. This contribution was divided equally between the two segments, or $28,696 excluding GST ($33,000 including GST) per road, to be serviced and was seen as a means of accelerating development in the area and leveraging the recently-adopted planning provisions for MR 873. This private agreement was proposed to and accepted by Council at the two aforementioned meetings.

3.8 The Tuahiwi Road sewer main extension was therefore to be funded partly via private agreement ($33,000 including GST), and partly via connection charges ($2,250 including GST per dwelling unit for the first ten units to connect). It is noted that in the recommendations section of the report to Council 7 November 2017 it is stated that the connection charge shall apply to the first ten dwelling units, however, in the main body of the report it was stated as applying to the first 34 dwelling units. For all of Council’s costs to be recovered the connection charge should apply to the first 34 dwelling units.

3.9 At the time of the report to Council 7 November 2017, a high level assessment had been completed by Council staff with regards the capacity of the Turiwhaia pump station. It was determined that the wastewater flows for an additional ten connections in the Turiwhaia pump station catchment could be accommodated within the existing pump station. Flows above that were considered to trigger an upgrade to the pump station and reticulation downstream of the pump station. The upgrade was to be funded by new development, replacements, and level of service charges. Provision for the pump station and reticulation upgrades was proposed in year two of the LTP budget at a cost of $1.934 million. The costs were to be recouped through development contributions and rates. This is considered to be the reason for the connection cost only being applied to the first ten connections as opposed to the originally assessed 34 connections.

3.10 Council staff have undertaken further assessment to ascertain the redundant capacity of the Turiwhaia pump station. The previously estimated ten connection limit is no longer considered applicable.

3.11 Similarly, the Topito Road sewer main extension was to be funded partly via private agreement ($33,000 including GST), and partly via connection charges ($3,056 including GST per dwelling unit for the first 19 units to connect). It is noted that the connection
charges were not included in the report’s recommendations to Council, however, they were necessary for Council costs to be recovered.

3.12 It has subsequently been determined, based on likely development and existing properties not currently connected to reticulation, that up to 30 dwelling units are likely to be connected to the sewer main in Topito Road over time.

3.13 Council staff have designed the two wastewater extensions and undertaken a detailed engineers estimate, the revised total estimated cost is $225,125 excluding GST. The revised budget for the works therefore exceeds the current financial year Tuahiwi wastewater growth budget of $125,852 excluding GST by $98,280 excluding GST. The growth budget is development contribution funded. $117,572 excluding GST being accounted for in the development contributions for the 2018/19 financial year and $125,852 excluding GST being accounted for in the 2019/2020 financial year, equating to a shortfall of $8,280 excluding GST in the development contributions for the 2018/19 financial year. The additional $8,280 excluding GST being the funding for design of the Topito Road extension approved by Council in April 2018. Note the $8,280 excluding GST differs to the $8,908 excluding GST stated in the April 2018 report due to the carry over budgets from 2017/18 being rounded down (by $628 excluding GST) to the nearest thousand dollars.

3.14 Additionally, for the current financial year the following budgets have been previously allocated for works on the Tuahiwi wastewater system: $58,748 excluding GST previously for level of service (LOS) and $58,748 excluding GST previously for renewals. Note that the sewer LOS and renewals budgets were intended for this project, however should have been allocated as growth budgets.

3.15 It is therefore proposed that the level of service budget and the renewals budget be reallocated to the growth budget. Hence, resulting in a total budget of $243,348 excluding GST for this project.

3.16 The combined reallocated budget of $117,496 excluding GST will not be captured in the 2018/19 nor the 2019/20 development contribution rates. However, Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga contributions ($57,391 excluding GST) will be paid on completion of the sewer main extensions with the outstanding balance of $68,461 excluding GST to be captured by financial contributions and 2020/21 development contribution rates.

3.17 Should the entire budget be expended a financial contribution of $1,229 including GST per unit title would need to be levied on the cluster developments occurring at 80 Topito Road and 233 Tuahiwi Road. The financial contribution is calculated by the total budget ($243,348 excluding GST), minus the portion of the existing budget captured in the 2018/19 development contributions ($117,572 excluding GST), minus the Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga contribution ($57,391 excluding GST), divided by 64 being the total number of dwelling units, (30 in Topito Road and 34 in Tuahiwi Road), that are anticipated to connect to the wastewater extensions.

3.18 It is acknowledged that once the works have been completed the opportunity for taking financial contributions from future developments will lapse. However, development contributions from 2020/21 onwards will include this cost as part of the development contribution.

3.19 Recent discussions with representatives of Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga indicate that the delaying of the wastewater extension may hinder the progress of single-family cluster housing developments in the immediate area, and may result in the Runanga’s development at 233 Tuahiwi Road falling over due to restricted funding timeframes.
3.20 The design works for the Topito Road wastewater extension have been completed by Council staff and the work is currently out to tender.

3.21 It is anticipated that the Topito Road wastewater extension will be completed and ready for connections in May 2019.

3.22 **Water**

3.23 The water main in Topito Road currently ceases approximately 600m southwest of Tuahiwi Road, at 61 Topito Road.

3.24 The extension of the water main in Topito Road has not previously been considered or assessed by Council staff in earlier reporting, hence to date no budget has been approved by Council for these works.

3.25 Water installation works along Topito Road are estimated as $14,000 excluding GST including a 10% contingency if works are completed in conjunction with sewer installation works.

3.26 It is proposed to request a financial contribution of $1,150 including GST per dwelling for the 7 cluster home development at 80 Topito Road (equalling a total of $8,050 including GST) which represents half of the projected 14 dwellings likely to connect to the extended water main. The balance is proposed to be funded by Development Contributions from the 2020/21 financial year. This would require Council Funding this share initially then recovering with Development Contributions later. A new budget is required to be allocated for this work.

3.27 The design work for the Topito Road water extension has been undertaken by Council staff in conjunction with the design of the wastewater extension, and the water main has been included as a provisional item in the tender document.

3.28 The extension of the water main is required to facilitate the proposed cluster housing development at 80 Topito Road.

3.29 **Roading**

3.30 The upgrading of Topito Road has not previously been assessed by Council staff.

3.31 Topito Road is sealed for approximately the first 330m southwest of the Tuahiwi Road intersection, with a minimum formed width of approximately 5m. Beyond this point Topito Road is unsealed and decreases to a minimum width of approximately 3m in the vicinity of 80 Topito Road’s frontage. Refer to Appendix C for an annotated aerial image.

3.32 The upgrading of Topito Road is considered necessary to facilitate the proposed cluster developments at 80 Topito Road and 233 Tuahiwi Road, which is to be accessed via Topito Road. The current road formation is not considered adequate to safely and effectively accommodate the vehicle movements associated with the aforesaid developments.

3.33 The Topito Road corridor is of limited width, approximately 10m at its narrowest. Typically a roading corridor should have a minimum width of 15m, thus enabling the required carriageway formation, verge, and associated drainage to be effectively accommodated within the road reserve.

3.34 Additionally, it is acknowledged that substantial open stormwater drains run down either side of Topito in the vicinity of 80 Topito Road’s frontage, and a number of power poles are located within or in close proximity of the road reserve at this location. Both of these
factors further limit the space available for carriageway widening and associated infrastructure to be effectively accommodated.

3.35 Topito Road’s legal boundary is not straight, stepping in to adjoining properties at certain locations, and hence increasing the width of the road corridor. The acquisition of land adjacent to Topito Road, 5m on the northern side, would increase width to the preferable 15m minimum. This could be achieved with Council incrementally purchasing or having vested the land as part of subdivision, noting that this appears to have been previously done at 40 and 50 Topito Road. The ownership of the land adjacent to Topito Road is fragmented, and hence the purchasing of all the required land could take a considerable length of time or may not be possible. A cost assessment to calculate the financial implications of this land purchase has not been undertaken.

3.36 The proposed site plan for the cluster housing development at 80 Topito Road would require amending if the vesting or purchase of a 5m strip adjacent to Topito Road is to be pursued by Council. Currently a wetland area / stormwater detention pond encroaches upon this 5m strip. The proposed site plan is Trim Report Number 180612065228.

3.37 The possibility of land being vested in Council for road reserve has not been discussed with the developer at 80 Topito Road.

3.38 Staff recommend that obtaining additional road reserve width along Topito Road not be pursued at this time and that this matter be discussed with Runanga in terms of the ongoing development in MR873.

3.39 Council staff have undertaken a high level engineer’s estimate for the upgrading of Topito Road. The following options were considered, noting that Options 2a & 2b must be effected concurrently if 80 Topito Road is developed:

Option 1) Widen and seal Topito Road from the end of the seal to the proposed access at No. 80 Topito Road (which is adjacent to the eastern boundary of the property). This work is not to be undertaken this financial year, instead Council shall take financial contributions for developments which are valued proportional to the length of road utilised by each development and the upgrading work may be undertaken at some time in the future, depending on the level of development in the vicinity;

Option 2a) Upgrade the length of Topito Road between 233 Tuahiwi Road’s Topito Road access & No. 80 Topito Road’s proposed access to a width of 4m in accordance with the Engineering Code of Practice Standard Drawing 600-273 (Issue D), Rural Right of Way, including passing bays at 90m intervals. This work is to be completely funded by the developer of 80 Topito Road; and

Option 2b) Widen Topito Road to 5m from the end of seal to the 233 Tuahiwi Road’s access, to be funded by Council and the developer of 233 Tuahiwi Road.

3.40 The high level engineers estimate allows for the costs to be correctly apportioned between new developments and to ascertain the cost implications for the proposed cluster housing developments at 80 Topito Road and 233 Tuahiwi Road.

3.41 Table 1: The Financial Breakdown (Excluding GST) for the Upgrading Options for Topito Road

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Description of Works</th>
<th>Total Budget (Excluding GST)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Widen &amp; Seal Topito Road from End of Seal to 80 Topito Road</td>
<td>$253,449</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TRIM Number 190220019715  Page 6 of 17  Council  5 March 2019
3.42 Option 1 is the most desirable outcome and allows for future development beyond the two known cluster housing developments, however, it is also the most expensive option as considerable works are required.

3.43 To enable Option 1 at a future date it is intended that a roading financial contributions shall be taken from developments occurring on Topito Road southwest of the current end of seal. The applicable roading financial contributions will different for each development, and will be dependent upon the length of upgrade required to access the property.

3.44 Typically, when Council has taken financial contributions that equate to more than 30% of the total budget for the upgrading works (e.g. Option 1) it triggers Council to undertake the associated works.

3.45 It is proposed that the costs of Option 2a be fully borne by the developer at 80 Topito Road. This is considered appropriate as if any further developments that occur on this portion of Topito Road the road will require further upgrading, in accordance with Option 1, in order to accommodate the increased traffic loading. Hence, the minimum solution only benefits the development at 80 Topito Road.

3.46 The developer at 80 Topito Road will therefore be required to undertake roading works estimated at $129,118 excluding GST, prior to obtaining the 224 Certificate of Completion for their proposed cluster housing development, thus negating a requirement for a roading financial contribution requirement for this development. The applicable roading financial contribution being $32,385 including GST for 80 Topito Road, less than the cost of the interim upgrading works.

3.47 It is proposed that the costs for Option 2b be partly borne by the developer at 233 Tuahiwi Road ($29,239 excluding GST), and partly borne by Council ($29,239 excluding GST). This is considered reasonable as the development at 233 Tuahiwi Road cannot occur without this section of Topito Road being widened, however, there is an existing demand on this section of Topito Road with a number of properties already utilising it for vehicular access. It is therefore considered appropriate that Council contributes a proportion (50%) of the costs associated with the staged upgrade of this section of Topito Road.

3.48 The developer at 233 Tuahiwi Road will therefore be required to undertake roading works costing in the region of $29,239 excluding GST, prior to obtaining the 224 Certificate of Completion for their proposed cluster housing development thus negating a requirement for a roading financial contribution requirement for this development. The applicable roading financial contribution being $14,002 including GST for 223 Tuahiwi Road, less than the cost of the widening works.

3.49 The aforementioned cost apportionment for the upgrading of Topito Road is dependent upon the development at 233 Tuahiwi Road occurring prior to the development at 80 Topito Road. The 80 Topito Road consent may be conditioned to ensure this. This is yet to be discussed with the developer at 80 Topito Road, however, the staging of the development to allow for the incremental upgrading of Topito Road has been previously raised.

3.50 The uncertainty around the anticipated location and rate of development within the Tuahiwi area makes it challenging to predict future demand. In order to facilitate the two pending cluster housing developments (at 80 Topito Road & 233 Tuahiwi Road) it is proposed as per Option 2b that the widening of Topito Road from 27 Topito Road up to 233 Tuahiwi Road’s Topito Road access be undertaken now and that this work be partly funded by
Council and partly by financial contribution by the developer at 223 Tuahiwi Road. This is to be achieved by Council entering into a cost share agreement with the developer at 233 Tuahiwi Road.

3.51 To ensure that the timeframe of the developers at 233 Tuahiwi Road is met, design and construction of the upgrading of Topito Road from the end of seal to 233 Tuahiwi Road’s Topito Road access needs to commence in the current 2018/19 financial year. The Council funded portion of these works is to be sourced from the Roading Subdivision Extra-over Development budget.

3.52 Excluding the cluster housing development at 80 Topito Road, the proposed solution of adopting Options 2a & 2b does not allow for further development along Topito Road west of the 233 Tuahiwi Road’s Topito Road access.

3.53 Council staff need to further investigate/assess funding options for further roading upgrades that may be required to facilitate future cluster housing developments within Maori Reserve 873.

3.54 The Cost of the Topito Road Water and Sewer Extension, and Roading Upgrades

3.54.1 Table 2 provides a summary of the water, sewer, roading and development contribution costs that are to be incurred by the developers seeking to establish new dwelling units at 80 Topito Road and 233 Tuahiwi Road. Please note that the summary includes GST, but excludes all onsite costs that may be applicable. Development Contribution credits have been applied to the first lot of the 80 Topito Road development but credits are not applicable to 233 Tuahiwi Road as a dwelling presently exists. Furthermore, the assessment is based on the 2018/19 development contribution rates.

3.55 Table 2: Financial Breakdown (Including GST) for the Water and Sewer Extension, and the Topito Road Upgrade for Developing Cluster Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster Site Location</th>
<th>No. of Units</th>
<th>2018/19 Development Contributions* per Unit</th>
<th>Roading Upgrade Cost – Estimate per Development</th>
<th>Sewer Financial Contribution per Unit</th>
<th>Water Financial Contribution per Unit</th>
<th>Total Cost per Unit</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80 Topito Road Development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$19,292</td>
<td>$148,486</td>
<td>$1,229</td>
<td>$1,150</td>
<td>$170,157</td>
<td>$341,497.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$26,178</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,229</td>
<td>$1,150</td>
<td>$28,557</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233 Tuahiwi Road Development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$26,177</td>
<td>$33,625</td>
<td>$1,229</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$61,031</td>
<td>$198,059.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$26,177</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,229</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$27,406</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The development contributions include Reserves (Rural & Res 4 Zone), Water (Tuahiwi), Water – ODA (Woodend – Tuahiwi), Sewer (Eastern Districts – Outfall), Sewer (Tuahiwi), and Roading (District).

3.56 As can be shown Table 2 above developments occurring within the Tuahiwi area are susceptible to considerable costs even before onsite works are considered.

3.57 Onsite costs would include the installation of infrastructure within the property to convey wastewater to the public mains (i.e. septic tanks, pumps and service laterals). These costs would apply to new developments requiring an entirely new system or homeowners choosing to replace an existing system. Council staff have estimated the cost of these works to be in the region of $16,600 per a dwelling unit. In a cluster housing development multiple dwelling units may utilise a communal system, hence potentially reducing the expense incurred by an individual dwelling unit.
4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1. Land Use Recovery Plan Action 21 directed the Council to change its District Plan in 2015 to facilitate residential development on Maori land in Maori Reserve 873. This includes provision for phased cluster housing on conforming rural zoned properties.

4.2. Cluster housing creates small but highly concentrated areas of development (up to seven dwelling units per a 5,000m² lot in accordance with Rule 31.34.1 of the District Plan, Revision 18th of October 2018) in rural areas where effective servicing is not necessarily present. Hence, the costs and challenges of enabling such developments may be considerable.

4.3. Council is at risk of development in this area not proceeding as planned or existing properties electing not to connect to the wastewater extensions. If Council chooses to install the infrastructure to service planned growth in the area but this development does not occur, then Council has no means of recovering the infrastructure costs incurred.

4.4. It is standard practice for the Developer/Consent Holder to cover the full cost of any reticulation extension or roading upgrade required to service a new development.

4.5. The Council will need to continue to work with Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga, and property owners to determine the feasibility of servicing each cluster proposal on its merit, and a coordinated service development for the wider Maori Reserve 873 area.

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

5. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

5.1. **Groups and Organisations**

   Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga have collaborated with Council in the funding of sewer main extensions in Tuahiwi.

5.2. **Wider Community**

   No wider community views have been sought.

6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**

   6.1.1. This project has been approved by Council and the budgets to complete the job is contained within the Turiwhaia Pump Station & Reticulation Upgrade – Construct & Design Growth Budgets totalling $125,852 excluding GST.

   6.1.2. Two sewer budgets for Tuahiwi, being Level of Service 101067.000.5113 and Renewals 101067.000.5114 each of $58,748 excluding GST respectively, were budgeted for this sewer reticulation project. However, as this project is a growth project these two budgets cannot be automatically utilised, therefore creating the projected budget short-fall.

   6.1.3. It is proposed that the level of service and renewal budgets for this year be reallocated to growth 101067.000.5115, hence increasing the project budget total to $243,348 excluding GST. This is adequate to meet the estimated costs.

   6.1.4. Table 3: Financial Breakdown (excluding GST) of the Exiting Sewer Extension Budgets 2018/19
6.1.5. Less the Runanga contributions for each sewer main alignment of $57,391.30 excluding GST a balance of $167,270.70 excluding GST is to be funded by Council.

6.1.6. Currently $125,852 excluding GST has been budgeted by Council for the sewer extension. Of this $117,572 excluding GST is included in the 2018/19 financial year development contributions with the remaining included from 2019/20 financial year. It is acknowledged that the current (2018/19) development contribution rates will not capture the additional $8,280 excluding GST included in the 2019/20 development contributions nor the reallocated budget that has been requested by Council staff, less the Runanga contributions. This equates to $68,385 excluding GST. The Development Contribution rates will capture this additional expenditure in 2020/21 as part of the budgeting process. Any developments that occur prior to the extension works being completed and the revised 2020/21 Development Contribution rates becoming applicable will be charged a financial contribution to cover the cost.

Table 4: The Proposed Financial Breakdown (excluding GST) of the Sewer Extension Budgets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Current Project</th>
<th>Budget (Excl. GST)</th>
<th>2018/19 Budget</th>
<th>Expenditure to Date</th>
<th>Construction Estimate</th>
<th>Outstanding Commitments (PDU Fees etc.)</th>
<th>Funding Contingency</th>
<th>Total Projected Expenditure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101066.000.5115</td>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$17,426</td>
<td>$2,574</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101067.000.5115</td>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>$105,852</td>
<td>$105,852</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$105,852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101067.000.5113</td>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>$58,748</td>
<td>$462</td>
<td>$56,286</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$58,748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101067.000.5114</td>
<td>Renewals</td>
<td>$58,748</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$19,620</td>
<td>$10,904</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$40,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>$243,348</td>
<td>$17,888</td>
<td>$183,758</td>
<td>$13,478</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$225,124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The 2020/21 Development Contributions rates capture the reallocated budget.

**The above figures are based on the assumption that the developments at 80 Topito Road and 233 Tuahiwi Road shall occur in 2019/20.

6.1.7. Water installation works along Topito Road are estimated as $14,000 (excluding GST) including a 10% contingency if works are completed in conjunction with sewer installation works. The water main has been designed and is currently allowed for as a separable portion in the Topito Road and Tuahiwi Road sewer main extension contract. There is currently no budget for these works. If water installation was completed as a separate contract then these costs would increase in the order of $2,000 to $3,000.

6.1.8. The extension of the water main along Topito Road has not been budgeted for. It is proposed that Council fund this work, and costs be partly recovered by a financial contribution of $8,050 (including GST) from the proposed development at 80 Topito...
6.1.9. It is proposed that the upgrading of the Topito Road carriageway between the end of seal at 29 Topito Road and 233 Tuahiwi Road’s Topito Road access is to be funded partly by the development occurring at 233 Tuahiwi Road ($30,964 excluding GST), and by Council ($30,964 excluding GST).

6.2. **Community Implications**

6.3. **Risk Management**

Growth distribution of cluster housing in particular within Tuahiwi offers challenges in terms of utility servicing given the unexpected or out-of-sequence development that can occur. A Master Planning exercise is planned to ascertain future serving of Tuahiwi.

7. **CONTEXT**

7.1. **Policy**

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

7.2. **Legislation**

The Local Government Act of 2002 is relevant in this matter.

7.3. **Community Outcomes**

This report relates to the following community outcomes:

a. **Effect is given to the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi**
   - The Council in partnership with Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga, continue to build our relationship through mutual understanding and shared responsibilities. 1,2,3,4

b. **There are wide ranging opportunities for people to contribute to the decision making that effects our District**
   - The Council takes account of the views across the community including mana whenua. 1,3

c. **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
1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to seek Council approval to enter into private agreements with Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga and private property owners to extend the STEP sewerage scheme in Tuahiwi to facilitate development in accordance with revised planning provisions applying to MR873.

Attachments:

i. Map of the Tuahiwi village area

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 171020113861.

(b) Agrees to enter into a private agreement with Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga to receive $33,000 towards the cost of implementing a STEP sewer main in Tuahiwi Road from Topito Road to Waikoruru Road at a total cost of $109,470 (incl. GST).

(c) Approves a connection charge of $2,250 per dwelling unit for the first ten units to connect to the sewer along this length of Tuahiwi Road.

(d) Notes that those connecting to the service would be required to also pay development contributions required for the Eastern Districts Sewerage Scheme Ocean Outfall and the Woodend reticulation system and treatment plant at the sum of $9,471.

(e) Notes that further extensions of the STEP scheme in the vicinity will likely give rise to the need to upgrade the capacity of the Turiwhaia pumping station and further recoveries of these costs will need to be made via an additional development contribution.

(f) Notes that the costs of that upgrade is included in draft LTP budgets for the Council’s consideration in January 2018.
3. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

3.1. Land Use Recovery Plan Action 21 directed the Council to change its District Plan in 2015 to facilitate residential development on Maori land in Maori Reserve 873. This include provision for phased cluster housing on conforming rural zoned properties.

3.2. Since these provisions became operative, a number of Whanau groups have progressed development proposals but none have gone onto completion at this stage. While issues of financing and finalising arrangements among descendent owners have been causes for delay, so too has arrangements to provide for and fund necessary servicing.

3.3. Unlike development of contiguous lots within a subdivision under the control of a single party, this situation involves discontinuous properties, multiple owners and parties who wish to progress incremental development for residential purposes over extended periods. Financing networked water and wastewater services in this situation is problematic and a barrier to expeditious development.

3.4. Recent discussions with the Upoko of Ngai Tuahuriri, Te Maire Tau, have sought to progress servicing along a segment of Tuahiwi Road between Topito Road and Okaihau Road and along Topito Road for approximately 970 metres south of Tuahiwi Road. Water service is available along most of the length of these sections, but the current STEP sewerage scheme does not provide service for any of the area along Tuahiwi Road and most of the area along Topito Road.

3.5. To accelerate this servicing of wastewater, a funding contribution of $66,000 has been put forth by the Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga. This contribution would be divided equally between the two segments, or $33,000 per road, to be serviced and would be seen as a means of accelerating development in the area and leveraging the recently-adopted planning provisions for MR 873.

In the interim to facilitate development along Tuahiwi Road, a wastewater main would be extended from the existing Turiwhaia Pump Station to Waikoruru Road. The total cost for this extension would be approximately $109,469. After the Rununga contribution of $33,000 is subtracted from this amount, a total of $76,469 would be funded by the Council. To recover these costs, a connection charge of $2,250 per property wanting to connect would be required.

The connection cost of $2,250 was arrived at by assuming that, in the next 10 years, the 20 existing properties along Tuahiwi Road would connect to the new reticulation system and that an additional two parcels would be developed to their maximum 7 residences per parcel. This yields a total of 34 connections that would share in the Council-funded portion of $76,469 for the new reticulation system.

In addition to these connection costs, persons wanting to connect to the reticulation system in Tuahiwi Road would need to pay the following costs:

- Development contributions – costs that contribute to recouping the cost of the existing reticulation system and treatment plant infrastructure in Woodend and in the Eastern Districts Sewer Scheme.
- Onsite costs – the costs to install infrastructure within the property boundary to convey wastewater to the public mains, i.e. septic tanks, pumps, and service laterals. These costs would apply to new development requiring an entirely new septic system or homeowners choosing to replace their existing septic tank
and pump. If a homeowner has an adequate septic tank and chooses to retain that tank and pump, then these costs would not apply.

The table below details each of these costs for the first ten connections along Tuahiwi Road.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Connection Cost</td>
<td>$2,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Development Contributions (DC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Woodend DC</td>
<td>$231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Eastern Districts DC</td>
<td>$9,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Onsite Costs</td>
<td>$16,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Total incl. GST</td>
<td>$28,281</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 – Costs Associated with Wastewater Connection

3.6. Wastewater flows for up to ten new connections in the Turiwhaia pump station catchment can be accommodated within the existing pump station. The above costs apply to those first ten houses to connect along Tuahiwi Road. Additional development beyond these ten homes, whether they occur along Tuahiwi Road, Topito Road, or elsewhere in the Turiwhaia pump station catchment, will trigger an upgrade to the pump station and reticulation downstream of the pump station. This upgrade would be funded by new development, replacements, and level of service charges. Provision for the pump station and reticulation upgrades is proposed in year two of the LTP budget at a cost of $1.934 Million. These costs would be recouped through development contributions and rates. Appropriate development contribution costs will be determined in the next financial year as part of the design of the pump station and downstream reticulation.

To achieve a sustainable solution, considerable engagement and consultation with the community will be required to determine an appropriate scale of reticulation upgrade and its feasible uptake duration.

3.7. Council staff are aware of a proposed development at 80 Topito Road. If this development moves forward as planned, then Council staff may bring forward a similar proposal for wastewater infrastructure along Topito Road.

3.8. The Management Team/CE has reviewed this report and supports the recommendations.

4. COMMUNITY VIEWS

4.1. Community views were canvased in relation to the planning provisions facilitating additional residential development in rural zoned MR873 and factored into the decision-making on the Plan Change at that time.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

5.1. Council faces the following financial implications to service Tuahiwi village with wastewater service.

5.1.1. To extend wastewater service along Tuahiwi Road, Council faces a financial contribution of $76,469. To service development in Tuahiwi Village beyond the ten homes mentioned earlier in this report, Council faces a $1.934M cost to make upgrades to the Turiwhaia pump station and
downstream reticulation. These costs would be recovered over a period of time as properties connect to the sewer system.

5.2. Council is at risk of development in the area not proceeding as planned or existing properties choosing to not connect to the sewer system. If Council chooses to install the infrastructure to service planned growth in the area but this development does not occur, then Council has no means to recover the infrastructure costs incurred.

6. **CONTEXT**

6.1. **Policy**

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

6.2. **Legislation**

The Local Government Act of 2002 is relevant in this matter.

6.3. **Community Outcomes**

This report relates to the following community outcomes:

1. Effect is given to the Treaty of Waitangi.

2. There is a safe environment for all.
1. SUMMARY

1.1. There are four distinct purposes of this report. Each of these is detailed below.

1.2. The first is to seek approval from Council to bring forward funding of $35,720 into the 2017/18 financial year for a wastewater reticulation main extension in Tuahiwi Road. This budget was approved by Council on 7 November 2017, and funding for this extension was placed in the draft Long Term Plan for the 2018/19 financial year. This timeframe does not meet the required timeframe of Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga (the Runanga) and therefore needs to be accelerated. The amount of $35,720 provides for design fees and 25% of the cost of installing the main. The remaining 75% of the construction cost will remain in the 2018/19 financial year budget.

1.3. The second is to seek approval from Council to accept $33,000 from the Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga (the Runanga) toward the extension of wastewater reticulation in Topito Road from the existing Turiwhaia pump station to the vicinity of 61 Topito Road to serve a proposed development at 233 Tuahiwi Road. The total cost of this main extension is estimated at $86,109, with the Council portion estimated to be $53,109. This will be a new budget item placed in the draft Long Term Plan by staff submission for the 2018/19 financial year.

1.4. The third is to request funding of $8,908 for the current financial year to begin design of the main extension in Topito Road.

1.5. The fourth is to update Council on efforts toward developing a master plan for improving wastewater service in the Tuahiwi area.

Attachments

i. Map showing Tuahiwi Road Main Extension
2. **RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180219017018.

(b) **Approves** the request to bring funding of $35,720 forward from the 2018/19 financial year in the draft Long Term Plan to the current financial year of 2017/18 for design and partial construction of the main extension in Tuahiwi Road.

(c) **Approves** a budget of $8,908 for the current financial year of 2017/18 to design a wastewater main extension in Topito Road.

(d) **Agrees** to enter into a private agreement with Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga to receive $33,000 (incl. GST) towards the cost of implementing a STEP sewer main in Topito Road from Tuahiwi Road to 61 Topito Road at a total cost of $86,109.

(e) **Notes** that additional works to develop a master plan for wastewater service in the Tuahiwi area will be conducted in parallel to these main extensions, with extensive public engagement with residents of the Tuahiwi community beginning later in 2018.

3. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

**Tuahiwi Road Reticulation Extension**

3.1. At a meeting on 7 November 2017, Council approved a request to enter into an agreement with Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga to receive $33,000 toward the construction of a wastewater reticulation main in Tuahiwi Road and to fund the remaining cost of this construction. Council’s portion of this construction is estimated to be $76,470. This is detailed in Trim report number 171020113861. The location of this main is shown in Figure 1.

3.2. Council’s portion of the design and construction of this wastewater main was included in the draft Long Term Plan for the 2018/19 financial year, with design currently planned to commence in July 2018.

3.3. Recent discussions with representatives of Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga indicate that this timeframe is not adequate and will potentially hinder progress toward development of single-family cluster housing in the Tuahiwi area.

3.4. In order for development to progress in the timeframe desired, design and construction of the main extension needs to begin before the start of the 2018/19 financial year.

3.5. Resources internal to Council’s Project Delivery Unit (PDU) can design and call for tenders for the main extension in the timeframe required to service the development. Therefore, Council staff requests that funding for design and 25% of construction of this main extension be made available in the 2017/18 financial year. The amount of funding to be brought forward into the current financial year is $35,720. The remaining amount of $45,750 will be placed in year 1 of the draft Long Term Plan.
**Topito Road Extension**

3.6. During a recent meeting with representatives from Te Ngāi Tuahuriri Runanga, plans to construct cluster housing at 233 Tuahiwi Road were also discussed. The builder of these homes wishes to connect to Council's wastewater scheme.

3.7. A wastewater reticulation extension along Topito Road from the existing Turiwhaia pump station to the vicinity of 61 Topito Road would be required for these new homes to connect to Council's scheme. The cost of this main extension is estimated to be $86,109 for construction, professional fees, and contingency. The location of this main is shown in Figure 2.

3.8. The Runanga has offered to contribute $33,000 (incl. GST) toward the extension of this main. The balance of the works is $58,059 after the Runanga contribution is deducted. This amount would be paid by Council. Budget provision for this main extension will be placed in year 1 of the draft Long Term Plan by staff submission.

3.9. These costs would be recovered by a connection cost of $3,056 per property. This was arrived at by assuming that the 9 existing properties along Topito Road that aren't connected to public reticulation would connect to the system and that two additional properties along Topito Road will develop to their full potential in the next 10 years. This yields a total of 19 new connections to share in the Council-funded portion of $58,059 for the new reticulation system.

3.10. To ensure that the timeframe of the developers is met, design and tendering for the works needs to commence in the current financial year. Resources internal to PDU can design and call for tenders for the main extension in the timeframe required to service the development. Therefore, Council staff request that funding for the design of this main extension in the amount of $8,908 be made available in the 2017/18 financial year.

**Master Plan for Wastewater Service in Tuahiwi**

3.11. In addition to these main extensions in the Tuahiwi area, Council staff will begin working on a master plan for servicing the Tuahiwi community with reticulated wastewater. This master plan will include anticipated reticulation extensions needed, estimated upgrades to the Turiwhaia pump station, and funding strategies for the work necessary to upgrade wastewater service in the Tuahiwi community.

3.12. A significant portion of this planning process will involve consulting with the Tuahiwi community to identify those properties that plan to develop in the next 10 to 15 years, as well as existing properties that don’t plan to develop but that would still like to connect to a public wastewater system.

3.13. This information, along with estimated costs for reticulation and pump station upgrades, will be used to develop an appropriate development contribution for the Tuahiwi scheme.

3.14. The main output of this master plan will shape the extent of the public wastewater scheme in the Tuahiwi area.
4. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

4.1. The public has not been consulted on this matter to date; however, funding for the main extension in Tuahiwi Road is included in the Long Term Plan which is currently out for public consultation. Therefore, the public will have ample opportunity to review that project.

4.2. Extensive public consultation will be conducted as part of the master planning efforts. This consultation will be geared toward identifying those properties which might develop in the future and those properties that have a desire to connect to a public wastewater scheme in the future.

5. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

5.1. Council faces the following financial implications to service Tuahiwi village with wastewater service.

5.1.1. To extend wastewater service along Tuahiwi Road, Council’s share is $76,469.

5.1.2. To extend wastewater service along Topito Road, Council’s share is $53,109.

5.1.3. Once upgrades to the existing Turiwhaia pump station are required, Council’s share will be approximately $1.934M.

5.2. These costs will be recovered through development contributions over a period of time as properties connect to the sewer system.

5.3. Council is at risk of development in the area not proceeding as planned or existing properties choosing to not connect to the sewer system. If Council chooses to install the infrastructure to service planned growth in the area but this development does not occur, then Council has no means to recover the infrastructure costs incurred.

6. **CONTEXT**

6.1. **Policy**

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

6.2. **Legislation**

The Local Government Act of 2002 is relevant in this matter.

6.3. **Community Outcomes**

This report relates to the following community outcomes:

- Core utility services are provided in a timely, sustainable and affordable manner.
Figure 1 – Tuahiwi Road Main Extension
Figure 2 – Topito Road Main Extension
1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to seek Council approval to enter into private agreements with Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga and private property owners to extend the STEP sewerage scheme in Tuahiwi to facilitate development in accordance with revised planning provisions applying to MR873.

Attachments:
iv. Map of the Tuahiwi village area

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(f) Receives report No. 171020113861.

(g) Agrees to enter into a private agreement with Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga to receive $33,000 towards the cost of implementing a STEP sewer main in Tuahiwi Road from Topito Road to Waikoruru Road at a total cost of $109,470 (incl. GST).

(h) Approves a connection charge of $2,250 per dwelling unit for the first ten units to connect to the sewer along this length of Tuahiwi Road.

(i) Notes that those connecting to the service would be required to also pay development contributions required for the Eastern Districts Sewerage Scheme Ocean Outfall and the Woodend reticulation system and treatment plant at the sum of $9,471.

(j) Notes that further extensions of the STEP scheme in the vicinity will likely give rise to the need to upgrade the capacity of the Turiwhaia pumping station and further recoveries of these costs will need to be made via an additional development contribution.

(k) Notes that the costs of that upgrade is included in draft LTP budgets for the Council’s consideration in January 2018.
3. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

3.1. Land Use Recovery Plan Action 21 directed the Council to change its District Plan in 2015 to facilitate residential development on Maori land in Maori Reserve 873. This includes provision for phased cluster housing on conforming rural zoned properties.

3.2. Since these provisions became operative, a number of Whana u groups have progressed development proposals but none have gone onto completion at this stage. While issues of financing and finalising arrangements among descendent owners have been causes for delay, so too has arrangements to provide for and fund necessary servicing.

3.3. Unlike development of contiguous lots within a subdivision under the control of a single party, this situation involves discontinuous properties, multiple owners and parties who wish to progress incremental development for residential purposes over extended periods. Financing networked water and wastewater services in this situation is problematic and a barrier to expeditious development.

3.4. Recent discussions with the Upoko of Ngai Tuahuriri, Te Maire Tau, have sought to progress servicing along a segment of Tuahiwi Road between Topi to Road and Okaihau Road and along Topito Road for approximately 970 metres south of Tuahiwi Road. Water service is available along most of the length of these sections, but the current STEP sewerage scheme does not provide service for any of the area along Tuahiwi Road and most of the area along Topito Road.

3.5. To accelerate this servicing of wastewater, a funding contribution of $66,000 has been put forth by the Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga. This contribution would be divided equally between the two segments, or $33,000 per road, to be serviced and would be seen as a means of accelerating development in the area and leveraging the recently-adopted planning provisions for MR 873.

In the interim to facilitate development along Tuahiwi Road, a wastewater main would be extended from the existing Turiwhaia Pump Station to Waikoruru Road. The total cost for this extension would be approximately $109,469. After the Rununga contribution of $33,000 is subtracted from this amount, a total of $76,469 would be funded by the Council. To recover these costs, a connection charge of $2,250 per property wanting to connect would be required.

The connection cost of $2,250 was arrived at by assuming that, in the next 10 years, the 20 existing properties along Tuahiwi Road would connect to the new reticulation system and that an additional two parcels would be developed to their maximum 7 residences per parcel. This yields a total of 34 connections that would share in the Council-funded portion of $76,469 for the new reticulation system.

In addition to these connection costs, persons wanting to connect to the reticulation system in Tuahiwi Road would need to pay the following costs:

- Development contributions – costs that contribute to recouping the cost of the existing reticulation system and treatment plant infrastructure in Woodend and in the Eastern Districts Sewer Scheme.

- Onsite costs – the costs to install infrastructure within the property boundary to convey wastewater to the public mains, i.e. septic tanks, pumps, and service laterals. These costs would apply to new development requiring an entirely new septic system or homeowners choosing to replace their existing septic tank
and pump. If a homeowner has an adequate septic tank and chooses to retain that tank and pump, then these costs would not apply.

The table below details each of these costs for the first ten connections along Tuahiwi Road.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Connection Cost</td>
<td>$2,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Development Contributions (DC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Woodend DC</td>
<td>$231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Eastern Districts DC</td>
<td>$9,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Onsite Costs</td>
<td>$16,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Total incl. GST</td>
<td>$28,281</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 – Costs Associated with Wastewater Connection

3.6. Wastewater flows for up to ten new connections in the Turiwhaia pump station catchment can be accommodated within the existing pump station. The above costs apply to those first ten houses to connect along Tuahiwi Road. Additional development beyond these ten homes, whether they occur along Tuahiwi Road, Topito Road, or elsewhere in the Turiwhaia pump station catchment, will trigger an upgrade to the pump station and reticulation downstream of the pump station. This upgrade would be funded by new development, replacements, and level of service charges. Provision for the pump station and reticulation upgrades is proposed in year two of the LTP budget at a cost of $1.934 Million. These costs would be recouped through development contributions and rates. Appropriate development contribution costs will be determined in the next financial year as part of the design of the pump station and downstream reticulation.

To achieve a sustainable solution, considerable engagement and consultation with the community will be required to determine an appropriate scale of reticulation upgrade and its feasible uptake duration.

3.7. Council staff are aware of a proposed development at 80 Topito Road. If this development moves forward as planned, then Council staff may bring forward a similar proposal for wastewater infrastructure along Topito Road.

3.8. The Management Team/CE has reviewed this report and supports the recommendations.

4. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

4.1. Community views were canvased in relation to the planning provisions facilitating additional residential development in rural zoned MR873 and factored into the decision-making on the Plan Change at that time.

5. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

5.1. Council faces the following financial implications to service Tuahiwi village with wastewater service.

5.1.1. To extend wastewater service along Tuahiwi Road, Council faces a financial contribution of $76,469. To service development in Tuahiwi Village beyond the ten homes mentioned earlier in this report, Council
faces a $1.934M cost to make upgrades to the Turiwhaia pump station and downstream reticulation. These costs would be recovered over a period of time as properties connect to the sewer system.

5.2. Council is at risk of development in the area not proceeding as planned or existing properties choosing to not connect to the sewer system. If Council chooses to install the infrastructure to service planned growth in the area but this development does not occur, then Council has no means to recover the infrastructure costs incurred.

6. CONTEXT

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

6.2. Legislation
The Local Government Act of 2002 is relevant in this matter.

6.3. Community Outcomes
This report relates to the following community outcomes:

1. Effect is given to the Treaty of Waitangi.
2. There is a safe environment for all.
Appendix A: Maps Showing Previously Proposed Works

Figure 1: Previously Proposed Tuahiwi Road Main Extension
Figure 2: Previously Proposed Topito Road Main Extension
Appendix B: Maps Showing Current Proposed Works

Figure 3: Approximate Current Proposed Tuahiwi Road Wastewater Main Extension (Orange Line)
Figure 4: Approximate Current Proposed Topito Road Wastewater Main Extension (Orange Line)
Figure 5: Approximate Current Proposed Topito Road Water Main Extension (Turquoise Line)
Appendix C: Topito Road Roading Upgrades

Figure 6: Topito Road, (Sealed Green Line, Distance to 233’s Frontage Orange Line, & Distance to 80’s Frontage Red Line)
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT FOR DECISION

FILE NO and TRIM NO:  RDG-28 / LTC-03-15 / 190415056053

REPORT TO:  Council

DATE OF MEETING:  28 to 30 May 2019

FROM:  Joanne McBride, Roading & Transport Manager
        Gerard Cleary, Manager, Utilities & Roading

SUBJECT:  Roading Staff Submission - Runanga request for improvements on Tuahiwi Road

SIGNED BY:  

(1)  Department Manager

(2)  Chief Executive

1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is seek approval for a proposed approach to address drainage issues identified on Tuahiwi Road. This has been raised during the joint meetings between Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga and Council.

1.2. The issue raised is the roadside berm on the east side of Tuahiwi Road between the Marae and the Urupā become very soft during the wet season and is damaged when vehicles park on the berm alongside the road. This is due to the lack of a formed swale along the roadside which causes water to pond in the berm.

1.3. The aerial photograph included in Appendix i) indicates the area of concern.

1.4. The proposed approach to address this issue is to firstly form a swale alongside the road and install a culvert under one driveway to allow water to flow to a nearby drain. This would then be monitored.

1.5. The area is generally flat, however there should be sufficient fall to allow drainage along the swale. Should a more formal piped drainage system be required in the longer term then this would need to be included in a future Long Term Plan submission.

1.6. The proposed swale would be constructed in such a way that it would complement a formal piped system, should this be required in the future.

1.7. The construction of the swale can be funded from within existing maintenance budgets.

Attachments:

i. Appendix i) - Aerial Photograph of Tuahiwi Road

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 190415056053;

(b) Approves the recommend approach of installing a swale along the roadside and monitoring;

(c) Notes that this work can be carried out form within Maintenance Budgets in 2019/20;
3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1 The issue of damage to roadsides on Tuahiwi Road around the Marae and Urupā has been raised at the joint meetings between Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga and Council.

3.2 Particularly during larger events these is overflow parking occurring in this area and during winter and wet seasons the road sides become soft due to high moisture levels.

3.3 Exacerbating this issue is the fact that there is no formalised swale along this section of road and one property access that does not have a culvert under the formed access. This in effect means that water cannot flow to the drain down gradient.

3.4 The berm is used as an overflow parking area when the Marae car park gets fill. This usually happens when there is a large gathering at the Tuahiwi Marae.

3.5 The roadside berm is presently grass and does not have kerb and channel.

3.6 There is no budget allocated for the installation of kerb and channel at this location and there is no NZTA funding available for new kerb & channel.

4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

There are a number of options available to Council:

4.1. **Option One – Install Swale and Monitor.**

This option involved designing and installing a swale from south of the Urupā to join into the existing drainage system outside no. 226 Tuahiwi Road. A culvert pipe will also need to be installed under the access to no. 228 Tuahiwi Road. This is the recommended option as it would direct water to a channel and help remove ponding water from the berm area. Overall fall in this area has been checked and this option is considered feasible.

4.2. **Option Two – Install Formal Drainage System**

This option would involve forming a swale and installing an access culvert as described in Option One, however additional to this would involve the installation of a subsoil drain and sumps along the swale to provide better drainage capacity. This is not considered necessary initially and would be considered in the future should issues persist. To allow this work to be carried out a request for funding would need to be submitted through the Long Term Plan process.

4.3. **Option Three – Install Formal Drainage System and Formalise Parking Areas**

This option would involve forming a swale, installing an access culvert and formal sump / pipe system as described in Option Two, however additional to this would involve the forming of recessed parking areas along the road. These would be chip sealed and fenced with bollard and wire fencing to allow for parking in larger events. This would provide a high level of service and would require a request for funding through the Long Term Plan process.

4.4. **Option Four – Do nothing:**

This is not the preferred option. Good drainage one of the key factors for protecting road pavements and therefore installing a swale will provide benefits for the road.
4.5. This issue was not included in the draft Annual Plan as it has been raised during a Runanga liaison meeting this year. Subsequent to this a site meeting was held in March with staff to discuss the issues and consider options.

5. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

5.1. **Groups and Organisations**

5.2. This issue has been raised during the joint meetings between Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga and Council.

5.3. **Wider Community**

5.4. No specific views have been sought from the wider community.

6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**

6.2. The recommended Option One can be carried out from maintenance budgets in 2019/20.

6.3. Should Option Two or Three be the preferred option then this would need to be included in the next Long Term process so that funding could be allocated.

6.4. **Community Implications**

6.5. There are no Community Implications associated with this audit report.

6.6. **Risk Management**

6.7. There are no significant risks associated with this audit report.

6.8. Due to the archaeologically sensitive nature of the area, advice will be sought on the proposed work prior to commencement and an archaeological authority may be required.

6.9. **Health and Safety**

6.10. There are no specific Health & Safety issues associated with this report, however wet muddy conditions on the roadside may create a slip or trip hazard. This situation occurs in various locations around the district.

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**

Not applicable.

7.3. **Community Outcomes**

This report consider the following outcomes:

*There is a safe environment for all*

- Harm to people from natural and man-made hazards is minimised.
- Crime, injury and harm from road crashes, gambling, and alcohol abuse are minimised.
Transport is accessible, convenient, reliable and sustainable
∑ The standard of our District’s roads is keeping pace with increasing traffic numbers.

7.4. Delegations
The Council has the authority to receive this report and consider submissions as part of the Annual Plan process.
Appendix i – Aerial Photo of Tuahiwi Road
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT FOR DECISION

FILE NO and TRIM NO:    RDG-32-76 / 190415056065

REPORT TO:      Council

DATE OF MEETING: 28 to 30 May 2019

FROM:          Joanne McBride, Roading & Transport Manager
                Gerard Cleary, Manager, Utilities & Roading

SUBJECT:       Coldstream Road Improvements

1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to update Council on estimated costs for Upgrading Coldstream Road in conjunction with the construction of the multi-use sports facility.

1.2. The upgrade of Coldstream Road is required to better cater for the anticipate use once the new facility is built. As such consideration needs to be given to pedestrian, cycle and motor vehicle use of the road in this area.

1.3. A scheme design is underway for the wider area and includes a proposed shared path on the southern side of Coldstream Road, flush median to help facilitate turning manoeuvres and pedestrian refuge islands for pedestrians crossing the road between the various facilities.

1.4. The current budget in the Long Term Plan for the upgrade work is $500,000. This estimate was developed prior to the scheme design being undertaken.

1.5. Initial cost estimates at scheme design stage indicates the likely cost of the work is in the order of $710,000 which will result in a shortfall of $210,000.

1.6. An initial briefing has been held with Council on the scheme design. This will follow with a briefing to the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board and then formal approval of the scheme design will be sought.

1.7. Timing of construction of the new multi-sports facility is likely to see opening around March 2021. As such road and footpath construction is unlikely to begin until spring 2020, however servicing is likely to begin earlier. The work will include the installation of kerb & channel, stormwater provisions and widening of the pavement to accommodate the required cross section.

1.8. It is therefore recommended that the $50,000 of funding be retained in 2019/20 for detailed design, the remaining budget be moved to 2020/21 and an additional $210,000 of budget be allocated to allow this project to proceed. Budget is to be allocated from the Strategic Roads Account.

Attachments:

i. Coldstream Road Scheme Design Plans (Trim no. 190514067838).
2. **RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 190415056065;

(b) **Approves** the budget of $50,000 being retained in 2019/20;

(c) **Approves** the budget of $450,000 being moved to 2020/21 and additional budget of $210,000 being allocated to allow the upgrade work to be carried out (total budget of $660,000 for 2020/21);

(d) **Notes** that a briefing will be held with the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board prior to formal approval of the scheme design being sought;

(e) **Circulates** this report to all Community Boards and the Utilities & Roading Committee for information.

3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1 On 19 June 2018 as part of the Long Term Plan deliberations, Council formally signed off on the construction of a Multi-Use Sports Facility to be located on Coldstream Road in Rangiora.

3.2 The facility will be approximately 6000m², have four indoor courts and the ability to be extended in the future.

3.3 Coldstream Road currently has a very rural feel with no footpaths or provision for cyclists. The current speed limit is 100km/h. There is also Mainpower Oval, Maria Andrews Sports Fields and the Cemetery, which all access off Coldstream Road.

3.4 With the construction of the new Multi-Use Sports Facility there will be an increase in the public accessing this facility from both within and outside of the district. It is important that safe and efficient access is provided.

3.5 As such upgrading of the road will be necessary to better cater for the anticipate use once the new facility is built. This will need to include pedestrian and cyclist facilities as well as catering for a high number of turning vehicles in the area.

3.6 Abley Consultants have been engaged by Council to develop a scheme design for the wider area.

4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1. A scheme design has been developed by Abley Consultants and includes the following improvements:

- Kerb & Channel along both sides of Coldstream Road
- Flush median to allow for turning vehicles
- 3m wide shared path along Coldstream Road
- Two pedestrian refuges to allow for safer pedestrian crossing across the road
- Speed threshold to the east of the Multi-Use Sports Facility
4.2. The road will need to be widened from the current width of 6.6m to 11.4m to allow for the additional width needed for the flush median. This will necessitate the installation of kerb & channel along the northern side of the road to provide protection for the poles.

4.3. The estimate for the proposed works is $710,000 and the current budget as shown in the Long Term Plan is $500,000.

4.4. It is proposed to fund the pedestrian refuge islands and the speed threshold from Minor Improvement funding and the shared path from Walking & Cycling Programme. These are separate budgets and are not included in the $710,000 budget for Coldstream Road.

4.5. The estimate includes the cost of extending street lighting along the frontage of the Multi-Use Sports Facility. A design and formal quotation has not yet been requested from Mainpower. This will be the next step of the project.

4.6. The estimate includes an allowance for professional fees and includes a 10% contingency.

4.7. It is recommended that Council approve additional budget of $210,000 to allow the upgrade work to be undertaken.

4.8. Alternatively Council could decline this recommendation and ask staff to reduce the scope of work to fit with the existing allocated budget. This is not recommended as this would result in compromises to the design and impact on the safe operation of the road.

4.9. The links to Coldstream Road along East Belt and Golf Links Road will need to be staged and funding separately and do not form part of this report.

4.10. This issue was not included in the draft Annual Plan as the scheme design and cost estimates had not been completed at the time.

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. Groups and Organisations

5.2. The draft scheme design has been presented to the Multi-Use Sports Facility Project Steering Group.

5.3. A briefing has been held with Council on this issue and a further briefing will be held with the Rangiora-Ashley Board on the scheme design prior to formal sign off.

5.4. Wider Community

5.5. Key features of the draft scheme design have been shared with adjacent property owners as part of the consultation process.

5.6. No further specific consultation has been undertaken.

6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1. Financial Implications

6.2. The scheme design estimate for the proposed works is $710,000 and the current budget as shown in the Long Term Plan is $500,000 (PJ101037.000.5133). As such $210,000 of additional budget would be required to upgrade the road.

6.3. The additional budget of $210,000 would be funded from the Roading Strategic account which is funded by loan. The rates impact is 0.02%.
6.4. The shared path and pedestrian refuge facilities will be funded from the Walking & Cycling and Minor Safety budgets. Walking & Cycling has a budget of $500,000 per year and Minor Safety has a budget $560,000 per year which is allocated to minor safety initiatives around the district. This will be included in a separate report to Utilities & Roading Committee.

6.5. The budget can be updated now that the scheme design has been carried out.

6.6. **Community Implications**

6.7. There are no Community Implications associated with this audit report.

6.8. **Risk Management**

6.9. There are risks associated with this report particularly around the perception of adequacy of parking around the facilities.

6.10. **Health and Safety**

6.11. There are no Health & Safety issues associated with this report.

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**

7.3. Not applicable.

7.4. **Community Outcomes**

This report consider the following outcomes:

*There is a safe environment for all*

- Harm to people from natural and man-made hazards is minimised.
- Crime, injury and harm from road crashes, gambling, and alcohol abuse are minimised.

*Transport is accessible, convenient, reliable and sustainable*

- The standard of our District’s roads is keeping pace with increasing traffic numbers.
- Communities in our District are well linked with each other and Christchurch is readily accessible by a range of transport modes.

7.5. **Delegations**

The Council has the authority to receive this report and consider submissions as part of the Annual Plan process.
1. SUMMARY

1.1 This report is to brief Council regarding ongoing concerns raised by residents in the Silverstream subdivision about noise, privacy and vehicle lights causing issues along the western side of the development on the Ohoka Road frontage (previously referred to as the New Arterial Road).

1.2 Staff had previously received a number of complaints regarding road noise and requests for asphalt surfacing on the new road, as well as a request for replacement of existing fencing. A report on these issues was taken to Council as part of the 2018 LTP deliberations.

1.3 During the 2018 LTP deliberations it was agreed that asphalt surfacing would be laid along the western side of the development on Ohoka Road to help reduce the noise for existing residents. This work has been completed and feedback has been received from two residents; one advising they were pleased with the outcome and the other not.

1.4 Fencing has been replaced at the southern end of this portion of road and is due to be replaced at the northern end as well. The new fence is higher at 2.4m while the existing subdivision fences are 1.8m high. The sections of higher fence were agreed with property owners, firstly because the road in these locations ramps up significantly to the bridges (significantly more than along the straight) and secondly because these properties are near curves and as such headlights can shine into houses at night.

1.5 A request has been received to replace the remaining fence along this section of road with new 2.4m high fences.

1.6 There are four options available to Council:
   a. Option One – Replace fencing along the full length with a new 2.4m high timber fence.
   b. Option Two – Replace fencing for two properties immediately adjacent to Hayson Drive with a new 2.4m high timber fence due to their location near an intersection.
   c. Option Three – Make a one off payment of $500 per property to allow the property owners to go towards upgrading their existing fence and/or carry out planting within their property boundary.
d. Option Four – Maintain the status Quo.

1.7 There is no funding currently allocated for replacement fencing however consideration could be given to funding this from the current project budget.

Attachments:

i. Appendix i) - Aerial Photographs of Ohoka Road
ii New Arterial Road - Photos of Fencing for Report (TRIM No. 190521071173)

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 190407051583;
(b) Declines the request for fencing improvements and maintains the status quo;
(c) Circulates this report to the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board, Oxford-Ohoka Community Board and the Utilities & Roading Committee for information.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1 The New Arterial Road project was overseen by a Project Control Group (PCG) which included staff from Councils Utilities & Roading Team, Project Delivery Unit, Planning Team and also included the Developer.

3.2 Noise was considered as part of the design process and it was agreed that this would be managed by using the smallest sized chip seal and a lower speed limit in an effort to minimise noise.

3.3 The PCG considered the appropriate surface for the New Arterial Road and concluded that a two coat chip seal (Grade 4&6) was appropriate. This is the same surfacing used in urban streets.

3.4 During the 2018/19 Long Term Plan process submissions were heard from residents on the new road and it was agreed that an asphalt surfacing be laid on the road to help reduce noise for adjacent residents.

3.5 Asphalt surface was laid along this section of the road in late January 2019. This has resulted in a reduction in noise.

3.6 Subsequent to the new asphalt being laid, further correspondence has been received on behalf of the property owners raising the issues of road construction, speed, privacy and noise. A list of concerned residents was provided.

3.7 A meeting was held on site with the spokesperson to discuss these concerns further.

3.8 Staff are working to address the speeding concerns and will be carrying out further work with an aim of trying to reduce speed.

3.9 No specialist noise testing has been undertaken before / after the new asphalt surface being laid, however one resident has carried out a noise test from a cell phone and indicated they believe the noise has dropped by 5DBa. As the Decibel scale is logarithmic this is considered to be a reasonably large reduction on the noise scale. We have also received feedback from another resident along this road who stated they had noticed a significant reduction in tyre noise on the new seal.
3.10 The existing fence along the western boundary of the development was a requirement of the resource consent for the subdivision and has specific design requirements which are consent noticed on the property titles. Any change to this requires a resource consent application to be applied for and granted before the fence can be altered.

3.11 It is noted that the road was shown on the Outline Development Plan and as such all property purchasers’ were made aware of the future road.

3.12 The District Plan exempts noise from having to be considered for the New Arterial Road as set out in clause 31.12.2.4. This exemption was approved as part of LURP Action 47 which was issued by the Minister of Earthquake Recovery.

3.13 It is noted that the current traffic volume on this road is 7500 vehicles per day and that this is expected to grow over coming years. The district has a number of roads which have volumes well in excess of Ohoka Road where there is no fencing provided by Council.

3.14 It is also noted that to undertaking fencing beyond that already approved could be seen to set a precedent.

3.1 The issue was not included in the draft Annual Plan as the asphalt surfacing was being undertaken to reduce noise effects. This issue has since been raised by a resident.

**ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

3.2. It is acknowledged that as traffic volumes will increase along this route as growth continues particularly around west Rangiora.

3.3. Council policy is that all Arterial and Strategic urban roads in residential areas will be surfaced with asphalt surfacing when they are next resurfaced. Asphalt surfacing has been carried out along this portion of the road and has resulted in a noise reduction. There are no specific requirements for fencing.

3.4. It was noted in a previous report that asphalt surfacing does help reduce tyre noise from vehicles travelling along the road, however it does not have any impact on engine noise coming from vehicles utilising the road.

3.5. The existing properties along Butchers Road have a 1.8m high wooden paling fence along the road frontage. This fence was a requirement of the resource consent which was issued for the subdivision.

3.6. The resource consent for the subdivision required a fence to be constructed to a specified design and that a consent notice be registered on the title of each property fronting the road. Residents are required to maintain these fences.

3.7. The existing fences have been raised to a height of 2.4m at the southern ends of the road where the new road ramps up to the bridge over the Kaiapoi River. The raising of the fence at the northern end of the road has been approved and is due to commence shortly. It was agreed to raise the fence in these locations as the new road was lifted as it ramps up to the bridges, which resulted in a significant reduction in privacy for the property owners as well as issues with headlights shining into properties at night. Photographs attached in Appendix ii) show the current fence heights in relation to the houses (TRIM No. 190521071173).
3.8. The options available to Council are as follows:

a. **Option One – Replace fencing along the length with 2.4m high timber fence.**

This option involves replacing the remaining fences along the full length with a new 2.4m high wooden fence. The length is 390m and the estimated cost of fencing only is $100,000 including staining.

A resource consent would need to be secured for the change to the fencing and there would be legal costs associated with the change in consent notices which would be required on the affected lots.

The cost to replace the fencing is estimated to be $100,000 for the removal of the existing fences and construction of new fences and estimated $50,000 to $100,000 in costs for the consenting and legal work associated with the changes to the consent notices, therefore for this option Council would need to allow budget of $200,000 for replacement fencing.

b. **Option Two – Replace fencing immediately adjacent to Hayson Drive with 2.4m high timber fence.**

This option involves replacing the fences for the two properties either side of the Hayson Drive intersection with a new 2.4m high wooden fence. The length is 70m and the estimated cost is $18,000 including staining.

A resource consent would need to be secured for the change to the fencing and there would be legal costs associated with the change in consent notices which would be required on the affected lots.

It is noted that any property located at an intersection should expect some headlight spill from turning vehicles purely due to their location.

The cost to replace the fencing is estimated as being $18,000 for the removal of the existing fences and construction of new fences and estimated $25,000 in costs for the consenting and legal work associated with the changes to the consent notices, therefore for this option Council would need to allow budget of $43,000 for replacement fencing.

c. **Option Three – One-off Payment of $500 per property.**

This option is to make a one off payment of $500 to each property adjacent to the road with the existing 1.8m high fence, for either upgrading of their existing fence and/or for planting within the property as they see fit.

It is noted that staff have previously extended an offer to the resident to assist with the resource consent process should the residents wish to alter or replace the existing fence themselves.

d. **Option Four – Status Quo.**

This option is to leave the existing fence in place.

It is noted that staff have previously extended an offer to the resident to assist with the resource consent process should the residents wish to alter or replace the existing fence themselves.

3.9. The Management Team have reviewed this report and support the recommendations.
4. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

4.1. **Groups and Organisations**

4.2. No specific consultation has been undertaken on this matter.

4.3. **Wider Community**

4.4. A number of complaints were received regarding road noise along with four submissions to the 2018 Long Term Plan deliberations. Since this time an asphalt surface has been laid along this section of road to help reduce noise.

5. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

5.1. **Financial Implications**

5.2. There is no budget currently allocated for replacement fencing.

5.3. If Council decided to approve additional funding it would not qualify for any NZTA funding.

5.4. Consideration could be given to funding the fencing from the existing project which is growth funded from District Development Contributions (50%) and existing rate payers (50%). There is currently $300,000 of budget available in PJ100199.000.5135 with an estimated $100,000 of remaining commitments in relation to fencing, landscaping and actions from the safety audit, which need to be completed.

5.5. **Community Implications**

5.6. Road noise can be affected by various factors including the road surface, vehicle type, tyre type, volume and the speed of traffic using a road.

5.7. The effect of road noise will vary between individuals and can cause annoyance.

5.8. **Risk Management**

5.9. Normal construction risks will apply.

5.10. **Health and Safety**

5.11. Should any physical works be required to be carried out then the contractor will be required to provide a Site Specific Health & Safety Plan for approval, prior to work commencing on site.

6. **CONTEXT**

6.1. **Policy**

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

6.2. **Legislation**

This project will be subject to the Resource Management Act 1991 and Regional Plan Rules and resource consent requirements.
6.3. **Community Outcomes**

This report considers the following outcomes:

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

**Transport is accessible, convenient, reliable and sustainable**
- The standard of our District’s roads is keeping pace with increasing traffic numbers.
- Communities in our District are well linked with each other and Christchurch is readily accessible by a range of transport modes.

6.4. **Delegations**

Council has the authority to approve works within the Road Reserve.
Appendix i – Aerial Photograph of Ohoka Rd with Fencing lengths

**KEY:**
- **Red line** – Option One – Higher fence along remaining length as requested
- **Orange Star** – Option Two – Higher fence only at intersection
- **Green line** – Area where higher fencing has already been agreed
Photos - properties with fences at 1.8m high.
Photos - properties with fences at 2.4m high
1. **SUMMARY**

1.1. This report is to request changes to the Roading capital works budgets.

1.2. Table one details the proposed budget changes.

1.3. The following is a summary of the recommended budget changes to the draft Annual Plan:

   - Rangiora Woodend / Boys Rd / Tuahiwi Rd – 2019/20 budget updated to $200,000 to allow for intersection upgrade to proceed ahead of programme;

   - Travel Demand Management / Modelling – Waimakariri District Council share of Greater Christchurch commitments is $591,300. An application is to be submitted to NZTA for 51% share. Council share $289,712. This item was included in the Roading Activity Plan commentary in January (Trim. 181126138931) but did not carry through to the table and was outlined in the Travel Demand Management Measures Report to Council in January (Trim. 190109001703).

1.4. Funding will be required in 2019/20 for Travel Demand Management work and modelling to support the Greater Christchurch Partnership work.

1.5. It is proposed to reallocate a portion of Footpath Renewals and Maintenance budget which was previously unsubsidised to cover Council share of the Greater Christchurch commitments. NZTA have confirmed that a financial assistance rate of 51% is available for the 3 year period for footpaths. Therefore there is $417,631 of surplus budget available each year, over the three years. Council are to fund the 49% share of the Travel demand Management work at a cost of $289,712, with an application to be made to NZTA for the remaining 51% share.

1.6. As part of the Draft Annual Plan process consultation was carried out on bringing forward funding for the investigation of Park and Ride. In total 61 submissions were received, 42 in favour of bringing the funding forward and 19 in favour of the status quo.

1.7. The projects above with the exception of Travel Demand Management / modelling are signalled in the Long Term Plan.
2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 190415055924;

(b) Approves the budget changes as shown in Table One below;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Draft Annual Plan 2019/20 ($000)</th>
<th>Updated Annual Plan 2019/20 ($000)</th>
<th>NZTA Funding Share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Woodend / Boys Rd / Tuahiwi Rd</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Demand Management / Modelling</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$591.3</td>
<td>$301.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$791.3</td>
<td>$401.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c) Approves bringing forward $100,000 of budget for Park and Ride investigation as outlined in the Draft Annual Plan Consultation document;

d) Notes that the budget of $591,250 for Travel Demand Management has a Council share of $289,712 which will be reallocated from Footpath Reconstruction funding which is now subsidised;

e) Notes that an application will be made to NZTA for a 51% share of the funding required for Travel Demand Management / Modelling. The risk of this not being funded is considered to be low;

(f) Notes that budget may need to be brought forward for other projects if work progresses more quickly than anticipated;

(g) Notes that all GCO Partners are contributing to the cost of this work;

(h) Circulates this report to the Community Boards and the Utilities & Roading Committee.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1. Changes are required to the Roading Capital Works Budgets beyond that detailed in the draft Annual Plan which reflect changed to the timing of delivery of projects.

3.2. There are a number of factors including external controls, timing of anticipated development and internal factors which can affect the delivery of projects.

3.3. Adjustments to the budgets are proposed as detailed in Table One below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Draft Annual Plan 2019/20 ($000)</th>
<th>Updated Annual Plan 2019/20 ($000)</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Woodend / Boys Rd / Tuahiwi Rd</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>Safety improvements at the intersection. Carryover $50k from 2018/19 as work was delayed due to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.4. Funding will be required in 2019/20 for Travel Demand Management / Modelling work to support the Greater Christchurch Partnership work.

3.1 The Christchurch Investment Story and other regional planning initiatives set the aspiration for moving from this heavily single occupancy private vehicle based travel mode to a more sustainable transport system that has greater choice for the travelling public. The focus is to increase the people carrying capacity of the transport system rather than vehicle capacity, to cope with forecast growth in the region. This means a shift towards car sharing and the use of mass transport systems such as buses, and an encouragement of active modes, such as walking and cycling.

3.5. Within the wider context, there is an increasing demand for travel south across the Waimakariri River between Waimakariri District and Christchurch City, particularly in the morning peak. A number of studies have been conducted which have resulted in projects such as the Western Belfast Bypass and the Northern Corridor Project being undertaken.

3.2 NZTA have developed a business case for the delivery of a managed lane from Tram Road through to Cranford Street to align with the Northern Corridor project.

3.6. Along with the managed lane, the business case has identified, at a high level, a suite of Travel Demand Management (TDM) initiatives which are expected to be required in future years. These initiatives include education, marketing/communication, software, research, Park & Ride facilities, and express bus services, which will assist the lane to operate effectively and provide adequate provision for this mode change.

3.7. The following work which needs to be undertaken to support the Greater Christchurch work as detailed in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projects in 2019/20</th>
<th>Total estimated cost across all partners</th>
<th>Financial Assistance Rate (FAR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transport Modelling update (CTM and CAST)</td>
<td>$650,000</td>
<td>Standard FAR (51%) available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated economic, land use and transport model</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>Standard FAR (51%) available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Travel Survey</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>Standard FAR (51%) available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Demand Management (TDM)*</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>Enhanced FAR may be available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remix</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>Standard FAR (51%) available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transport Futures Detailed Business Cases</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>Enhanced FAR may be available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL COST</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,730,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDC Share (12.5%)</td>
<td>$591,250</td>
<td>FAR (51%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

external effects. Bring forward $150k from 2020/21 to allow intersection work to progress ahead of programme.

 Council share of Greater Christchurch commitments is $289,712. Application to be submitted to NZTA for 51% share.
* This is Travel demand management measures anticipated for the partners and excludes the business case. Includes a package of works around education, software, research and travel planning. WDC share of the total cost is 12.5% as agreed with the GCP Partners.

3.8. It is proposed to reallocate a portion of Footpath Renewals and Maintenance budget which was previously unsubsidised to cover Council share of the Greater Christchurch commitments.

3.9. The FAR (financial assistance rate) of 51% has now been formally approved for footpath renewals and maintenance.

3.10. The current budget for Footpath Renewals is $683,000 and Footpath Maintenance is $135,885 (total of $818,885). The 51% subsidy has resulted in $417,631 of additional budget being available.

3.11. As part of the Draft Annual Plan process consultation was carried out on whether funding should be brought forward to allow for the investigation of Park and Ride to proceed. There were two options put forward in the consultation document:

- Option One – Council’s preference – A portion of the allocated budget ($100,000) be brought forward to the 2018/19 and 2019/20 years (split over two years) to allow for public transport infrastructure investigation to begin.
- Option Two – Status quo – Funding remains allocated for 2025 to 2027 years and investigation work is put off until then.

3.12. In total 61 submissions were received. Of these 42 were in favour of bringing the funding forward (69%) and 19 preferred to keep the status quo (31%).

4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

4.1. Options with regards to budget changes are for the Council to retain the status quo as per the approved Long Term Plan funding or to accept the proposed budget changes as part of the Annual Plan process:

- **Option One – Retain the status quo:**
  This is not recommended because circumstances have changed since the Long Term Plan was adopted and projects would not be able to be completed.

- **Option Two - Accept proposed changes as detailed in Table One:**
  This is the recommended option as it will allow projects to continue and work to be completed with the three year NZTA funding cycle. This will also allow timing of projects to be managed to meet external requirements.

4.2. With regard to bringing forward funding for Park and Ride investigation there are also two options:

- **Option One – Bring forward funding for Park & Ride investigation:**
  This is the recommended option as it will allow planning work to be undertaken and park and ride locations to be considered resulting in a best for district outcome. This options was favoured by 69% of submissions received on this issue.

- **Option Two - Retain the status quo:**
  This is not the recommended option as future planning is required to ensure the best outcome for the district as a whole.

4.3. The Travel Demand Management / Modelling funding requirement was included in the Roading Activity Plan commentary in January (Trim. 181126138931) but did not carry
through to the table. This issued was also outlined in the Travel Demand Management Measures Report to Council in January (Trim. 190109001703).

4.4. This change to budget for Rangiora Woodend was not included in the Draft Annual Plan as the scheme design and cost estimates had not been completed at the time.

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

5. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

5.1. **Groups and Organisations**

5.2. Some works will need to be timed to coordinate with projects being undertaken by other agencies.

5.3. **Wider Community**

5.4. No specific community feedback has been sought on these changes.

6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**

6.2. There is a risk that NZTA may not fund a share of the Travel Demand Management / Modelling costs. This is considered to be a low risk.

6.3. Council share for the funding for Travel Demand Management / Modelling will be reallocation from Footpath Reconstruction funding which was previously unsubsidised but now has a 51% financial assistance rate from NZTA. The 51% subsidy has resulted in $417,631 of additional budget being available. Council are to fund the 49% share of the Travel demand Management / Modelling work at a cost of $289,712.

6.4. **Community Implications**

6.5. Some projects may not commence or be completed in the originally expected timeframe.

6.6. **Risk Management**

6.7. All GCP Partners are contributing towards the costs of this work. All parties are to pay an agreed share with the Waimakariri District Council share being 12.5% of the total cost. There is a risk that a partner may not pay their share. There have been no indications to date of this happening and the risk is considered low.

6.8. Normal construction risks will apply.

6.9. **Health and Safety**

6.10. As per standard tendering process of any physical works, the contractor will be assessed for Health & Safety and required to provide a Site Specific Health & Safety Plan for approval prior to work commencing on site.

7. **CONTEXT**

7.1. **Policy**

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

The Land Transport Management Act and Local Government Act are relevant in this matter.

7.3. Community Outcomes

This report considers the following outcomes:

There is a safe environment for all

- Harm to people from natural and man-made hazards is minimised.
- Our district has the capacity and resilience to quickly recover from natural disasters and adapt to the effects of climate change.
- Crime, injury and harm from road crashes, gambling, and alcohol abuse are minimised.

Transport is accessible, convenient, reliable and sustainable

- The standard of our District’s roads is keeping pace with increasing traffic numbers.
- Communities in our District are well linked with each other and Christchurch is readily accessible by a range of transport modes.

7.4. Delegations

The Council has the delegated authority to add or amend budgets.
1. **SUMMARY**

1.1 This report is to update Council on Travel Demand Management measures which are likely to be required as part of the Northern Arterial Project and proposed HOV (High Occupancy Vehicle) lane.

1.2 The Travel Demand Management package is likely to include a number of measures which will need to be implemented around the time of the Northern Arterial opening and include education, software, Park & Ride, research and travel planning.

1.3 Early discussions have been held around the provision of “Park & Ride” facilities within the Waimakariri District to support car sharing and possible express commuter services. This is likely to result in a request for the $4 million funding which is currently sitting across two years in 2025/26 and 2026/27 being brought forward and may also require additional funding in the future.

1.4 There will also be ongoing operational costs associated with the Travel Demand Management measures which do not currently have funding allocated. These include education, software, research and travel planning.

1.5 To date initial investigations have been undertaken in conjunction with NZTA and Christchurch City Council however there is a wide range of estimates and insufficient detail which results in a low level of confidence in the estimates provided to date. Therefore further work will be undertaken to scope the extent of Travel Demand Management measures in the district and confirm likely costs.

1.6 To allow for investigation and planning work to be carried out, it is requested that $100,000 of budget be brought forward from 2025/26 year into 2019/20.

1.7 Further updates will be brought to Council as this work progresses.
2. **RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 190109001703;

(b) **Approves** $100,000 of funding for Park & Ride from the 2025/26 year be brought forward, $40,000 to the 2018/19 year and $60,000 to 2019/20, to allow for investigation and planning work to be carried out;

(c) **Notes** that this will be funded out of the Strategic Roading account;

(d) **Notes** that there will be no effect on rates;

(e) **Notes** that staff will continue to work in conjunction with the Greater Christchurch Partners to determine the scope of Travel Demand Management required;

(f) **Notes** that it is likely funding for Park & Ride will need to be brought forward from 2025/26 and 2026/27 years as part of a future AP or LTP process, to allow for these facilities to be developed.

3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1 In 2009 Council agreed to adopt the Greater Christchurch Travel Demand Management (TDM) Strategy and Action Plan. This documents sets the travel demand management policy direction, targets and actions to achieve a more sustainable transport system in the UDS area.

3.2 Christchurch has one of the highest usage rates of private cars for commuting in New Zealand with around 85% of vehicles being single occupancy vehicles.

3.3 The Christchurch Investment Story and other regional planning initiatives set the aspiration for moving from this heavily single occupancy private vehicle based travel mode to a more sustainable transport system that has greater choice for the travelling public. The focus is to increase the people carrying capacity of the transport system rather than vehicle capacity, to cope with forecast growth in the region. This means a shift towards car sharing and the use of mass transport systems such as buses, and an encouragement of active modes, such as walking and cycling.

3.4 Within the wider context, there is an increasing demand for travel south across the Waimakariri River between Waimakariri District and Christchurch City, particularly in the morning peak. A number of studies have been conducted which have resulted in projects such as the Western Belfast Bypass and the Northern Arterial Project being undertaken.

3.5 Construction of the Northern Arterial Project began in 2016 and will provide the following:
- A four lane motorway (two lanes each way) between Cranford Street and the existing motorway immediately south of Chaney's Off-ramp. This project is due to be completed by mid-2020.
- A shared path / cycleway between Cranford Street and Chaney's Off-ramp.
- A 3rd northbound lane across the Waimakariri River Bridge, and up to the Tram Road off ramp.

3.6 Subsequent to construction starting on the Northern Arterial Project, consent has been granted to construct a 3rd southbound lane, and a “clip on” cycleway across the Waimakariri
River Bridge. One of the conditions of this consent is that this 3rd southbound lane is to be a High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lane.

3.7 NZTA have developed a business case for the delivery of an HOV lane from Tram Road through to Cranford Street. This business case has been submitted to NZTA and a decision is likely early in 2019. This will be the first HOV lane in a motorway environment in New Zealand.

3.8 Along with the HOV lane, the business case has identified, at a high level, a suite of Travel Demand Management (TDM) initiatives which are expected to be required in future years. These initiatives include education, marketing/communication, software, research, Park & Ride facilities, and express bus services, which will assist the HOV lane to operate effectively and provide adequate provision for this mode change.

3.9 Staff are currently involved in discussions with Christchurch City Council ECan and NZTA on the extent of Travel Demand Management (TDM) measures and Park & Ride facilities which are likely to be required. A separate business case is being prepared on Travel Demand Management (TDM). It is expected that this will be submitted to NZTA in the first quarter of 2019. Once this business case is completed, it is expected that there will be a clearer picture of the likely scope of measures and the cost.

3.10 Travel Demand Management
TDM can mean different things to different people. For the HOV lane this will focuses on methods and programmes that can change travel behaviour (how, when and where people travel). A TDM programme seeks to influence a range of travel behaviours so that we maximise the efficiency of the existing transport system. It doesn’t suggest that all motor vehicle usage is bad but encourages people to think about what the most efficient mode would be.

3.11 For the HOV lane the TDM package is likely to include:
- Marketing and Communications at road opening
- Park & Ride facilities (detailed in the section below)
- "Mobility as a Service" (MaaS) Ride Share software (to encourage and facilitate car sharing)
- Express Bus Services
- Customer Insight Research (to inform decision making)
- Education campaigns
- Travel Planning

3.12 Marketing / communications at opening and Park & Ride facility construction will be one off costs however the other items will be ongoing costs which have not been budgeted for. It is also noted that Park & Ride facilities will have an on-going maintenance cost which will require funding. At this stage the very high level estimate of these costs is between $225,000 to $300,000 per annum total costs (NZTA funding share of $153,000 / WDC share $147,000).

3.13 Park & Ride
Park & Ride facilities will be required in key strategic locations in order to provide a safe and convenient place for commuters to park their vehicles and then connect with either public transport or with other commuters for car sharing.

3.14 There are three different levels of service which can be provided for Park & Ride facilities, being:
3.15 To support the future transport network it will be necessary to provide Park & Ride facilities. While the exact locations and sizes of parking areas are not yet known it is likely that facilities will be required in the following locations:

- Rangiora
- Kaiapoi
- Woodend
- Tram Road (possibly the Mandeville area)

3.16 Park & Ride facilities in Waimakariri District are currently located in White Street Rangiora (40 Parks) and Silverstream Retail Centre (30 Parks). Both areas are serviced by the Blue Line buses and have bike shelter parking available. Both sites are well utilised. An informal park and ride area has been constructed on River Road next to the Dog Park and there is an informal parking area at the eastern end of Tram Road.

3.17 $4 million of funding for Park & Ride facilities is currently sitting in the 2025/26 and 2026/27 years and this is for Rangiora and Kaiapoi. This funding will likely need to be brought forward to allow for some Park & Ride facilities to be developed earlier, around the time of the opening of the Northern Arterial Road in mid-2020. Dependent on the outcome of further investigation and planning there may also be additional funding required in the future however this cannot be confirmed at this current stage.

3.18 The following is indicative timing of the project:

- 2019/20 – Investigation, options assessment and consultation
- 2020/21 – Property purchase, consenting, detailed design
- 2021/22 – Construction

There may be options available to stage the delivery of Park & Ride facilities and this will be considered during the investigation and options assessment phase.

3.19 While not directly related to Council’s budgets, it should be noted that the operating costs of any additional express bus services, as identified in the HOV lane business case, are likely to fall to our district’s ratepayers through ECan’s rating system.

3.20 Further updates will be brought to Council as this work progresses.

4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1. The Council is a partner to initiatives through the Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy. In 2009 Council agreed to adopt the Greater Christchurch Travel Demand Management (TDM) Strategy and Action Plan.

4.2. The Christchurch Investment Story and other regional planning frameworks set the aspiration for moving from this heavily single occupancy private vehicle based travel mode to a more sustainable transport system that has greater choice for the travelling public. The focus is to increase the people carrying capacity of the transport system rather than vehicle capacity, to cope with forecast growth in the region. This means a shift towards car sharing and the use of mass transport systems such as buses.
4.3. The current Roading Activity Management Plan and 2018-28 Long Term Plan makes reference to travel demand management as a key means of managing future growth. There is funding for passenger transport infrastructure in the Long Term Plan, including park and ride.

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

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. Groups and Organisations

5.2. No specific feedback has been sought on this issue.

5.3. Wider Community

5.4. No specific feedback has been sought on this issue other than consultation which has been undertaken by NZTA.

6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1. Financial Implications

6.2. There is currently $4 million of funding shown in the 2018-28 Long Term Plan for Park & ride facilities in Kaiapoi and Rangiora. This funding is shown across the 2025/26 and 2026/27 financial years. It is assumed NZTA funding share will be available for this project (meaning Council contribution is $1.96 million). It is likely that a request to bring forward this funding will be brought to Council in the future and there may also be a requirement for additional funding for these facilities, however due to the wide range in estimates and insufficient detail this is unclear and will need further investigation.

6.3. The business case submitted to NZTA for the HOV Lane indicates likely costs to provide Park & Ride in Waimakariri District are likely to be around $9.6 million. There has been no justification or breakdown of this estimate provided to staff to date and as such there is currently a low level of confidence in this figure.

6.4. If the current NZTA funding share rate of 51% is assumed then this will leave a shortfall in Council share of $2.744 million. If the enhanced funding share rate can be secured from NZTA at 75% then this would leave a funding shortfall of approximately $0.44 million (refer to table below)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding in 2018-28 LTP for Park &amp; Ride (2025/26 &amp;26/27)</th>
<th>$4M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Made up of:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZTA Share (51%)</td>
<td>$2.04M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Share (49%)</td>
<td>$1.96M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Park &amp; Ride cost from HOV Business Case</th>
<th>$9.6M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If 51% Financial Assistance Rate from NZTA:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZTA Share (51%)</td>
<td>$4.896M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Share (49%)</td>
<td>$4.704M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shortfall over and above $1.96M Council Share allocated in LTP</td>
<td>$2.744M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| If 75% Financial Assistance Rate from NZTA:        |       |
| NZTA Share (75%)                                  | $7.2M |
| Council Share (25%)                               | $2.4M |
| Shortfall over and above $1.96M Council Share allocated in LTP | $0.44M |
6.5. There are also likely to be ongoing operational costs associated with Travel demand measures such as education, software, research, travel planning and operational maintenance of Park & Ride areas. At this stage the very high level estimate of these costs is between $225,000 to $300,000 per annum total costs (including NZTA subsidy).

6.6. To date initial investigations have been undertaken in conjunction with NZTA and Christchurch City Council however there is a wide range of estimates and insufficient detail which results in a low level of confidence in the estimates provided to date. Therefore further work will be undertaken to scope the extent of Travel Demand Management measures in the district and confirm likely costs.

6.7. $100,000 of funding has been requested to be brought forward to allow for initial investigation to begin in 2019/20.

6.8. The remainder of the Park & Ride funding which currently sits in the future years (2025/26 and 2026/27) will need to be brought forward as part of a future AP or LTP process, to allow for these facilities to be developed.

6.9. Further updates will be brought to Council once this information is known.

6.10. **Community Implications**

6.11. NZTA have been through a consultation process as part of the Northern Arterial Project and a public hearing has been held for the 3rd southbound lane on the Waimakariri River Bridge.

6.12. Further consultation, communications and education will be required should the HOV lane be approved and progress.

6.13. **Risk Management**

6.14. There is a risk of negative reaction to the introduction of an HOV lane. This risk is mitigated by the education and publicity proposed in the business case.

6.15. Given that this HOV lane will be the first in a motorway environment in New Zealand, there is a risk that the lane may not function as anticipated, or may not attract the expected mode shift to HOVs.

6.16. **Health and Safety**

6.17. There are no specific Health & Safety considerations to be considered as part of this report.

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**

The Land Transport Management Act is the relevant legislation in this matter.
7.3. **Community Outcomes**

This report consider the following outcomes:

**There is a safe environment for all**
- Harm to people from natural and man-made hazards is minimised.
- Our district has the capacity and resilience to quickly recover from natural disasters and adapt to the effects of climate change.
- Crime, injury and harm from road crashes, gambling, and alcohol abuse are minimised.

**Transport is accessible, convenient, reliable and sustainable**
- The standard of our District’s roads is keeping pace with increasing traffic numbers.
- Communities in our District are well linked with each other and Christchurch is readily accessible by a range of transport modes.
- Public transport serves our District effectively.

7.4. **Delegations**

Council has the authority to receive information and consider all relevant facts.
1. SUMMARY

1.1. This report is to update Council on the Roading Subdivision Contribution Programme for 2019/20.

1.2. There are a number of developments around the district each year where Council contributes to the cost of upgrading Roading infrastructure. These include housing and commercial developments as well as requests for seal extensions in line with the Private Funding of Seal Extension Policy.

1.3. There are various developments currently underway around the district which will require Council to fund a share of the upgrade costs.

1.4. Support has also previously been given to Browns Road / North Eyre Road property owners north of the Eyre River, as well as Broad Road / Rangiora Leithfield Road property owners should they come up with a 50% cost share for sealing outside of their properties.

1.5. As developments progress through the year and further information becomes available, the funding contribution required by Council will be confirmed and reported to Council.

1.6. Due to the quantum of development planned in the near future, there is likely to be pressure on this budget over the next financial year.

1.7. The full extent and timing of these commitments is not yet known and therefore it is recommended that no changes be made to this budget until this becomes clearer.

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 190413055719;

(b) Notes the that there is likely to be pressure on the Subdivision Contribution budget in the 2019/20 year due to the quantum of anticipated development;

(c) Notes that further reports will be brought before Council as and when there is more certainty around future projects and costs;
(d) **Notes** that support has previously been given to Browns Road / North Eyre Road property owners north of the Eyre River, as well as Broad Road / Rangiora Leithfield Road property owners should they come up with a 50% cost share for sealing outside of their properties;

(e) **Circulates** this report to Utilities & Roading Committee for information.

### 3. BACKGROUND

3.1. The Roading Subdivision Contribution Budget is the funding source for financial contribution driven seal extensions and for 50% cost share seal extensions. It also funds other cost share projects where existing roads need to be upgraded in response to development, such as the urbanisation. The funding covers the cost of the benefit to existing ratepayers resulting from the work.

3.2. As this work is driven by developers it is difficult to budget accurately and in the past funding has regularly been carried forward at year end due to expected work not being completed in the time anticipated.

3.3. Council often doesn’t have control over when this work is carried out. The exception is Council managed projects and that is normally where financial contributions have been taken and Council completes the work, such as seal extensions.

3.4. In 2018/19 a report was taken to Council seeking support for the following seal extension projects, subject to the property owners being able to fund their required 50% share;

- Σ Duffs Road to seal a 100m section of the road. Pricing has been sent to the property owner. Confirmation not yet received.
- Σ Browns Road / North Eyre Road to seal approximately 1.35km of road. Staff are continuing to work with the property owners on this project. A separate report will be brought to Council on this issue.
- Σ Broad Road / Rangiora Leithfield Road property owners have not agreed to take this forward at this stage.

3.5. In the 2019/20 year there is unallocated budget totalling $679,000. Likely commitments are as follows:

- Σ Cone Street Kerb & Channel and Footpath - Council share is $30,000;
- Σ Railway Road Urbanisation in conjunction with NPD Service Station Development – Value to be confirmed however estimated cost is $35,000;
- Σ Urbanisation of Parsonage Road in conjunction with the Freeman Woodend development – Value to be confirmed however estimated cost is $200,000;
- Σ Broad Road / Rangiora Leithfield Road Seal Extension. Unlikely to occur. Estimated cost is $141,000;
- Σ Browns Road / North Eyre Road Seal Extension. Very likely to occur. Estimated cost is $190,000;
- Σ Pentecost Road Urbanisation. The section adjacent to the school is to be carried out in 2019/20 to align with the opening of the new school. Value to be confirmed however estimated cost is $500,000.
- Σ Duffs Road Seal Extension. Sealing of a 100m section. This price has been with the resident for some time therefore it is considered unlikely to occur. Estimated cost is $8,000;
- Σ Topito Road Upgrade in conjunction with development occurring along the road. Estimated cost is $175,000 (refer to report 190501062382);
∑ Burgesses Rd – Request for private funding of seal extension to be considered. Estimated cost is $16,000.

4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

4.1. The issues to be considered are as follows:

4.2. The Roading Financial Contribution Budget is an allocation each year and as a high proportion of the work depends on developers and their timing often budget needs to be carried over at year end.

4.3. Estimates indicate that the current budget is unlikely to be sufficient to cover the commitments for the 2019/20 financial year. Options are to only budget for the confirmed projects with a contingency to cover unknowns, or to budget an annual allocation each year based on knowledge and experience and accept that in some years the budget will be too high and in others it may be too low.

4.4. The approach taken previously is to be conservative and only budget for confirmed projects, accepting that in some situations funding may have to be brought forward. This option is adopted to minimise unnecessary carry overs at year end. It may result in funding having to be brought forward if projects advance more quickly or developments happen and the Council has to respond with a contribution. This will result in more staff time having to write more reports.

4.5. This issue was not included in the draft Annual Plan as timing for these projects is dependent on developers and as such there are uncertainties around whether all projects identified will proceed.

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

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. Groups and Organisations

5.2. No specific consultation has been undertaken on this however the view of the community has been monitored through Service requests and Long Term Plan submissions.

5.3. Wider Community

5.4. As above.

6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1. Financial Implications

6.2. The following table outlines the projects that will likely be completed in 2019/20 and 2020/21:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>TIMELINES</th>
<th>ESTIMATED COST $$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2019/20</td>
<td>2020/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSSIBLE PROJECTS for 2020/21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cones Street Kerb &amp; Channel and footpath</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Likely/Unlikely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanisation of Railway Road with NPD Fuel Station</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanisation of Parsonage Road</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pentecost Road Upgrade in conjunction with new school</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topito Road Upgrade</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browns Road / North Eyre Road Sealing</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad Road/Rangiora Leithfield Road Sealing</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duffs Road Sealing</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burgesses Road Sealing (if approved)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (estimate) for 2019/20</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**POSSIBLE PROJECTS for 2020/21**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Likely/Unlikely</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pentecost Road Upgrade (south of the school)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach Grove Shared Path</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>210,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todds Road Urbanisation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enverton Drive Urbanisation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (estimate) for 2020/21</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$760,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.3. The current Subdivision Contribution budget is $679,077 made up of the following areas:

- **Council Performed Works** – PJ100361.000.5133 - $218,608
- **Direct Payment to Developers** - PJ100364.000.5133 - $418,608
- **Design Fees** - $41,861

Therefore there would be a shortfall should all projects proceed.

6.4. Unspent budget from 2018/19 of $120,000 has been identified for carried forward meaning budget of $900,000 total is likely to be available. As the majority of these projects are not Council led, the timing is not within Councils control.

6.5. Should all projects proceed and further funding be required then a report will be brought to Council on this matter.

6.6. **Community Implications**

6.7. The construction phase of the proposed projects have the potential to cause disruption to traffic. Staff will work with the Communications Team and ensure notification is carried out.

6.8. **Risk Management**

6.9. Normal construction risks will apply.
6.10. Health and Safety

6.11. As part of a construction contract the contractor will be required to submit a Site Specific Health & Safety Plan for approval, prior to work commencing on site.

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
The Land Transport Management Act is the relevant legislation in this matter.

7.3. Community Outcomes
This report consider the following outcomes:

There is a safe environment for all
- Harm to people from natural and man-made hazards is minimised.
- Our district has the capacity and resilience to quickly recover from natural disasters and adapt to the effects of climate change.
- Crime, injury and harm from road crashes, gambling, and alcohol abuse are minimised.

Transport is accessible, convenient, reliable and sustainable
- The standard of our District’s roads is keeping pace with increasing traffic numbers.
- Communities in our District are well linked with each other and Christchurch is readily accessible by a range of transport modes.

7.4. Delegations
Council has the authority to receive this report for information.
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT FOR DECISION

FILE NO and TRIM NO: GOV-07-01/190516069213

REPORT TO: Council

DATE OF MEETING: 28-30 May 2019

FROM: Kelly LaValley, Project Delivery Manager

SUBJECT: Development Contributions Schedules Following Draft 2019/20 Annual Plan Consultation

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

1. SUMMARY

1.1 This report is to provide an update to the development contribution schedules for the 2019/20 Annual Plan.

1.2 The draft 2019/20 Development Contribution schedules was included in the 2019/20 Annual Plan consultation document, as previously approved by council.

1.3 As a result of changes to budgets through the AP submissions, development contributions have changed from the Draft 2019/20 Development Contributions schedules that went out for consultation with the AP.

Attachments:

i. 2019/20 Development Contributions schedules (Trim 190516069687)

ii. 2019/20 Development Contribution Schedules report to Council 29 January 2019 (TRIM 190110002171)

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 190516069213.

(b) Approves the 2019/20 Development Contribution schedules to be effected on 1 July 2019 at the start of the new financial year.

(c) Notes if further changes to the 2019/20 Development Contributions schedules are required based on the Annual Plan deliberations, a further report will be presented to Council at the 18 June Annual Plan adoption meeting.

(d) Notes that consent and connection applications receipted prior to 1 July 2019 will include the 2018/19 Development Contribution rate.

(e) Notes that UV projects have been removed from growth budgets for 2019/20 and that there have been development contributions assessed and paid during the 2018/19 year. Based on Local Government Act 2002 requirements, these development contributions do not have to be refunded as the UV treatment projects will still be completed.
3. BACKGROUND

3.1. The Development Contributions Policy has a series of schedules that set out the basis for the various development contributions. Development contributions include those that relate to District-wide growth, scheme growth, and specific Development Contribution Areas (DCA). The location of any particular development will determine which development contributions apply.

3.2. Development Contributions (DCs) have two primary components, the growth rate anticipated for the scheme or development contribution area and the capital cost of the works required for servicing the new growth. The DCs are determined based on the projects and costs which are required to facilitate growth in the area divided by the expected number of properties to be developed in that area. These project costs include both past expenditures and anticipated future expenditures that need to be recovered by growth in the area that is serviced by the growth related projects.

3.3. Solely growth related projects (those required only to service new development) have capital costs spread as a development contribution over the anticipated number of new lots in the scheme/District.

3.4. Partially growth related projects (level of service improvements that also provide additional capacity for growth) typically have the growth component as the percentage of new lots in the scheme/District anticipated in the 10-year planning period.

3.5. DCA servicing requirements are identified through structure plans and investigations into the requirements to service specific growth areas. Through the structure plan process, infrastructure projects are subject to a cost benefit analysis. DCAs are typically solely growth related and therefore all of the costs are divided among the number of properties anticipated to develop in the area.

3.6. Development contributions are based on budgets set forth in the Annual Plan and were consulted on with the 2019/20 Annual Plan.

4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

4.1. The draft 2019/20 Development Contributions schedule was approved for consultation with the 2019/20 Annual Plan (AP) on 29 January 2019.

4.2. As a result of budget changes between consultation and deliberations, the 2019/20 Development Contribution schedules have changed to reflect the changes to the growth related budgets.

4.3. A summary of the changes to the schedules is presented in Table 1 below. Note that these figures are based on staff submissions that have not yet been incorporated into the budget spreadsheets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WATER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuahiwi</td>
<td>2,822</td>
<td>8,286</td>
<td>8,457</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Additional solely growth budget for water main extension in Topito Rd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4. Development contributions not included in the above table have not changed from the draft Development Contributions Schedules.

4.5. It is recommended that the Development Contributions schedules with the changes noted above be adopted with the Annual Plan, unless there are further changes as a result of the AP deliberations.

4.6. If there are further changes as a result of the AP deliberations or that have not been included in this report, a further report will be presented to Council at the 18 June 2019 Annual Plan adoption meeting.

4.7. One of the primary reasons for the changes to water development contributions from the 2018/19 schedules to the 2019/20 schedules is the removal of the UV treatment projects from the growth budgets.

4.8. Over the 2018/19 financial year, the water scheme development contributions have included the UV treatment projects and therefore some growth related funds have been collected for these projects.

4.9. The Local Government Act 2002 section 209(1)(d) requires that development contributions be refunded if the territorial authority does not provide the reserve, network infrastructure, or community infrastructure for which the development contribution was required.

4.10. On the basis that the UV treatment projects will still be delivered, it is not considered necessary to refund the development contributions paid or charged on the basis that the UV treatment projects are no longer being funded through growth.

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

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. Groups and Organisations

5.2. Community groups and organisations, including developers, have had an opportunity to review the Draft 2019/20 Development Contribution Schedules as part of the AP consultation process.

5.3. Specific issues relating to specific development areas are consulted on with developers and landowners in the area as required during the early stages of a development.

5.4. Wider Community

5.5. The wider community have also had an opportunity to review the Draft 2019/20 Development Contributions Schedules as part of the AP consultation process.

5.6. While there was one submission relating to the Development Contributions Policy, there were no submissions relating to the development contributions schedules.

6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1. Financial Implications

6.2. The current funding policy, excluding ring fenced outline development areas, is to fund capital works until growth occurs. The development contribution amount is amended each year to reflect the cost of funds and any changes to the programme.
6.3. The ability of the Council to require development contributions from growth to pay for the infrastructure required to accommodate growth is critical to ensuring growth is self-funding. This means that the cost of the increased capacity in Council’s infrastructure is the responsibility of those requiring the increased capacity and not carried by the people who occupy existing dwellings.

6.4. The legislation allows the Council to recover growth related expenditure for projects undertaken during the previous 10 years as well as future expenditure providing that future expenditure is scheduled in Council’s Long Term Plan.

6.5. Community Implications

6.6. The recommended changes to the proposed 2019/20 DCs will have an impact on developments in the Tuahiwi area. The changes result in a $171 per connection increase for water supply.

6.7. As there have been no other changes to the 2019/20 DCs, there are no effects beyond those presented in the draft development contributions report.

6.8. Risk Management

6.9. The key risk associated with development contributions is the timing of works completed to ensure that work is timed so as to not hold up development while also not be too far in advance of development such that interest costs are incurred ahead of income from development contributions.

6.10. This risk is managed through careful programming of work and collaboration with developers on timing of developments.

6.11. Health and Safety

6.12. There are no specific Health and Safety Risks associated with development contributions.

6.13. There will be individual project based Health and Safety Risks associated with the specific projects included in the development contributions. These risks will be assessed during the planning, design, and construction phases of each specific project.

7. CONTEXT

7.1. Policy

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

7.2. Legislation

7.3. The Local Government Act 2002 (LGA2002) Subpart 5 Sections 197 through 211 relates to development contributions.

7.4. Community Outcomes

7.5. Transport is accessible, convenient, reliable and sustainable.

7.6. Core utility services are provided in a timely and sustainable manner.

7.7. There is a healthy and sustainable environment for all.
7.8. Public spaces and facilities are plentiful, accessible and high quality.

7.9. Businesses in the District are diverse, adaptable and growing.

7.10. **Delegations**

7.11. Council has delegation to make any changes to the Development Contribution Policy including schedules.

7.12. Council staff may only apply development contributions in accordance with the Development Contributions Policy including the schedules.

Kelly LaValley  
*Project Delivery Manager*
## WATER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Long Term Plan</th>
<th>Draft Annual Plan 2019 - 20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cust</td>
<td>8,119</td>
<td>4,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernside</td>
<td>1,862</td>
<td>1,362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrymere</td>
<td>843</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
<td>2,074</td>
<td>1,963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East Kaiapoi DCA</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Kaiapoi DCA</td>
<td>3,008</td>
<td>3,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandeville</td>
<td>1,426</td>
<td>1,115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohoka</td>
<td>4,208</td>
<td>4,636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>7,486</td>
<td>7,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford 1</td>
<td>3,983</td>
<td>5,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford 2</td>
<td>6,696</td>
<td>7,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poyntzs Road</td>
<td>1,776</td>
<td>978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>5,188</td>
<td>5,413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Rangiora DCA</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Rangiora DCA - Kippenberger Ave</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Rangiora Outline Development Plan Area</td>
<td>4,524</td>
<td>4,694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Rangiora</td>
<td>1,175</td>
<td>1,108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbrook (m²)</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summerhill</td>
<td>6,546</td>
<td>6,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuahhiwi</td>
<td>8,068</td>
<td>8,457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend - Tuahhiwi water</td>
<td>1,167</td>
<td>1,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikuku Beach</td>
<td>1,275</td>
<td>511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Eyreton</td>
<td>2,395</td>
<td>1,762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend</td>
<td>4,174</td>
<td>6,254</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## SEWER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Long Term Plan</th>
<th>Draft Annual Plan 2019 - 20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Districts - Ocean Outfall</td>
<td>5,434</td>
<td>4,765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
<td>2,079</td>
<td>2,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East Kaiapoi</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>West Kaiapoi</td>
<td>East North East Kaiapoi Reticulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todds Rd Business Zone (per hectare)</td>
<td>2,148</td>
<td>2,254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Rangiora DCA Other Properties</td>
<td>8,685</td>
<td>9,151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Rangiora DCA (Gilberthorpes)</td>
<td>8,685</td>
<td>9,151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner West Rangiora DCA</td>
<td>8,685</td>
<td>9,151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Rangiora DCA</td>
<td>8,685</td>
<td>9,151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Rangiora DCA</td>
<td>8,685</td>
<td>9,151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernside</td>
<td>2,148</td>
<td>2,254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuahiwi</td>
<td>2,148</td>
<td>2,254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandeville, Ohoka, Swannanoa - new properties</td>
<td>13,164</td>
<td>13,602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandeville, Ohoka, Swannanoa - existing properties wishing to connect</td>
<td>13,164</td>
<td>13,602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikuku Beach</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Woodend DCA</td>
<td>7,169</td>
<td>7,422</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DRAINAGE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>West Kaiapoi</th>
<th>East North East Kaiapoi Reticulation</th>
<th>Rangiora</th>
<th>East North East Kaiapoi Reticulation</th>
<th>Rangiora</th>
<th>East North East Kaiapoi Reticulation</th>
<th>Rangiora</th>
<th>East North East Kaiapoi Reticulation</th>
<th>Rangiora</th>
<th>East North East Kaiapoi Reticulation</th>
<th>Rangiora</th>
<th>East North East Kaiapoi Reticulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>7,708</td>
<td>9,089</td>
<td>5,739</td>
<td>5,739</td>
<td>5,739</td>
<td>5,739</td>
<td>5,739</td>
<td>5,739</td>
<td>5,739</td>
<td>5,739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Rangiora</td>
<td>7,708</td>
<td>9,089</td>
<td>5,739</td>
<td>5,739</td>
<td>5,739</td>
<td>5,739</td>
<td>5,739</td>
<td>5,739</td>
<td>5,739</td>
<td>5,739</td>
<td>5,739</td>
<td>5,739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Rangiora DCA</td>
<td>5,739</td>
<td>5,739</td>
<td>5,739</td>
<td>5,739</td>
<td>5,739</td>
<td>5,739</td>
<td>5,739</td>
<td>5,739</td>
<td>5,739</td>
<td>5,739</td>
<td>5,739</td>
<td>5,739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Rangiora - Enverton Drive East</td>
<td>5,739</td>
<td>5,739</td>
<td>5,739</td>
<td>5,739</td>
<td>5,739</td>
<td>5,739</td>
<td>5,739</td>
<td>5,739</td>
<td>5,739</td>
<td>5,739</td>
<td>5,739</td>
<td>5,739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Rangiora - Enverton Drive / Ballarat Rd</td>
<td>2,359</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>2,359</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>2,359</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>2,359</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>2,359</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>2,359</td>
<td>2,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbrook (m²)</td>
<td>6,163</td>
<td>6,163</td>
<td>6,163</td>
<td>6,163</td>
<td>6,163</td>
<td>6,163</td>
<td>6,163</td>
<td>6,163</td>
<td>6,163</td>
<td>6,163</td>
<td>6,163</td>
<td>6,163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todds Rd Business Zone (per hectare)</td>
<td>57,500</td>
<td>57,500</td>
<td>57,500</td>
<td>57,500</td>
<td>57,500</td>
<td>57,500</td>
<td>57,500</td>
<td>57,500</td>
<td>57,500</td>
<td>57,500</td>
<td>57,500</td>
<td>57,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Urban</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Woodend DCA</td>
<td>9,895</td>
<td>9,327</td>
<td>2,784</td>
<td>2,784</td>
<td>2,784</td>
<td>2,784</td>
<td>2,784</td>
<td>2,784</td>
<td>2,784</td>
<td>2,784</td>
<td>2,784</td>
<td>2,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend DCA</td>
<td>2,784</td>
<td>2,784</td>
<td>2,784</td>
<td>2,784</td>
<td>2,784</td>
<td>2,784</td>
<td>2,784</td>
<td>2,784</td>
<td>2,784</td>
<td>2,784</td>
<td>2,784</td>
<td>2,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Square Meters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend DCA (Commercial) (m²)</td>
<td>8.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East Kaiapoi</td>
<td>782</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East Kaiapoi Commercial (m²)</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Kaiapoi</td>
<td>6,325</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mill Road ODP</td>
<td>21,820</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ROADING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>5,782</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbrook (m²)</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Woodend</td>
<td>6,964</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Rangiora DCA</td>
<td>3,501</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Kaiapoi DCA</td>
<td>5,931</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Kaiapoi DCA - new collector Rd</td>
<td>5,756</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi North</td>
<td>460</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West Rangiora (West Belt Extension to Townsend Road)</td>
<td>8,577</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RESERVES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Zones</td>
<td>1,103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Zones</td>
<td>12,750</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT

FILE NO and TRIM NO: GOV-07-01/ 190110002171

REPORT TO: Council

DATE OF MEETING: 29 January 2018

FROM: Kelly LaValley, Project Delivery Manager

SUBJECT: 2019/20 Development Contributions Schedules

SIGNED BY: (for Reports to Council or Committees)

1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to obtain Council approval of the Draft 2019/20 Development Contributions Schedules for consultation as part of the 2019/20 Annual Plan (AP).

1.2. The draft 2019/20 Development Contributions Schedules are based on the AP budgets and growth projections.

1.3. As a result of changes to budgets and growth projections, many of the development contributions have changed from the 2018-28 Long Term Plan schedule.

1.4. The Development Contributions Schedules will be included with the supporting information to the Draft 2019/20 Annual Plan Consultation Document.

Attachments:

i. Draft 2019/20 Development Contributions Schedule

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 190110002171.

(b) Approves the Draft 2019/20 Development Contributions Schedules for consultation with the 2019/20 Annual Plan.

(c) Notes that proposed updates to the Development Contribution Policy are presented in a separate report (No. 181107130836).

3. BACKGROUND

3.1. The Development Contributions Policy has a series of schedules that set out the basis for the various development contributions. Development contributions include those that relate to District-wide growth, scheme growth, and specific Development Contribution Areas (DCA). The location of any particular development will determine which development contributions apply.
3.2. Development Contributions have two primary components, the growth rate anticipated for the scheme or development contribution area and the capital cost of the works required for servicing the new growth. The DCs are determined based on the projects and costs which are required to facilitate growth in the area divided by the expected number of properties to be developed in that area. These project costs include both past expenditures and anticipated future expenditures that need to be recovered by growth in the area that is serviced by the growth related projects.

3.3. Solely growth related projects (those required only to service new development) have capital costs spread as a development contribution over the anticipated number of new lots in the scheme/District.

3.4. Partially growth related projects (level of service improvements that also provide additional capacity for growth) typically have the growth component as the percentage of new lots in the scheme/District anticipated in the 10-year planning period.

3.5. DCA servicing requirements are identified through structure plans and investigations into the requirements to service specific growth areas. Through the structure plan process, infrastructure projects are subject to a cost benefit analysis. DCAs are typically solely growth related and therefore all of the costs are divided among the number of properties anticipated to develop in the area.

4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

4.1. A summary of the draft 2019/20 DCs based on the budgets and growth projections in the draft AP are shown below. Commentary is provided when the DC has changed by more than 10% from the 2018/19 DC.

Table 1 – Summary of Draft 2019/20 Development Contributions with Commentary for changes greater than 10% (All figures are inclusive of GST)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adopted Long Term Plan 18-19</th>
<th>Draft 19-20 Annual Plan</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WATER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cust</td>
<td>8,119</td>
<td>4,091</td>
<td>-49.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernside</td>
<td>1,862</td>
<td>1,362</td>
<td>-26.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrymere</td>
<td>843</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
<td>2,074</td>
<td>1,953</td>
<td>-5.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East Kaiapoi DCA</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Kaiapoi DCA</td>
<td>3,008</td>
<td>3,152</td>
<td>4.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandeville</td>
<td>1,426</td>
<td>1,115</td>
<td>-21.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohoka</td>
<td>4,208</td>
<td>4,636</td>
<td>10.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>7,485</td>
<td>7,710</td>
<td>3.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford 1</td>
<td>3,983</td>
<td>5,114</td>
<td>28.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford 2</td>
<td>6,695</td>
<td>7,380</td>
<td>10.23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Adopted Long Term Plan 18-19</th>
<th>Draft 19-20 Annual Plan</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poyntzs Road</td>
<td>1,776</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>-44.93%</td>
<td>UV treatment project shifted to District Water rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>5,188</td>
<td>5,413</td>
<td>4.34%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Rangiora DCA</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>6.92%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Rangiora DCA - Kippenberger Ave</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Rangiora Outline Development Plan Area</td>
<td>4,524</td>
<td>4,694</td>
<td>3.76%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Rangiora</td>
<td>1,175</td>
<td>1,108</td>
<td>-5.70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbrook (m2)</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summerhill</td>
<td>6,546</td>
<td>6,533</td>
<td>-0.20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuahiwi</td>
<td>8,058</td>
<td>8,286</td>
<td>2.83%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend - Tuahiwi water</td>
<td>1,167</td>
<td>1,595</td>
<td>36.68%</td>
<td>Increased expenditure on Chinnerys Road Main Upgrade project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikuku Beach</td>
<td>1,275</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>-59.92%</td>
<td>UV treatment project shifted to District Water rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Eyreton</td>
<td>2,395</td>
<td>1,762</td>
<td>-26.43%</td>
<td>UV treatment project shifted to District Water rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend</td>
<td>4,174</td>
<td>6,254</td>
<td>49.83%</td>
<td>Increased expenditure on Chinnerys Road Main Upgrade project and addition of the Woodend Beach Road ring main project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEWER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Districts - Ocean Outfall</td>
<td>5,434</td>
<td>4,765</td>
<td>-12.31%</td>
<td>Increase in growth number and the Woodend WWTP work was completed under budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
<td>2,079</td>
<td>2,225</td>
<td>7.02%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East Kaiapoi</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>5.04%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Kaiapoi</td>
<td>2,148</td>
<td>2,254</td>
<td>4.93%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East North East Kaiapoi Reticulation</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>3,161</td>
<td>2,515</td>
<td>-20.42%</td>
<td>Reduction in budget for Stage 3 of the Central Rangiora Sewer project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todds Rd Business Zone (per hectare)</td>
<td>166,095</td>
<td>166,095</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbrook Stage 2 (m2)</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Rangiora DCA Other Properties</td>
<td>8,685</td>
<td>9,151</td>
<td>5.37%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Rangiora DCA (Gilberthorpes)</td>
<td>2,217</td>
<td>2,383</td>
<td>7.49%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner West Rangiora DCA</td>
<td>1,796</td>
<td>1,927</td>
<td>7.29%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Rangiora DCA</td>
<td>3,497</td>
<td>3,531</td>
<td>0.97%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Rangiora DCA</td>
<td>6,320</td>
<td>6,739</td>
<td>6.63%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernside</td>
<td>13,325</td>
<td>13,325</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuahiwi</td>
<td>4,667</td>
<td>4,705</td>
<td>0.81%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandeville, Ohoka, Swannanoa - new properties</td>
<td>13,164</td>
<td>13,602</td>
<td>3.33%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandeville, Ohoka, Swannanoa - existing properties wishing to connect</td>
<td>1,368</td>
<td>1,558</td>
<td>13.89%</td>
<td>Interest on past expenditure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikuku Beach</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Woodend DCA</td>
<td>7,159</td>
<td>7,422</td>
<td>3.67%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adopted Long Term Plan 18-19</td>
<td>Draft 19-20 Annual Plan</td>
<td>% Change</td>
<td>Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Sewer</td>
<td>2,054</td>
<td>1,866</td>
<td>-9.15%</td>
<td>Increase in growth numbers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DRAINAGE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>14.07%</td>
<td>Decrease in growth numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Rangiora</td>
<td>7,708</td>
<td>9,089</td>
<td>17.92%</td>
<td>Interest on past expenditure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Rangiora DCA</td>
<td>5,739</td>
<td>5,739</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Rangiora - Enverton Drive East</td>
<td>5,383</td>
<td>6,163</td>
<td>14.49%</td>
<td>Interest on past expenditure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Rangiora - Enverton Drive / Ballarat Rd</td>
<td>2,359</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>14.46%</td>
<td>Interest on past expenditure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbrook (m2)</td>
<td>6.49</td>
<td>6.49</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todds Rd Business Zone (per hectare)</td>
<td>57,500</td>
<td>57,500</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Urban</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Woodend DCA</td>
<td>9,895</td>
<td>9,327</td>
<td>-5.74%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend DCA</td>
<td>2,784</td>
<td>2,784</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend DCA (Commercial) (m2)</td>
<td>8.65</td>
<td>8.65</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-75.53%</td>
<td>Bulk of North Kaiapoi Moorcroft piping project dropped off as in year 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East Kaiapoi</td>
<td>782</td>
<td>782</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East Kaiapoi Commercial (m2)</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Kaiapoi</td>
<td>6,325</td>
<td>6,325</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mill Road ODP</td>
<td>21,820</td>
<td>21,820</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ROADING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>5,782</td>
<td>5,894</td>
<td>1.94%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbrook (m2)</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>68.18%</td>
<td>Correction to calculation resulting from partial growth expenditure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Woodend</td>
<td>6,964</td>
<td>6,964</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Rangiora DCA</td>
<td>3,501</td>
<td>3,792</td>
<td>8.31%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Kaiapoi DCA</td>
<td>5,931</td>
<td>5,931</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Kaiapoi DCA - new collector Rd</td>
<td>5,756</td>
<td>5,756</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi North</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West Rangiora (West Belt Extension to Townsend Road)</td>
<td>8,577</td>
<td>8,577</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RESERVES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Zones</td>
<td>1,103</td>
<td>1,195</td>
<td>8.34%</td>
<td>Past expenditure picked up that was erroneously missed previously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Zones</td>
<td>12,750</td>
<td>12,750</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

5. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

5.1. Community views have not yet been sought on the draft development contributions, however the recommended option is to consult this as part of the 2019/20 Annual Plan.
6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**

6.2. The current funding policy, excluding ring fenced outline development areas, is to fund capital works until growth occurs. The development contribution amount is amended each year to reflect the cost of funds and any changes to the programme.

6.3. The ability of the Council to require development contributions from growth to pay for the infrastructure required to accommodate growth is critical to ensuring growth is self-funding. This means that the cost of the increased capacity in Council’s infrastructure is the responsibility of those requiring the increased capacity and not carried by the people who occupy existing dwellings.

6.4. The legislation allows the Council to recover growth related expenditure for projects in a manner that is generally consistent with the capacity life of the assets for which the development contributions are intended to be used.

6.5. In accordance with the above, Council’s Policy allows for some larger infrastructure projects such as the Ocean Outfall and new water source projects to be recovered over a 35-year period. Development contributions for specific Development Contribution Areas are generally recovered until the development area is completely developed.

6.6. **Community Implications**

6.7. The recommended changes to the DCs for the 2019/20 financial year will have an impact on developments and that impact will vary depending on where growth occurs.

6.8. To provide an indication of the impact of the development contributions on various development areas within the District, the following examples have been prepared. The 2018/19 development contribution rate has also been included for comparison.

### Table 2 – Summary of Draft 2019/20 Development Contributions for Example Development Areas (All figures are inclusive of GST)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Area</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Sewer</th>
<th>Drainage</th>
<th>Roading</th>
<th>Recreation</th>
<th>Total 2018/19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
<td>1,953</td>
<td>6,990</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5,984</td>
<td>12,750</td>
<td>27,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCAs pay the costs above PLUS:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East Kaiapoi</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>782</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29,589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Kaiapoi</td>
<td>3,152</td>
<td>2,254</td>
<td>6,325</td>
<td>11,687</td>
<td></td>
<td>51,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>7,710</td>
<td>1,866</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,894</td>
<td>12,750</td>
<td>28,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>5,413</td>
<td>7,280</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>5,894</td>
<td>12,750</td>
<td>31,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCAs pay the costs above PLUS:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Rangiora</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>9,151</td>
<td>9,089</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Rangiora</td>
<td>4,694</td>
<td>6,739</td>
<td>6,163</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>49,241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Rangiora SPA</td>
<td>1,108</td>
<td>3,531</td>
<td>5,739</td>
<td>8,577</td>
<td></td>
<td>50,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbrook (10,000 m² development)</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>22,500</td>
<td>64,900</td>
<td>7,400</td>
<td></td>
<td>127,845</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.9. The overall financial implication of these changes is dependent on the number of lots that are created and the areas that these lots are created in.

6.10. **Risk Management**

6.11. The key risk associated with development contributions is the timing of works completed to ensure that work is timed so as to not hold up development while also not be too far in advance of development such that interest costs are incurred ahead of income from development contributions.

6.12. This risk is managed through careful programming of work and collaboration with developers on timing of developments.

6.13. There is also the risk that the development contributions are challenged by a developer. In recent years, developers have been more vocal about rising development contributions and the effects on the financial viability of developments.

6.14. Risk of developer challenge to development contributions can be reduced through review of the development contributions policy and implementation of this Policy. A probity audit of the development contribution schedules was undertaken in September 2016. Recommendations from this report were implemented carried through to development contribution schedules in subsequent years.

6.15. **Health and Safety**

6.16. There are no specific Health and Safety Risks associated with development contributions.

6.17. There will be individual project based Health and Safety Risks associated with the specific projects included in the development contributions. These risks will be assessed during the planning, design, and construction phases of each specific project.

7. **CONTEXT**

7.1. **Policy**

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

7.3. **Legislation**

7.5. Community Outcomes

7.6. Transport is accessible, convenient, reliable and sustainable.

7.7. Core utility services are provided in a timely and sustainable manner.

7.8. There is a healthy and sustainable environment for all.

7.9. Public spaces and facilities are plentiful, accessible and high quality.

7.10. Businesses in the District are diverse, adaptable and growing

7.11. Delegations

7.12. Council has delegation to make any changes to the Development Contribution Policy including schedules.

7.13. Council staff may only apply development contributions in accordance with the Development Contributions Policy including the schedules.

Kelly LaValley
Project Delivery Manager
Attachment i
Draft Development Contributions Schedule
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>ADOPTED 18-19 Long Term Plan</th>
<th>Draft Annual Plan 2019 - 20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WATER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cust</td>
<td>8,119</td>
<td>4,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernside</td>
<td>1,862</td>
<td>1,362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrymere</td>
<td>843</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
<td>2,074</td>
<td>1,963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East Kaiapoi DCA</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Kaiapoi DCA</td>
<td>3,008</td>
<td>3,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandeville</td>
<td>1,426</td>
<td>1,115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohoka</td>
<td>4,208</td>
<td>4,636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>7,485</td>
<td>7,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford 1</td>
<td>3,983</td>
<td>5,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford 2</td>
<td>6,696</td>
<td>7,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poyntzs Road</td>
<td>1,776</td>
<td>978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>5,188</td>
<td>5,413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Rangiora DCA</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Rangiora DCA - Kippenberger Ave</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Rangiora Outline Development Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Rangiora</td>
<td>1,175</td>
<td>1,108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbrook (m2)</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summerhill</td>
<td>6,546</td>
<td>6,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuahiwi</td>
<td>8,068</td>
<td>8,286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend - Tuahiwi water</td>
<td>1,167</td>
<td>1,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikuku Beach</td>
<td>1,275</td>
<td>511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Eyreton</td>
<td>2,395</td>
<td>1,762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend</td>
<td>4,174</td>
<td>6,254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEWER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Districts - Ocean Outfall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East Kaiapoi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>DCA 1</td>
<td>DCA 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Kaiapoi</td>
<td>2,148</td>
<td>2,254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East North East Kaiapoi Reticulation</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>3,161</td>
<td>2,515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todds Rd Business Zone (per hectare)</td>
<td>166,095</td>
<td>166,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbrook Stage 2 (m²)</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Rangiora DCA Other Properties</td>
<td>8,685</td>
<td>9,151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Rangiora DCA (Gilberthorpes)</td>
<td>2,217</td>
<td>2,383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner West Rangiora DCA</td>
<td>1,796</td>
<td>1,927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Rangiora DCA</td>
<td>3,497</td>
<td>3,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Rangiora DCA</td>
<td>6,320</td>
<td>6,739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernside</td>
<td>13,325</td>
<td>13,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuahiwi</td>
<td>4,667</td>
<td>4,705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandeville, Ohoka, Swannanoa - new properties</td>
<td>13,164</td>
<td>13,602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandeville, Ohoka, Swannanoa - existing properties wishing to connect</td>
<td>1,368</td>
<td>1,558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikuku Beach</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Woodend DCA</td>
<td>7,169</td>
<td>7,422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Sewer</td>
<td>2,054</td>
<td>1,866</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DRAINAGE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>DCA 1</th>
<th>DCA 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Rangiora</td>
<td>7,708</td>
<td>9,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Rangiora DCA</td>
<td>5,739</td>
<td>5,739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Rangiora - Enverton Drive East</td>
<td>5,383</td>
<td>6,163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Rangiora - Enverton Drive / Ballarat Rd</td>
<td>2,399</td>
<td>2,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbrook (m²)</td>
<td>6.49</td>
<td>6.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todds Rd Business Zone (per hectare)</td>
<td>57.500</td>
<td>57.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Urban</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Woodend DCA</td>
<td>9,895</td>
<td>9,327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend DCA</td>
<td>2,784</td>
<td>2,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Woodend DCA (Commercial) (m²)</td>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RESERVES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **SUMMARY**

1.1. The purpose of this report is to provide a request for changes to the 2019-20 Annual Plan regarding the Roading and Drainage components of the Earthquake Recovery budgets.

1.2. The changes are outlined as follows:

**Roading**

1.3. The draft Annual Plan does not allow for any budget in the 19/20 year as it was envisaged all roading works would be complete by June 2019.

1.4. While the vast majority of roading projects will be complete by June 2019, some minor works associated with the Kaiapoi East Access Road (100268.000.5134) are expected to run into the early part of 2019/20 and an additional budget of $30K is needed to complete these works.

**Drainage**

1.5. The draft Annual Plan allows for a budget of $192K to make repairs to the Feldwick Stormwater pump station (100251.000.5124). These works have been completed early as part of another project and therefore the budget is no longer required.

**Programme Update**

1.6. Overall, the earthquake recovery works are progressing very well and currently three contracts are underway and scheduled for completion in either June or July this year.

1.7. At the conclusion of the three current contracts, there will only be one remaining project, being Feldwick Stormwater Management Area. This project is integrated with wider catchment upgrade works, scheduled for construction in the 20/21 financial year.
1.8. The current programme estimate is $38.7M, which is approximately $1.4M less than original estimate used to establish the Cost Share Agreement with the Crown, but approximately $0.5M more than the latest update in August 2018.

1.9. The current estimate of $38.70M, still compares favourably with the overall programme budget of $38.65M (<0.2%).

1.10. A final summary report will be brought to the July or August Council meeting, which should conclude the works with the exception of the Feldwick SMA project, which is programmed for construction as part of the wider Feldwick catchment works in 20/21. The report will include the final programme cost.

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No.190418058189

(b) Approves the amendments to the Earthquake Recovery budgets for Roading and Drainage, as outlined in Tables 1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account Number</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Draft Annual Plan Budget (19/20)</th>
<th>Proposed Annual Plan Budget (19/20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100268.000.5134</td>
<td>Kaiapoi East Access Road</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100251.000.5124</td>
<td>Feldwick Drain Pump Station</td>
<td>$192,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Recommended changes to the 19/20 roading and drainage earthquake budgets

(c) Notes that the current programme estimate is $38.70M, which compares favourably with the overall programme budget of $38.65M (<0.2%).

(d) Notes that the additional $30,000 for Kaiapoi East Access Road receives a 51% subsidy from NZTA.

(e) Circulates this report to the Community Boards.

3. BACKGROUND & ISSUES AND OPTIONS

3.1. Kaiapoi East Access Road (KEAR)

3.1.1. This report seeks to add an additional $30K for the KEAR in 2019/20.

3.1.2. The physical works are on track to be essentially complete by June 2019/20. However, some minor works are expected to spill over into the 19/20 year, including responding to the final safety audit, and legalisation of the road corridor. An additional $30K is required to complete these works.

3.2. Feldwick Stormwater Pump Station

3.2.1. This report seeks to remove $192K from the 2019/20 drainage component of the Earthquake Recovery budget.

3.2.2. The $192K budget is no longer necessary as the works have been completed.
3.3. **Programme Update**

3.3.1. Overall, the earthquake recovery works are progressing very well and currently three contracts are underway and scheduled for completion in either June or July this year.

3.3.2. At the conclusion of the three current contracts, there will only be one remaining project, being Feldwick Stormwater Management Area. This project is integrated with wider catchment upgrade works, scheduled for construction in the 20/21 financial year.

3.3.3. The current programme estimate is $38.7M, which is approximately $1.4M less than original estimate used to establish the Cost Share Agreement with the Crown, but approximately $0.5M more than the latest update in August 2018.

3.3.4. The current estimate of $38.70M, still compares favourably with the overall programme budget of $38.65M (<0.2%).

3.3.5. While the overall budget is essentially adequate, one of the drainage projects has experienced a significant cost escalation. The forecast cost of the Beswick SMA (100469.000.5124) has increased by approximately $700K, primarily due to unexpected dewatering costs, a need to redesign the pond during the construction phase to minimise the maximum pond depth, and the need to remove some unexpected asbestos cement pipe under the SMA. This project is being constructed as part of the Kaiapoi East Enabling Works (Contract 18/34) and is due for completion in mid-June 2018.

3.3.6. The Beswick SMA cost increase has been largely been offset by a saving in the Jones Street reticulation works and the road decommissioning works. Although, it should be noted that the Council has agreed to transfer any surplus budget from the road decommissioning works to fund the construction of new roads in the Kaiapoi East Regeneration Area.

3.3.7. A final summary report will be brought to the July or August Council meeting, which should conclude the works with the exception of the Feldwick SMA project, which is programmed for construction as part of the wider Feldwick catchment works in 19/20. The report will include the final programme cost.

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

4. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

4.1. **Groups and Organisations**

4.1.1. The works in the earthquake recovery programme are monitored by the Earthquake Infrastructure Recovery Steering Group. There is some crossover of works with the Regeneration Steering Group, and the groups work very closely together.

4.2. **Wider Community**

4.2.1. The community has been consulted widely over the earthquake recovery works and over the Regeneration Plan. The community have been kept informed over the progress of specific projects.

5. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

5.1. **Financial Implications**

5.1.1. The proposed changes to the Annual Plan budgets are shown in Table 1.
5.1.2. There is a risk that delays to the construction of the Beswick SMA could lead to further unexpected dewatering costs, but a contingency sum has been allowed for in the projected spend.

5.1.3. The additional $30,000 cost for the Kaiapoi East Access Road, is funded jointly by NZTA and WDC. The Waimakariri District Council cost is 49% ($14,700), with the NZTA share being 51% ($15,300).

5.2. Community Implications
5.2.1. The community implications associated with these projects are improved transport links and improved Stormwater management.

5.3. Risk Management
5.3.1. There are no material risks associated with the two proposed budget changes.

5.4. Health and Safety
5.4.1. All works will be managed in accordance with the U&R Department's H&S practices relating to safety in design, engaging contractors, and overseeing construction works.

6. CONTEXT

6.1. Policy
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 Greater Christchurch Regeneration Act, Land Transport Management Act, Local Government Act are all relevant in this matter.

6.3. Community Outcomes
6.3.1. The following community outcomes are relevant in this matter:

- There are wide ranging opportunities for people to contribute to the decision making that effects our District
- There is a safe environment for all
- Core utility services are provided in a timely and sustainable manner
- Transport is accessible, convenient, reliable, affordable and sustainable.

6.4. Delegations
6.4.1. The Council has the delegated authority to add or amend budgets.

Gary Boot
Senior Engineering Advisor
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT FOR DECISION

FILE NO and TRIM NO: RES-24 /190404050422

REPORT TO: Council

DATE OF MEETING: 28 May 2019

FROM: Chris Brown, Manager Community and Recreation

SUBJECT: Tennis Development Coldstream Road

SIGNED BY: Tennis Development Coldstream Road

1. SUMMARY

1.1 The purpose of this report is to seek a decision from Council as to whether it wishes to contribute funding towards the development of a ten court tennis centre in Rangiora at Coldstream Road.

1.2 The proposal consulted on in the Draft Annual Plan was that the Council would provide the land, car parks, water and sewer infrastructure and the base course of the tennis courts and the clubs would pay for the tennis court surfacing and nets, fencing and lighting, as well as a club room.

If the Council does decide to contribute funding to the development it would be on the basis of a formal Heads of Agreement being signed by both Rangiora and Southbrook Tennis Clubs and evidence of available funding from the Clubs to complete the development.

Attachments:

i. Draft Business Case New Tennis Club (Trim 190502062504)
ii. Review of Business Case – Richard Lindsay (Trim 190502062506)
iii. Coldstream Road Site Master Plan (Trim 181123137746)

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 190404050422

(b) Notes the tennis clubs draft business case (Trim 190502062504)

(c) Notes the Peer Review of the business case (Trim 190502062506)

(d) Approves staff developing a Heads of Agreement, for approval by Council, with the Southbrook and Rangiora Tennis Clubs with the key responsibilities as outlined in the Section 4.6 of this report.

(e) Approves the provision of $1 million as signalled in the Annual Plan for the development of the infrastructure and base for the ten court tennis development at Coldstream Road.
Notes that, in accordance with the key terms of the proposed Heads of Agreement, no expenditure will occur until Council has agreed that Tennis Clubs have the necessary funding to complete the development.

Approves the funding provision over two financial years with existing funding of $515,000 being available for use during 19/20 financial year and the balance of $485,000 to be funded in the 20/21 financial year.

Notes that a resource consent will be required before any construction can commence.

Notes that timing of construction will be managed so as not to conflict with the construction of the multi sports facility in Coldstream Road.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1. Council staff have been having on-going discussions regarding the provision of tennis courts in Rangiora for many years. In the past there have been proposals for tennis to be installed at Southbrook Sport and Recreation Park and Arlington Park and Pentecost Road.

3.2. In 2013 Council staff in the Greenspace Team were approached by Ron van Till in regards to a proposal to build a district wide tennis centre. This development which was for 16 courts did not proceed due to withdrawal of the key funder.

3.3. Council had supported the proposal and agreed to contribute approximately $315,000 towards the construction of a car park in 2015/16 financial year and this budget provision has been carried forward.

3.4. Subsequently representatives from both the Southbrook and Rangiora Tennis Clubs have had several conversations with Staff about potential locations of a Tennis Centre for Rangiora.

3.5. The Coldstream Road land was identified as a good location and the indicative plans for that land incorporate a ten court tennis development with a Plan.

3.6. The Tennis Clubs have continued to discuss with staff the concept of a development and have prepared a draft business plan which details the projected growth and income.

3.7. Note that for the development to proceed a resource consent will be required. The resource consent will cover impact effects such as noise, scale of intensity, type of use, hours of operation, car parking requirements, traffic impact etc. The current functional design layout which is included as attachment (iv) represents that the tennis centre can fit into the site. This design layout will need to be modified to show the plans for the tennis clubrooms before lodging a resource consent.

3.8. Council currently provides a number of community tennis courts. A number of these tennis courts have clubs associated with them, however they are relatively small and not centrally located. The Rangiora Tennis Club and Southbrook Tennis Clubs are both located on private land.

3.9. The following table lists the locations of the tennis courts in the District that the Council currently owns and maintains. In addition to the list is the Kaiapoi Tennis Club which the Council has financially contributed to in the mid-2000s.
3.10. Note that the Council does not currently own or maintain any tennis courts in the Rangiora area. The Fernside, Southbrook and Rangiora Clubs all provide facilities independent of Council.

3.11. The court surfaces at the Southbrook Club is in need of replacement and neither Rangiora nor Southbrook Clubs have any courts with lights for evening games. The nearest lit courts are at Kaiapoi.

3.12. There are courts at Rangiora High School but they are for school use and the School has confirmed that while members of the community can use the courts outside of school hours they do not encourage community use and prefer them to be used by their students.

4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1. Business Case

   4.1.1. The Tennis Clubs have prepared a draft business case for the Coldstream Road Tennis Development.
   
   4.1.2. The Clubs are intending to rapidly grow their membership and to actively encourage casual use by non-members at a suitable fee.
   
   4.1.3. They are also planning on revenue from a bar in the clubrooms on site to assist as a revenue stream.

4.2. Peer Review

   4.2.1. The draft Business case prepared by the Tennis Clubs has been peer reviewed by Richard Lindsay at the request of staff.
   
   4.2.2. Richard was asked to review the business case from two key perspectives:
   
   - Are the projected membership numbers like to be achieved
   - Are the proposed membership fees realistic
   
   4.2.3. A copy of the full report is attached (Trim 190502062506) but the key findings in relation to membership projections were:
• Ratio numbers of members to population used in the Business Case were based on miscalculated ratios in a 2013 report. We have re-adjusted these ratios which demonstrate that the Business Case’s 1.75% of the population being members is at the high end of existing membership rates.

• This membership growth would be reversing a regional and national trend of declining Tennis club membership.

• Several strategies have been identified to grow membership (particularly focussing junior development and school partnerships). These will all need to be proactively managed to ensure membership levels are sustained over time.

• How casual players are brought into the fold is a critical factor to the ongoing success of the proposed club, and Tennis in general.

4.2.4. In relation to membership fees the key findings were:

• The forecast membership fees are within an acceptable level to similar clubs in the Canterbury region that have a similar offering.

• There is a significant increase in membership fees from year one to year two that will need to be carefully communicated to ensure members return.

4.3. Community Use

4.3.1. Preliminary discussions about the conditions for a Council contribution had had an assumption that at least one of the courts would be available for community use, similar to other Council provided tennis courts in the District.

4.3.2. The basis of the business case and also referenced in the Peer Review is the need to provide for casual use whereby people can have a game of tennis without necessarily belonging to a club.

4.3.3. The following is an extract from the conclusion of the Peer Review:

"Capturing the casual "pay to play" participation and generating revenue opportunities from these participants will be a key strategy for ongoing sustainability and this warrants further investigation."

( Page 9)

4.3.4. There is a national trend for many sports to operate on a pay to play basis.

4.3.5. Tennis is part of that trend and the membership of tennis clubs nationally is declining with many people opting to pay to play when it suits them with no obligations to be part of an organised club.

4.3.6. The online infrastructure already exists to facilitate customers booking a court. There is a website called “Pay2Play” that currently hosts 36 different clubs spread throughout NZ. On the site customers can book and pay online to participate in a variety of racquet sports at 36 different venues throughout NZ. The site offers the following services:
4.3.7. The site is supported by both Tennis NZ, Squash NZ and Badminton NZ.

4.3.8. It is likely that the Tennis Club at Coldstream Road will adopt a similar service for people wishing to play on a casual basis.

4.3.9. As the Club will be responsible for all of the ongoing operating and maintenance costs (with the exception of the car park area) it will be important for the Club’s financial security to maximise revenue from the courts.

4.3.10. For that reason staff are not recommending that a court, or courts, be retained for free access for the community.

4.3.11. The courts will offer a high level of service compared with Council maintained and operated courts both in terms of the type of playing surface and the fact that the courts will be lit to facilitate twilight and evening tennis.

4.3.12. From a community perspective, players of many different codes are used to pay for play – current examples in our community include: squash, badminton, basketball, netball, swimming and all users of the new Multi sports facility will also be paying. Hockey players also pay club membership as well as paying for each use of the artificial turf.

4.4. For the development to proceed a resource consent will be required. The resource consent will cover impact effects such as noise, scale and intensity, type of use, hours of operation, car parking requirements, traffic impact etc.

4.5. The Resource consent preparation process will take some time as the Club will need to have a design of their clubrooms completed as well as a traffic impact assessment completed and this will have to be done after a resource consent is granted for the Multi Use Sports Facility.

4.6. Staff have had discussions with the Tennis Club representatives on various options for progressing a development. The outcome was agreement on three principal options with the Club and Staff preferring Option 1.

4.7. **Option 1.**

4.7.1. The concept is that the Council would undertake the formation of the base course and asphalt surface of the courts and the Clubs would complete the development. The key proposed responsibilities of the Council and the Tennis Clubs are summarised in the table below. If the Council supports the development the points in the table would be incorporated into a Heads of Agreement which would be concluded prior to any expenditure by the Council.

4.7.2. The Council would need to have evidence from the Clubs of their financial ability to complete the courts (nets/line markings/fencing and lights) before the Council committed to any development on site.
4.7.3. Key responsibilities of the Council and Tennis Clubs:

The Council will:

- Prepare the Resource Consent application
- Complete the subbase for the courts and the asphalt surface, including drainage and stormwater treatment
- Provide ducting for electrical cables for lighting to each Court and ducting to the pavilion site.
- Provide water and sewer connections to the edge of Pavilion site
- Provide car parking to meet the requirements of the Resource Consent
- Maintain car parking areas
- Provide and maintain whatever landscaping is required for a Resource Consent.
- Lease the land to the Tennis Club for a term of 30 years at a peppercorn rental.

The Tennis Club will:

- Provide to the Council’s satisfaction funding surety prior to the commencement of any development.
- Complete the construction of ten tennis courts, prior to the construction of a clubrooms, including the court surfacing, fencing, lights, nets and line markings within 12 months from the handover from Council.
- Maintain the tennis courts and equipment and meet all associated operational costs.
- Be responsible for ongoing maintenance and replacement of the courts including the playing surface
- Provide opportunities for casual (non-member) use of the courts.

4.7.4. Staff would ensure that site works do not cause any delay to the completion of the Sports Facility and if the tennis development happens once the Sports Facility is open, staff will work with the contractor/s to ensure that work does not interfere with access to the Sports Facility.

4.7.5. Note that if the clubrooms are not available for use when the tennis courts are completed there will be toilet facilities available at the Multi Use Sports Centre.

4.7.6. This is the recommended option.

4.8. **Option 2**

4.8.1. Under this option the Council would complete all of the development, excluding the clubrooms.

4.8.2. The Tennis Clubs would meet the cost of the above ground developments (nets/line markings/fences/lights/court playing surface) and reimburse the Council for the actual costs incurred for completing those items.

4.8.3. The advantage of this option is that the Courts would be completed and ready to be used for match play at the time of handover to the Club.

4.8.4. The Tennis Clubs do not support this option as they consider that they can complete the work much cheaper than Council employed contractors can do.

4.8.5. The Clubs are basing that assumption on the basis of the cost estimates for the work that the Council has received from Ross Davidson.

4.8.6. Ross Davidson’s estimates were prepared with close reference to a recently completed large scale tennis development in Christchurch.

4.8.7. This option is not recommended.
4.9. **Option 3**

4.9.1. Under this option the Council would make a financial grant to the Tennis Club and the Club would undertake all of the development of the Courts, with the exception of the car park area.

4.9.2. To protect Council it would be possible to make sums of money available conditional upon certain milestones being completed.

4.9.3. Milestones could include:

- Resource consent approval
- Completion of connections for power/water/sewer/stormwater
- Completion of base course
- Completion of asphaltic surface

4.9.4. It would also provide the potential for the Tennis Clubs to source external funding for some of the work.

4.9.5. When Staff discussed this option with representatives from the Tennis Clubs they were reluctant to undertake this work and their clear preference was for the Council to undertake the ground preparation and sealing etc.

4.9.6. After discussion with the Clubs this is not a preferred option.

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

5. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

5.1. **Groups and Organisations**

5.1.1. Several of the tennis clubs in the District support the Coldstream Road development as they think it will benefit the development of tennis in the District.

5.2. **Wider Community**

The proposal was consulted on in the Draft Annual Plan and there were a total of 127 submissions to the Plan of which:

- 58 were in favour of the proposal (46%)
- 25 were against (20%)
- 3 asked to reserve judgement (2%)
- 41 did not comment on the tennis facility (32%)

6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**

6.1.1. Staff have had two cost estimates prepared by Ross Davidson at AECOM. The first estimate, prepared in 2017, was for the total tennis development and was for a total of $2.73 million – the following is an extract from that estimate:
6.1.2. The Tennis Club representatives, disagree with the figures and consider that they could build the whole complex for $1.71 million (excluding any car parking).

6.1.3. Staff subsequently got another cost estimate in Oct 2018 on just building the tennis courts without the flexipave surfacing, fencing, nets, lighting etc and with no provision for car parking, for a total cost of $750,000.

6.1.4. There is also a need to provide infrastructure such as water/sewer and power. The Sports Facility project is including provision of those services to the boundary of the tennis development and that cost (which will be separately identified in the tender) should be a cost to the tennis development.

6.1.5. We have not yet got a resource consent for the tennis development and it is likely that there will be a requirement to provide additional car parking. The $250k is a guessimate provision for car parking and services. The car parking is based on a lower level of service and could be gravel (this will be determined as part of the resource consent process).

6.1.6. It will be important to ensure that the Tennis Clubs complete the development of the courts prior to committing any funding to the development of a club rooms.

6.2. Community Implications

The project was included in the consultation material for the Draft Annual Plan.

6.3. Risk Management

6.3.1. The development will require a Resource Consent and there is a risk that the requirements of a Consent may not be acceptable to the Club or require additional financing for car parking.

6.3.2. If the development does proceed there is a risk that the Clubs may not have sufficient funding to complete the project. To minimise that risk, the Clubs will need to complete the courts ready for playing prior to expenditure on a club rooms.

6.4. Health and Safety

6.4.1. This will be addressed through the construction contract.

6.4.2. Staff will work with the Tennis Club to ensure that there is a health and safety plan for the balance of the work to complete the courts.

7. CONTEXT

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

7.2. **Legislation**

7.3. **Community Outcomes**
- Public spaces and facilities will be accessible and of a high standard.
- People will involve themselves in a range of recreation activities.

7.4. **Delegations**
The Council is the appropriate decision making body.
BUSINESS PLAN
FIVE YEARS 2019/20 – 2023/24

“NEW” (Coldstream Rd) TENNIS CLUB

MISSION STATEMENT

The primary mission of the “New” tennis club is to revitalise and promote the sport of tennis in the Rangiora community and district by providing a new quality tennis facility incorporating tennis programmes, competitions and coaching. The club will actively support all age groups and offer extended playing time in a safe and enjoyable environment.

VISION STATEMENT

The vision of the “New” tennis club is to have a new debt free 10 court tennis facility in place for the 2019/20 season and to increase the membership of the Rangiora and Southbrook tennis clubs from their current base of 70 members (45 seniors, 25 juniors) to 380 (160 seniors, 220 juniors) in five years. Courts with lights will enable the community to have greater access to tennis day and night for member and community participation in competitive and social tennis.

CURRENT SITUATION

Rangiora Tennis Club (RTC). The official address of the RTC is 229A King Street. However, the car park and courts are best accessed and visible from Church Street. The location is in a residential area. The car park is alongside WDC owned land which is set aside for a reserve. The land area 5,651 sqm. The club was established on its present site 1929. There are 5 asphalt tennis courts and a two storey wooden clubhouse built around 1960. The courts are in good order. Membership is 20 seniors, 25 juniors.

Southbrook Tennis Club (STC). The STC is situated in 2 Buckleys Rd, behind the Weston Milling factory buildings. The land area is 2,285 sqm. The club was established in 1958. There are 4 asphalt tennis courts and a small old block clubhouse. The courts are in urgent need of resurfacing. Membership is 25 seniors, no juniors.

Both clubs were well supported and had good membership up until around the turn of the century. Since then membership has declined significantly, attributable primarily to not having a modern court playing surface, lack of lighting, clubhouses which are no longer considered “fit-for-purpose”, and lack of associated integral elements (coaching, a youth/development programme, a recognised centre/base, spectatorship) which makes the sport attractive for people to join.

Both Rangiora Tennis Club (RTC) and the Southbrook Tennis Club (STC) have the following common deficiencies compared to successful tennis clubs:

- Poor membership for both seniors and juniors;
- No consistent programme for the coaching, development and promotion of junior tennis;
- Asphalt courts – RTC are in good condition, STC are in bad condition;
• No court lighting enabling both social/competitive play and coaching programmes in the evening;

• Clubhouse buildings which are old and not considered “fit-for-purpose”. The RTC building is in reasonable condition, the STC building is small and not in good condition;

• Lack of visibility to the public. Both clubs are located well away from public view. Southbrook has been locked from public use for some years. In the case of the RTC, the courts have had to be locked recently to benefit members only as there was an ongoing issue with anti-social behaviour (drug use, drinking etc.)

• Lack of funds to make any substantial improvements to their facilities;

• Administration of tennis activities and compliance with legislative requirements has become increasingly difficult with reliance on a few volunteers.

On the positive side, junior tennis across North Canterbury has grown in numbers in recent years which is stretching other club facilities. This increase is predominantly in beginner and younger grades. If these players can be retained through the provision of appropriate facilities and player development opportunities, then this bodes well for the future of the game in the region.

RESEARCH AND FINDINGS

1. Population. As at June 2017, the population of Rangiora was 18,100 and this is projected to double in the next 30-50 years. Christchurch city comprises six wards and each ward has a total population of between 55,000 and 65,000. Excluding the Riccarton-Wigram ward (3 clubs), the other wards have between 4-6 clubs. The % range of the population who are tennis club members is between 1.13% (Hagley-Ferrymead) to 3.14% (Fendalton-Waimairi). (Source: "Future of Tennis – A Strategic Review of the Current Situation and Options for the Future" Tim Shannahan, Sport Canterbury, May 2013. Section 4.4, pages 40-51). Using this data, and based on a 1.75% factor, the number of tennis members for Rangiora should currently be 317 and, given the WDC population projections, then potentially over 600 members. The financial five year budget assumes a conservative 360 members by Year 5.

2. Participation Motivators. The same report ("Shannahan Report") identified the seven drivers of a positive club member experience as being (Appendices 1 & 2): good social environment, decent facilities, great coaches, good communications, fulfilling potential, friendly and welcoming, professionalism and expertise. The report also stated that "based on the results of statistical significance testing, it was identified that enjoyment, general fitness and friendship were similar enough to consider all three the leading motivators, without rating one as more significant than the others" (page 37-39).

3. Participation Growth. The “Shannahan Report” (page 71-72) highlighted areas that could potentially assist club membership growth. The main recommendation was to reduce barriers to participation and allow people to play as much as they wish. In particular, for clubs to recognise the continuing strong trend toward casual “pay for play” participation and to develop and offer greater flexibility in membership options. Casual tennis includes both organised programmes (Easi Tennis, Cardio Tennis, Fast4 Tennis, Business House etc) and the “off the street” players.
4. **Club Sustainability.** The two threats to club future sustainability noted in the “Shannahan Report” are financial (refer financial section) and the lack of volunteers “… to operate effectively thereby placing a greater workload on a few willing volunteers” (summary page 20). The clubs with smaller memberships are most at risk through the lack of volunteers, whereas the larger clubs have a greater pool of members to call upon and to spread the workload. Larger clubs can also generally support a paid administration.

5. **Competition.** RTC and STC are the only clubs in Rangiora. Other clubs in close proximity are Fernside (5 ashphalt courts, 20 seniors, 65 juniors), Clarkeville (3 ashphalt courts, ?, seniors, ?, juniors), Ashley (2 ashphalt courts, 18 seniors). These clubs are not considered to be of any threat to the “New” club. In fact, the opposite, members are likely to transfer to the “New” club.

6. **Successful Clubs.** Five town clubs were identified as being representative of “successful” clubs (there are others). Information has been obtained from their websites, annual reports and financial statements, as well as discussions with key personnel. A brief profile of each:

   - **Waimairi.** Membership 143 seniors, 369 juniors. Their excellent website tells it all. This is a land-locked club with houses on three sides. They have just completed a court redevelopment programme and their seven courts which are now 4 Rebound Ace (hard) courts and 3 Tigerturf (astroturf) courts. The project cost $500,000 with funding from grants ($200,000), earthquake insurance proceeds and club investments. They are embarking on replacing their lights.

   - **Elmwood.** Membership ??? seniors, ??? juniors. All nine courts recently resurfaced with Rebound Ace. A few years back also added an upstairs outdoor viewing area.

   - **Cashmere.** Membership 127 seniors, 243 juniors. Twelve courts – 6 plexipave, 6 astroturf. The courts were re-surfaced a few years back, while two years ago the clubhouse was renovated and extended with outside decking.

   - **Shirley.** Membership 137 seniors, 183 juniors. An amazing earthquake recovery story (website: about > earthquake recovery). Basically, a new club facility with nine courts (4 synpave hard courts and 5 astroturf), new clubhouse and lights on the hard courts.

   - **Burwood Park.** Membership 79 seniors, 106 juniors. Seven courts – 4 plexipave, 3 astroturf. The earthquake impacted on this club, not with damage so much, but being adjacent to large red zone areas. In 2010, there were 123 seniors and 175 juniors.

7. **ClubMark.** An accreditation tool which provides a format for clubs to assess their performance across seven (7) key measurement criteria – planning for success, growing the club, developing coaches and umpires, playing the game, looking after volunteers, facilities, and well-being of club members. For a “New” club starting from low base membership, the Planning for Success section has perhaps the initial key elements. The components in this section are:

   - Planning – strategic plan in place with regular reviews;

   - Finances – financial sustainability with alternative income streams;
• Sponsorship & grants – specific group responsible for sponsorship and grant applications;
• Administration – policies and procedures in place and regularly reviewed;
• Management – members with a cross mix of skills;
• Communication – regular communications with members and community;
• Affiliation – affiliated to, and participates with, a parent body;
• Paid employees – appraisal process in place.

**KEY ELEMENTS FOR A SUCCESSFUL CLUB**

1. Courts and facilities that are of a high quality, are well maintained and retain relevance to members and the wider tennis community.

2. An organisation structure that enables the management committee members and volunteers to provide good governance, risk assessment, and financial accountability.

3. Programmes and services that provide for the playing and coaching of tennis for all members in both a competitive, casual and social environment.

BUSINESS PLAN

Build Cost and Funding

1. The total cost of the new facility is estimated to be approx. $1,750,000 comprising:
   - $750,000 for ground works, infrastructure requirements (electricity, water, sewerage etc) and car parking. It is assumed that the WDC will pay for these works.
   - $1.0m for the “above ground” costs being the laying of the top court surface (eg plexipave), fencing, clubhouse, volley board, fit-out costs and office equipment. Funding for this cost will come from the sale proceeds of the existing club properties and application to, and approval from, grant funding bodies (eg Rata Foundation).

2. A critical element in the set-up and transition phase (Years 1 & 2) is to have sufficient seed capital available (a) to fund the administrative, coaching and promotional costs required to move from essentially a new club to an established club – estimated at approx. $100k; and (b) to retain funds for operating working capital, future deferred maintenance, and a prudent risk reserve contingency – estimated at $100k.

3. Hence, for the club, a total of $1.2m funding is estimated to be required.

Transition

1. The transition from two existing clubs to form one “new” club will require a separate set of procedures. Matters to be covered will include, but not be limited to, the sale of two club properties, who is authorised to sign documents, engagement of lawyers, statutory compliance requirements (eg Incorporated Societies Act, Charities Commission, IRD), new constitution, new club name, setting up an initial transition management committee, etc etc.

Tennis Operations – Goals, Targets and Plans Years 1 to 5

Overview

To achieve the outcomes that the club’s vision contemplates, a critical determinant for success will be setting up the governance and administration structure to implement the tennis programmes, promote the facility and ensure future financial sustainability. To this end, funding will be required to employ a part-time Manager/Secretary/Treasurer/Marketer who will be the “glue” to co-ordinate club activities and promote the club, along with the professional coach.

The goals, targets and plans for the period groupings are addressed against four strategic pillars:

- Facilities
- Organisation
- Membership and participation
- Tennis delivery and performance
Year 1: Transition and Set-Up

Facilities
- Ensure the set up and fit-out of the new facility is of a high standard that will meet the needs of members and the wider community.
- Set up administration, accounting and communication systems.
- Investigate and develop an online court booking system.

Organisation
- Appoint an interim transition committee to manage the club's activities and responsibilities.
- Appoint a part-time manager/administrator capable of undertaking the task in the position description.
- Determine the coaching requirements of the club and how these are best met.

Membership and participation
- Retain the existing membership of the previous two clubs.
- Actively encourage new members and casual "pay for play" players with a structured advertising and promotional programme.
- Visit local schools and provide promotional material.
- Ensure contact details of all people visiting the facility who may have an interest in playing tennis are maintained.
- Research with other successful tennis clubs the tactics they use to increase membership and participation.

Tennis delivery and performance
- Continue with the existing junior coaching and competitive team play.
- Continue with existing senior social and competitive programmes.
- Research how other tennis clubs
- Plan a profile of the range of tennis programmes and activities that could be developed in the future.
Year 2-3: Promotion

Facilities
- Gain feedback from members to review and enhance the facilities being offered.
- Implement an online court booking system and other available technological advances.

Organisation
- In accordance with the constitution, ensure an organisation and committee structure is formed with the right mix of skills to manage the club’s activities and responsibilities.

Membership and participation
- Develop and implement a structured marketing and promotional programme designed with specific strategies to recruit new members and casual players.
- Create a follow up process of all potential members and visitors.
- Actively promote with schools what the new tennis club can provide.
- Create and provide an environment of “belonging” to the club, particularly for families.

Tennis delivery and performance
- Begin the pathway for the delivery of a quality junior tennis programme that allows juniors to reach their potential.
- Begin the pathway for providing a range of quality tennis experiences, both social and competitive, for both senior and junior players.
Year 4-5: Consolidation

Facilities

- 

Organisation

- 

Membership and participation

- 

Tennis delivery

- 

Financial Sustainability

Overview

1. **Legal Status.** Given the general dependence of sport, including tennis clubs, on funding from external sources, adherence to funding eligibility requirements is important. Most funding bodies (eg Rata foundation, gaming trusts) only support organisations that are either an incorporated society or a charitable trust. "Tennis clubs should be either an incorporated society or a charitable trust to maximise potential funding from funding bodies and achieve tax exempt status." (Shannahan Report, page 66).

2. **GST.** Registration and compliance with IRD GST legislation is required. Whilst it may not be considered essential for routine operating income and expenditure, it is essential for capital expenditure items when the GST component can be claimed back. This is particularly relevant given the large capital expenditure for the new facility.

3. **Financial Prudence.** The "Shannahan Report" (pages 67-68) set out the following recommendations for tennis clubs (in fact, any club) with respect to financial sustainability:

   - Aim to achieve an annual breakeven financial position after depreciation.

   - A breakeven budget should require dependence on funding from gaming trusts and grants to be less than 20% of revenue. Outcomes greater than 20% can be targeted and achieved, but only if the amount above the 20% threshold is not critical to club sustainability.
• Establish a depreciation reserve/capital replacement fund into which the annual depreciation expense amount should be deposited to fund ongoing management of assets. Club policy should be developed and agreed depending on what future asset replacements are planned, and when, plus realistic expectations of grant funding.

• Establish a cash reserve to provide for operational capacity in difficult times. A benchmark is for the cash reserve to be the equivalent of six months operating expenditure.

• Make informed financial decisions that involve a clear understanding of the affects on the short-term and long-term position of the club (e.g., paid coaching of juniors, subscription discounts etc).

General Financial Assumptions

The following general assumptions underpin the five year financial projections:

1. The budget aims to be in surplus by Year 5 before depreciation. Up to Year 5, the club will have sufficient funds in reserve for deferred maintenance/capital replacements and operating capacity risk. With the club then fully established and experience gained, a policy on these aspects will need to be developed and agreed.

2. The junior programme will be funded by 70% of junior subscriptions, parent contributions (e.g., interclub players) and grants for coaching, balls etc. While clubs have variations the funding of their junior programmes, these are the three main sources of income.

3. Funding of other club costs come from senior subscriptions, bar profits, tournament profits, grants, sponsorship etc.

Specific Financial Assumptions

Refer five year budget.
What is driving satisfaction?

Priorities for Improvement:
- Allowing me to fulfil my potential
- Being professional and well managed
- Having good communications
- Having great coaches
- Having good facilities e.g., playing venues, competition venues

Strengths:
- Providing a good social environment
- Value for money
- Being friendly and welcoming

Secondary Priority:
- 55%

Performance (% Very Satisfied and Extremely Satisfied):
- 85%
Seven drivers of a positive club member experience:

- Great Coaches
- Good Communications
- Fulfilling Potential
- Friendly & Welcoming
- Professionalism & Expertise
- Decent Facilities
- Good Social Environment
"NEW" (Coldstream Rd) TENNIS CLUB

FINANCIAL BUDGET ASSUMPTIONS

INCOME

1 REVENUE FROM MEMBERS - SUBSCRIPTION INCOME

1.1 Membership Numbers

Currently, the total combined membership of the two clubs is 70 (45 seniors & 25 juniors).
In section ?? of the Business Plan, research is detailed on the current and projected future population growth in
the Rangiora district, the findings and analysis contained in the extensive report titled "Future Delivery of Tennis"
(prepared by Tim Shennahan for Canterbury Tennis), and comparisons with five town clubs and the Kaiapoi Club.
Based on this research, the assumption is that membership numbers will (conservatively) be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary Student</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Senior</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior - competitive</td>
<td>12 - 15 years</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior - hot shots</td>
<td>11 &amp; under</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Junior</td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.2 Member Subscriptions

Membership categories, and what programmes and coaching are included in the category, vary between clubs.
The standard categories are senior, tertiary student, junior interclub and junior "hot shot" beginners. Some clubs
have packages for families, couples, parentplus, social (non playing) and first time trial subscriptions. Midweek
and social (playing) memberships have almost disappeared on the basis that such members have as much use of
courts and facilities as ordinary members or, alternatively, they can pay a casual court hire fee.

Subscriptions received from members include affiliation fees and GST (if registered) which are then paid over to the
local Association or IRD. The net income to the club excludes these items. This is important to recognise when
setting subscription rates.

For simplicity, the budget projections cover the four standard membership categories and excludes affiliation fees
that may be paid to the local/regional body. These vary and also depend on adherence policies.
The budget assumes a first year "promotional" subscription similar to current Rangiora/Kaiapoi rates, and then
increasing by Year 5 (approx) to a realistic and financially sustainable subscription.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Net Revenue to Club</th>
<th>% to Senior</th>
<th>Base</th>
<th>Less</th>
<th>Projected Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sub</td>
<td>GST</td>
<td>Year 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary Student</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior - competitive</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior - hot shots</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.3 Income from Subscriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>19,800</td>
<td>25,410</td>
<td>31,532</td>
<td>38,202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary Student</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>1,760</td>
<td>1,848</td>
<td>1,940</td>
<td>2,037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Senior</td>
<td>6,400</td>
<td>21,560</td>
<td>27,258</td>
<td>33,472</td>
<td>40,239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior - competitive</td>
<td>3,360</td>
<td>11,086</td>
<td>15,523</td>
<td>20,374</td>
<td>23,532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior - hot shots</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>5,280</td>
<td>7,392</td>
<td>9,702</td>
<td>11,206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Junior</td>
<td>4,960</td>
<td>16,366</td>
<td>22,915</td>
<td>30,076</td>
<td>34,738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Members</td>
<td>11,360</td>
<td>37,926</td>
<td>50,173</td>
<td>63,548</td>
<td>74,977</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.4 Levy on Members

Typically, a court maintenance and/or building levy which is added to the subscription and set aside into a specific
fund for future costs. Given the tennis complex is new, it is assumed such a levy will not be set until after Year 5.
"NEW" (Coldstream Rd) TENNIS CLUB
FINANCIAL BUDGET ASSUMPTIONS

INCOME (cont'd)

2 TRADING ACTIVITIES

2.1 Bar
Bar sales for the clubs surveyed (excluding one) ranged from $5,000 to $27,000 with a gross margin of 44%-60%.
The assumption is that revenue from bar sales will be $15,000 by Year 5 at a gross margin of 50%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>12,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Cost of goods sold</td>
<td>-1,500</td>
<td>-3,000</td>
<td>-5,000</td>
<td>-6,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>6,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP $</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.1 Other Trading
Other club activities in this category include the sales and cost of sales of tennis clothing/uniforms, court keylock cards, kitchen/shop food etc. Generally, the aim is to either break even on such activities or make a small profit.
The budget assumes a break even on these activities.

| Other trading activities | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

3 SENIOR TENNIS ACTIVITIES

3.1 Tournaments
Seniors (veterans) tournaments, business house nights, specific groups etc. For the five clubs surveyed, profits ranged from $2,500 to $7,200. The budget assumes one veterans tournament being held from Year 3 ($3,000 profit) and other tennis events also from Year 3 ($1,000 profit).

| Tournaments | 0 | 0 | 4,000 | 4,000 | 4,000 |

3.2 Court Hire - Casual Fees "Pay for Play"
An participation area which has been identified (refer Section ?? in Business Plan) as an area for growth plus the availability of lighted courts allows for greater court time access.
Assume no of times a court is hired during the year | 50 | 75 | 100 | 150 | 200 |
Assume court hire fee of $20 per hour | $20 | 1,000 | 1,500 | 2,000 | 3,000 | 4,000 |

3.3 Court Hire - North Canterbury Tennis
Assume no of times all courts hired during the year | 5 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
Assume court hire fee of $100 per day | $100 | 500 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 |

3.4 Other Events/Activities
EG Court hire to schools etc.

| Other Events/Activities | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Total for Senior Tennis Activities | 1,500 | 2,500 | 7,000 | 8,000 | 9,000 |

4 JUNIOR TENNIS ACTIVITIES

Clubs have varying "models" for the operation of junior tennis whether it be the coaching programme and how it is funded, additional parent contributions, the extent to which grants cover junior expenses, payment of a junior administrator etc.
However, the general "rule of thumb" is that approx. 70% of junior subscriptions go towards coaching costs and 30% towards club overhead expenses. Other costs associated with juniors (eg balls, equipment) are funded by grants. Income from junior subscriptions is shown "revenue from members" and junior costs in "expenses".

5 FUNDRAISING

5.1 Grants & Donations
(Noe: Excluding grants for capital projects)
Grant funders are more focused towards juniors and increasing community participation. The budget assumes that costs of tennis balls and equipment used in the junior programme are offest by grant income. Some clubs are getting funding for coaching, but it is inconsistent.
Funding for junior programme costs | 2,400 | 3,600 | 4,800 | 6,000 | 6,600 |
Funding for other "eligible" club costs | 2,000 | 2,500 | 3,000 |

| Total for Junior Tennis Activities | 2,400 | 3,600 | 6,600 | 8,500 | 9,600 |

5.2 Sponsorship
Sponsorship is a valuable source of "certain" annual income if it can be obtained, but this is difficult. The major clubs do have court sponsors (as do golf courses) sometimes with a connection to a member. The budget assumes a court sponsor at $300 per court pa from Year 2.

| Sponsorship | 0 | 3,000 | 3,000 | 3,000 | 3,000 |
5 FUNDRAISING

5.3 Other Fundraising
General fundraising activities undertaken by the club (e.g. raffles) and those promoted by fundraising organisations which may be of interest to the club (e.g. entertainment books). Most clubs do run fundraising activities of some type. Of the clubs surveyed, the range of income from fundraising activities ranged from $1,000 to $5,000. The budget assumes a modest income from fundraising.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 OTHER REVENUE

6.1 Interest Received
The assumption is that of the initial "seed capital" used for the set up and promotion costs in the first two years, $100,000 will be retained for future deferred maintenance and as a contingent "risk management" fund. Interest on bank operating balances is not likely to be material.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funds invested</th>
<th>Interest rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2 Social Events
Generally, the aim is to either break even on such activities or make a small profit. The budget assumes a break even position on social events.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.3 Sundry Income
Items not covered in other categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXPENSES

The key assumption is that approx. $100,000 is available from the property sale proceeds as "seed capital" to fund, for the first 2/3 years, costs associated with staff resourcing, coaching, advertising and promotion. These are detailed as a note to the expenses.

7 Courts & Buildings
Costs have been estimated from available information and benchmarked against other tennis clubs.

8 Tennis Activities/Programmes
Apart from costs funded under the "seed capital" criteria, expenses have been estimated from available information and benchmarked against other tennis clubs.

9 Administration
Apart from costs funded under the "seed capital" criteria, expenses have been estimated from available information and benchmarked against other tennis clubs.
## Financial Statements Budget Projections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue from Members</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6,400</td>
<td>21,560</td>
<td>27,258</td>
<td>33,472</td>
<td>40,239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscriptions - senior</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,980</td>
<td>16,368</td>
<td>22,916</td>
<td>30,076</td>
<td>34,738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscriptions - junior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member Levy (specific purpose)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>11,380</td>
<td>37,928</td>
<td>50,173</td>
<td>63,548</td>
<td>74,977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trading Activities</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>6,250</td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit from bar trading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Trading</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club tennis clothing, court keys, shop/food etc</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Trading</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>6,250</td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Senior Tennis Activities</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tournaments - veterans/business house etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court hire - casual fees</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court hire - regional events</td>
<td></td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other - refer assumptions</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Senior Tennis Activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Junior Tennis Activities</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refer assumptions / expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fundraising</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>6,800</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>9,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants &amp; donations</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsorship</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other fundraising</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Fundraising</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>6,600</td>
<td>11,300</td>
<td>13,500</td>
<td>15,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Revenue</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest received</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social events</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sundry income</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Other Revenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>24,760</td>
<td>56,028</td>
<td>77,473</td>
<td>95,298</td>
<td>110,577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td>(61,512)</td>
<td>(70,842)</td>
<td>(88,777)</td>
<td>(94,151)</td>
<td>(101,844)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating Profit / (Loss) before depreciation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>(36,752)</td>
<td>(14,814)</td>
<td>(11,304)</td>
<td>1,147</td>
<td>8,733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-operating/one-off items</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plus: Grants for capital items</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Depreciation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Profit / (Loss) after depreciation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>(36,752)</td>
<td>(14,814)</td>
<td>(11,304)</td>
<td>1,147</td>
<td>8,733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CASH FLOW</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opening cash &amp; funds invested</td>
<td></td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>83,246</td>
<td>48,434</td>
<td>37,130</td>
<td>36,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Profit / (Loss) before depreciation</td>
<td></td>
<td>(36,752)</td>
<td>(14,814)</td>
<td>(11,304)</td>
<td>1,147</td>
<td>8,733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plus: Grants for capital items</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Capital developments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Opening cash &amp; funds invested</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>63,248</td>
<td>48,434</td>
<td>37,130</td>
<td>36,278</td>
<td>47,011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"NEW" (Coldstream Rd) TENNIS CLUB

FINANCIAL STATEMENTS BUDGET PROJECTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENSES</th>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inflation % increase where applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courts &amp; Buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaning/refuse etc</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>541</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,120</td>
<td>6,242</td>
<td>6,367</td>
<td>6,465</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power &amp; heating</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,080</td>
<td>3,121</td>
<td>3,184</td>
<td>3,247</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lease cost &amp; rates (WDC)</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,040</td>
<td>2,081</td>
<td>2,122</td>
<td>2,165</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairs &amp; maintenance</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,020</td>
<td>1,040</td>
<td>1,061</td>
<td>1,082</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor equipment purchases</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>541</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>13,280</td>
<td>13,525</td>
<td>13,796</td>
<td>14,072</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Tennis Activities/Programmes                  |     |        |        |        |        |        |
| Junior                                        |     |        |        |        |        |        |
| Junior administrator retainer/wages           | A   | 7,500 | 7,500 | 7,500 |        |        |
| (10 hours/week x 30 weeks @ $25)             |     |        |        |        |        |        |
| Professional coach retainer                   | A   | 5,000 | 5,000 | 7,500 | 7,500 | 10,000 |
| Coaching (70% of junior subscriptions)        | 4.0 | 3,472 | 11,458 | 16,041 | 21,053 | 24,317 |
| Coaching subsidy                              | A   | 8,000 | 4,000 | 2,000 |        |        |
| Team fees                                     |     | 160 | 240 | 320 | 400 | 440 |
| (6 players per team @ $40/team)               |     |        |        |        |        |        |
| Tennis balls & equipment (refer grant income) | 5.1 | 2,400 | 3,600 | 4,800 | 6,000 | 6,600 |
| ($30 per junior)                              |     |        |        |        |        |        |
| Senior                                        |     |        |        |        |        |        |
| Team fees                                     |     | 80   | 120   | 160   | 200   | 240   |
| (2>6 teams @ $40/team)                       |     |        |        |        |        |        |
| Tennis balls                                  | 3,200 | 4,800 | 6,400 | 8,000 | 8,800 |
| ($40 per senior)                              |     |        |        |        |        |        |
| Uniforms/clothing (refer trading income)      | 2.1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Presentations & prizes                        |     | 300 | 306 | 312 | 318 | 325 |
| **Total**                                     | 20,612 | 29,524 | 45,033 | 50,972 | 56,221 |

| Administration                                 |     |        |        |        |        |        |
| Administrator/manager retainer/wages           | A   | 15,000 | 15,000 | 20,000 | 20,000 | 20,000 |
| (15-20 hours/week x 40 weeks @ $25/hour)      |     |        |        |        |        |        |
| Advertising, marketing & promotions            | A   | 5,000 | 5,000 | 2,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 |
| Accounting and audit                           | 1,500 | 1,530 | 1,561 | 1,592 | 1,624 |
| Bank fees & charges                            | 250 | 255 | 260 | 265 | 271 |
| Computer/Eftpсос/Website/Xero                  | 1,500 | 1,530 | 1,561 | 1,592 | 1,624 |
| Compliance costs (licences etc)                | 500 | 510 | 520 | 531 | 541 |
| General expenses                               | 1,000 | 1,020 | 1,040 | 1,051 | 1,062 |
| Legal & consulting                             | 500 | 510 | 520 | 531 | 541 |
| Office expenses                                | 500 | 510 | 520 | 531 | 541 |
| Printing & stationery                          | 500 | 510 | 520 | 531 | 541 |
| Telephone/internet/wifi                        | 150 | 153 | 158 | 159 | 162 |
| **Total**                                     | 27,900 | 28,058 | 30,219 | 29,384 | 29,551 |

Total Expenses                                 | 61,512 | 70,842 | 86,777 | 94,151 | 101,844 |

**NOTE A:**

It is assumed that $100,000 is available from the property sale proceeds to apply as "seed capital" to pay for resources for staff, coaching, advertising and promotion of the "new" club over the first 2/3 years as follows:

- Administrator/manager retainer/wages
- Professional coach retainer
- Coaching subsidies
- Advertising, marketing & promotions

|                                               |     |     |     |     |     |
|                                               | 15,000 | 15,000 | 20,000 | 20,000 | 20,000 |
|                                               | 5,000 | 5,000 | 7,500 |        |        |
|                                               | 6,000 | 4,000 | 2,000 |        |        |
|                                               | 5,000 | 5,000 | 500  |        |        |
|                                               | 31,000 | 29,000 | 30,000 |        |        |
Coldstream Tennis Centre

Executive Summary

RSL Consultancy has reviewed the Business Case from two main perspectives. Firstly, are the projected membership numbers likely to be achieved, and secondly, are the proposed membership fees realistic.

In our opinion, projected membership of 380 by year five can be achieved, however noting the following:

- Ratio numbers of members to population used in the Business Case were based on miscalculated ratios in a 2013 report. We have re-adjusted these ratios which demonstrate that the Business Case’s 175% of the population being members is at the high end of existing membership rates.

- This membership growth would be reversing a regional and national trend of declining Tennis club membership.

- Several strategies have been identified to grow membership (particularly focussing junior development and school partnerships). These will all need to be proactively managed to ensure membership levels are sustained over time.

- How casual players are brought into the fold is a critical factor to the ongoing success of the proposed club, and Tennis in general.

In our opinion, projected membership fee levels are realistic, noting the following:

- The forecast membership fees are within an acceptable level to similar clubs in the Canterbury region that have a similar offering.

- There is a significant increase in membership fees from year one to year two that will need to be carefully communicated to ensure members return.
1.0 Purpose of Peer Review

The purpose of this peer review is to provide feedback on the internal Business Case that has been developed in support of the development of the Coldstream Tennis Centre. In particular, RSL Consultancy has been requested to provide an assessment of the projected Membership and Membership Fees.

This review has not considered the wider network of tennis facilities or clubs. We have also not analysed any ancillary facilities proposed or implied, such as a clubrooms, given we do not have all information at hand.

2.0 Project Vision

The vision of the new Coldstream Tennis Club is to have a debt free 10 Court tennis facility at the Coldstream Road sporting precinct in place for 2019/20 season. The sport aims to increase the membership of the Rangiora and Southbrook Tennis clubs from their current base of 70 members (45 Seniors, 25 juniors) to 380 (160 Seniors, 220 Juniors) in five years.

The Business case outlines several proactive strategies to increase membership including implementing more development opportunities, encouraging casual “pay to play” participants, engaging local schools and general promotions.

Membership fees are proposed to be set at a “promotional” subscription in year one, similar to Rangiora and Kaiapoi rates, and then increasing to a financially sustainable membership by Year 5.

3.0 Participation Trends

3.1 Participation Trends for Canterbury

Longer term membership trends in Tennis, along with other sports, have been gathered by Sport Canterbury. This is known as the Sport Canterbury Report Card and is the main source of information to understand membership trends. Note, the membership figures are for the entire Canterbury region, not just the Christchurch numbers that have been used in the previous section to determine a membership as a percent of population.
Current participation trends for Tennis in the Canterbury region shows that there has been a steady decline in membership. From 2016 to 2017 tennis membership in the Canterbury region was down 31% (-1,857 members). The following graph shows the membership trend of tennis in the Canterbury Region.

It has been suggested that following a trend of decline in Tennis in Canterbury there is a need for more tennis courts to meet the needs of competition and casual participation, however, the addition of courts at Nga Puna Wai and the development of community hubs will help meet the demand.

3.2 National Trends

National Tennis trends show that overall Tennis, as with other traditional sports, has seen a decline in participation over the years (this is mirrored in Canterbury). Based on Sport NZ insights data between 1997/98 and 2013/14 tennis participation has declined 45% with the biggest drop in young men. However, following the implementation of the Strategic Framework recommendations in 2017 –2018 there was a 3% increase in overall recorded participation in 2018. 51% of tennis participation came through national programmes—Tennis Hot Shots, Cardio Tennis and Tennis Xpress, 28% through traditional adult and junior club memberships and 21% through casual players (business house, pay per play, secondary schools etc).

Another major national trend is a move towards casual ‘pay as you play’ participation which requires greater flexibility in membership options giving individuals the ability to engage in Tennis as they desire. A major challenge for tennis is turning participation into club members as well as membership retention. Data shows that 75% of those participating are not club members. This suggests that Tennis needs new avenues to gain greater membership numbers along with new approaches including the addition of digital technologies.

In terms of membership retention, 90% of club members plan to re-join, but only 44% of new are satisfied with their joining experience. 50% of lapsed members still play tennis.

---

1 Sport Canterbury Report Card (2017)
3 Sport NZ Insights (A strategic framework for tennis in New Zealand 2017-2022)
4 Tennis NZ Annual Report (2018)
5 A strategic framework for tennis in New Zealand 2017-2022
and 80% want ‘pay for play’ options. 75% of club members support casual hire at off-peak times.\textsuperscript{6}

Tennis NZ Annual report 2018 showed that national programmes are adding value to tennis clubs with participation in Tennis Hot Shots nationally growing to almost 62,000 children during 2017-2018, with 20% more players joining the coaching component of the programme than last year. The proposed Business Case identifies Hot Shots as a key programme for attracting juniors. The success of this programme nationally is a good indicator of its likely ongoing success in Rangiora.

The following figures show the national participation numbers from 2017 – 2018 as well as a breakdown of casual and national programme numbers.

\textbf{Table 3.1 National Participation Numbers (2017-2018)}\textsuperscript{7}

\begin{center}
\begin{figure}
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\end{center}

\textsuperscript{6} Membership Insights (A strategic framework for tennis in New Zealand 2017-2022)
\textsuperscript{7} Tennis NZ Annual Report Card – Participation Number (2017-2018)
4.0 Membership

4.1 Current Membership

Current tennis membership in the Rangiora community is reported to be declining.

The Rangiora Tennis Club has a total of 45 members (20 Seniors, 25 Juniors)\(^8\).

Southbrook has a total of 25 members. These are all Senior members.

4.2 Membership Projections

The Business Case projects membership to increase 443% within five years.

Projecting future membership is often challenging. There are a wide variety of factors that impact on participants choices. Two key factors that we have considered are demographic projections in the Waimakariri and membership rates as a proportion of the population.

Population Projections

It is projected that the Waimakariri district population will increase by another 36,600 over the next 25 years\(^9\).

- The key growth areas are identified as:
  - Rangiora at 7,915
  - Kaiapoi at 3,580
  - Woodend-Pegasus at 7,600

The following table outlines the population growth by age group. The majority of the projected increase in population is among those who will be 65 years or older.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Customised higher projection - WDC</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2028</th>
<th>2033</th>
<th>2038</th>
<th>2043</th>
<th>change 2013-2043</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-14 years</td>
<td>10,600</td>
<td>11,550</td>
<td>11,650</td>
<td>12,100</td>
<td>12,950</td>
<td>13,700</td>
<td>14,200</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-39 years</td>
<td>13,300</td>
<td>16,100</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>19,450</td>
<td>19,900</td>
<td>20,250</td>
<td>20,950</td>
<td>7,650</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-64 years</td>
<td>19,700</td>
<td>22,250</td>
<td>22,800</td>
<td>22,900</td>
<td>23,300</td>
<td>23,900</td>
<td>25,250</td>
<td>5,550</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+years</td>
<td>8,700</td>
<td>12,150</td>
<td>15,400</td>
<td>19,100</td>
<td>22,750</td>
<td>26,150</td>
<td>28,350</td>
<td>19,650</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52,300</td>
<td>62,050</td>
<td>67,850</td>
<td>73,550</td>
<td>78,900</td>
<td>84,000</td>
<td>88,750</td>
<td>36,450</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assuming the proportion of the population participating in Tennis remains relatively constant there will be a likely increase in participation in Tennis based purely on population growth.

---

\(^8\) Data shows that in 2012 Rangiora Tennis Club membership was at 62, indicating a decrease of 27.4% since 2012.

\(^9\) Census 2018 data still unavailable so we have used previously accepted population projection data supplied by WDC.
**Membership as a Proportion of Population**

Membership as a proposition of population is a key assumption in the Business Case. In the report referenced within the Business Case, 2012 tennis membership rates as part of the population in Christchurch (by ward) are outlined below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Membership as % of Population in Area</td>
<td>1.57%</td>
<td>3.14%</td>
<td>1.13%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.38%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When using these percentages with the current population of Rangiora we can make assumptions on the range of expected members at both the low and high end.

The Business Case states it uses a tennis membership capture rate of 1.75% of the population, equating to a membership that should currently be 317 members, growing to a total of 380 members by Year 5 (2024/25). The Business Case states the 1.75% ratio is used as the range % range of the population wo are tennis club members is between 1.13% and 3.14%. When reviewing the source of this membership percentage we have discovered an error in the reporting of these figures.

Where the report stated a minimum membership rate of 1.13% our calculations of this data show the minimum membership rate to be 0.38%, with the Christchurch wide average being 1.32%. It is also important to note these are 2012 figures and tennis has had a downward trend in membership since this point, with approximately a third less members by 2017. Given the lower average membership rate, and continued membership declines in recent years, we believe the 1.75% rate of tennis membership in Rangiora could be artificially high.

Using the population figure of 18,100 used in the Business Case the following are some alternative tennis membership rates:

- 0.75% - 136 members
- 1.00% - 181 members
- 1.25% - 226 members
- 1.50% - 272 members
- 1.75% - 317 members

The Business Case is projecting 145 members in year one which is comfortably within the lower end of tennis membership rates. The membership of 380 by year five would require a membership rate of approximately 2%.

---

5.0 Membership Fee Comparisons

The following table outlines membership fees for various tennis clubs in the Canterbury Region. These clubs have been recognised as being representative of ‘successful’ clubs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Club</th>
<th>Membership Fees</th>
<th>Membership Numbers</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>Tertiary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waimairi Tennis Club</td>
<td>$175/ Half Season $80 (age 4-6)</td>
<td>$125/ Half Season</td>
<td>$400/Half Season</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$119 (age 7 &amp; over)</td>
<td>$190 (age 8 &amp; over)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmwood Tennis Club</td>
<td>$330</td>
<td>$245</td>
<td>$795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12+ Interclub-$230 11 under Interclub - $220 Hotshots -$190</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cashmere Tennis Club</td>
<td>$360</td>
<td>$236</td>
<td>$215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interclub $215 Hotshots</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley Tennis Club</td>
<td>$220</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burwood Tennis Club</td>
<td>$170</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$220 (returning members) $100 Hotshots (age 6-10) $70- Hotshot (age 3-5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coldstream Members Subscription
The following figures from the Business Case shows the membership subscription developed for the current business case.
The adult membership rate proposed at Coldstream Road by year five is $255 (excl. GST). When comparing with existing clubs, this sits well within the range of Adult tennis club membership fees currently offered. The junior membership of approximately $180 (excl. GST) by year five also sits within the range. These subscription rates exclude affiliation fees which will vary dependent on the level of inter-club competition that is accessed by the member.

Managing the expectations of members as the fees are increased significantly between year one and year two will be crucial to retaining membership. While acknowledging the motivation behind providing a very low subscription fee in the first year there may be counter-arguments that should be considered.

Another important factor in the level of membership fee is the value received. If members can receive a quality product (the facility) and service (the experience) they will be prepared to pay more. If it is perceived that this value proposition is maintained and improved on over time, then members are likely to return and pay a reasonable level of subscription. If it is not maintained then members will consider alternative ways to invest their hard-earned money.

Casual Use
Given the large number of participants who do not wish to belong to a formal club to play tennis, an opportunity is available to ensure reasonable access and use of these courts.

While not members of a club, these participants are an important part of the fabric that makes up the tennis community. The club that will be based at Coldstream Road, should this facility be built, will need to agree an appropriate access agreement that factors in casual use.
6.0 Conclusion

This short report has considered the current and projected membership for Coldstream Road Tennis Facility alongside both Canterbury and national trends. Membership subscription levels of various tennis clubs in the Canterbury region have also been gathered to assess the proposed fee structure. The Business case is assuming an increase of membership to around 380 members by year five.

For this to occur the new club will need to reverse national and regional trends through the implementation of the strategies outlined in the Business Case to attract and retain members. Certainly, a new facility will assist this and having the courts as part of a wider sporting precinct will assist in profile.

Capturing the casual “pay to play” participation and generating revenue opportunities from these participants will be a key strategy for ongoing sustainability and this warrants further investigation.
1. SUMMARY

1.1 This report is seeking Council approval to increase landing fees and ground rental at Rangiora Airfield.

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 190513067253

(b) Approves airfield landing fees to be set at $10.00 per day, inclusive of GST, from 1 July 2019.

(c) Approves a 50% reduction in landing fees for Way to Go Helicopter Company.

(d) Delegates to the Community and Recreation Committee the authority to consider any submissions from Clubs and individuals at the Airfield for a concession on landing fees.

(e) Approves ground rental being increased to $6.00 per sq metre, incl GST, for 2019/20 financial year.

(f) Recommends to the incoming Council that it increases the ground rental for 2020/21 to $8.00 per sq m, including GST and for 2021/22 to $9.42 sq m (incl GST).

(g) Recommends to the incoming Council that all annual ground leases increases are linked to the Local Government Cost Index for all ground rental leases from 22/23.

(h) Approves each new lease at the airfield having the ground rental set at $9.42 including GST and a provision in the lease for annual ground rental increases linked to the movement of the Cost Price Index.

(i) Notes that because of the timing of rent review clauses in existing leases it can take two financial years for increases to come into effect.

(j) Notes that the Airfield Advisory Group supports the proposed changes to the landing fees and the ground rental.
3. BACKGROUND

3.1 The level of fees charged at the Rangiora Airfield has been discussed by Council on several occasions and in January 2018 the Council passed the following resolution relating to the airfield fees and charges:

(d) Approves the airfield land rent charge of $4.00 per square metre for inclusion in the Fees and Charges section of the Draft LTP.

(e) Staff to contact all airfield facility users and indicate that a review of airfield charges will occur over the next 12 months and discussions with users will be held as part of the review.

3.2 The proposed changes were not included in the Draft Annual Plan as they were still being worked through with the Airfield Advisory Group.

3.3 The increase in the square metre rate to $4.00 per sq m, inclusive of GST, was the first since 2011 when the ground rental rate was increased from $2.50 to $2.55 per sq metre.

3.4 In considering the airfield fees they relate to two areas – lease of ground space for hangars (Groundside) and landing fees (Airside).

3.5 The following is a summary of the 2019/20 proposed Airfield Budget

3.6 The following table is an apportionment of operating costs between Airside and Groundside

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groundside</th>
<th>Cost Share Allocation (ex GST)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Airside</td>
<td>$169,394.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Side</td>
<td>$193,687.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.7 Groundside: Ground Rental

The current rate for ground rental is $4/sq m (inclusive of GST). Any increase will take two years to fully implement as lease renewals and review periods occur will full implementation in the 2019/20 Financial Year.

The expected rental return from ground rental is currently expected to be $109,837 including GST, in the 19/20 financial year and the expected costs of maintaining groundside is $193,687 (ex GST)

3.8 The following table shows indicative figures of annual lease payments at the current rate of $4 sq/m inclusive of GST. :

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hanger Size</th>
<th>Annual Lease (Inc GST)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>150 sqm (47 hangers)</td>
<td>$600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180 sqm (9 hangers)</td>
<td>$720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350 sqm (9 hangers)</td>
<td>$1,440</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.9 Airside : Landing Fees

Currently the airfield recovers landing fees through several different methods:

- Fee agreements with user groups (a negotiated set fee for members of these groups – CRAC, Canterbury Aero Club etc.)
- Annual low user charges (50 or 100 landings for a set fee)
- Annual unlimited landings charged on a monthly basis
- Landing fee charged per landing

The current fee structure for these are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Fee</th>
<th>Number of Pilots / Aircraft</th>
<th>Amount Recovered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CRAC Club Members</td>
<td>$60</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>$6,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRAC Club Plane</td>
<td>$700</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Low User Charge</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury Aero Club</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$20,640 (inc GST)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.10 The remaining amount recovered through landing fees is from the casual users (approx. $13,441.61 inc GST). The total income from landing fees for a financial year is around $34,000 inc gst. The total cost of the Airside operation is around $168,394 exc gst.

4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

4.1. Airside – landing fees

4.1.1. The proposal is to introduce a standard landing fee of $10 incl GST per day. This would allow for unlimited use per day. The administration of this system would be done through the AIMM system and invoices would be generated monthly.

4.1.2. If this was implemented the total projected income, with no discounts would be in the range of $55-65,000 incl gst. (This compares with the current total of around $34,000).

4.1.3. Using an example of a "heavy use plane" – for 131 flight days per year this would equate to $1,310 incl gst.

4.1.4. Note that many of the owners of the heavy use planes currently belong to the Canterbury Recreational Aircraft Club (CRAC) and have been used to paying an annual landing fee charge of $60 incl gst.

4.1.5. The only proposed reduction to that fee structure is for Way to Go Helicopters. That firm undertook considerable development at the airfield a few years ago and part of that development was the construction of a concrete landing pad for their helicopters. The Council did not contribute to that development and since it
was constructed Way to Go has continued to pay landing fees with a 50% concession.

4.1.6. There are no concessions proposed for landing fees but it is most probable that some of the Clubs at the Airfield will develop proposals for reductions in landing fees. This report proposes that Council delegates to the Community and Recreation Committee the authority to consider such proposals and make decisions on any concessions.

4.1.7. The proposed system will be automated through the AIMM system and invoices will be processed through the Council’s Tech One system with no need for manual intervention. Any concessions by way of fee reduction do need to be manually altered which increases the cost to Council.

4.1.8. The $10 per day landing charges are still reasonable within similar airfields and the AIMM operators commented that $10 for a two hour time frame is fairly standard. But the $10 per day will be a significant change for the CRAC members.

4.1.9. Other options were considered by working parties but the consensus was that $10 per day with no concessions was administratively straightforward and is simple to explain for all users.

4.2. **Groundside – ground rental**

4.2.1. The preference is to retain a consistent SQM rate to be applied to all hanger leases.

4.2.2. To recover the full costs associated with groundside operations based on the expected expenses for 2019/20, a new rate of $9.42 inc GST would be required.

4.2.3. The following are examples of common ground rental sizes annual leases if a rate of $9.42 inc GST ($8.20 ex GST) per SQM is introduced. The following proposed annual leases are all inclusive of GST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rental Area</th>
<th>Proposed Annual Lease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>150 sqm</td>
<td>$1,413.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160 sqm</td>
<td>$1,636.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>360 sqm</td>
<td>$3,392.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.4. The proposal to charge a rate of $9.42sq m was discussed with the Airfield Advisory Group and many of the hangar owners. The consensus of response was that to move from $4.00 to $9.42 was too big an increase in one year.

4.2.5. Staff presented alternative proposals to stage the increase over 2 and 3 years respectively to the Airfield Advisory Group at their May meeting.

4.2.6. The Advisory Group unanimously supported the 3 year option as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Sq m rate</th>
<th>150 sq (common size)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>19/20</td>
<td>$6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>20/21</td>
<td>$8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>21/22</td>
<td>$9.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.7. With new leases from 1 July 2019 all leases would have an annual rent movement linked to the Local Government Cost Index.

4.2.8. As the actual date for rent reviews in each lease is different, the actual implementation of an increase is often spread over 2 calendar years.
4.2.9. Leases at the Airfield, as they are administered under the Reserves Act, do not have automatic rights of renewal, although in practice when a lease is due to expire the Council always offers the current hangar owner a new lease.

4.2.10. The following table summarises the periods for lease expiry for the 98 (approximately) leases at the Airfield:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Expiry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>Approximately 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021 - 2039</td>
<td>Approximately 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040 plus</td>
<td>Approximately 57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

5. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

5.1. **Groups and Organisations**

5.1.1. There have been several expressions of concern about the increased charges. Staff and Councillors Gordon and Williams have met a recently formed group of hangar owners to discuss the proposed changes.

5.1.2. Most of the comments at that meeting were centred around the Airfield Budget and the fact that some items should not be charged to the Airfield budget – eg overheads and loan repayments.

5.1.3. The Group wanted to spend time on examining each transaction that made up each cost centre but Staff said that this was not practicable. They also wanted to delay any increases for 6 months to give them time to undertake a forensic accounting exercise.

5.1.4. The Airfield Advisory Group supports the proposals in this report.

5.2. **Wider Community**

The Wider Community have not been consulted on proposed changes to the Airfield Fees and Charges

6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**

6.1.1. If the proposals for ground rental increase are fully implemented ( $9.42 sqm-gst incl) and the landing fee proposal of $10.00 per day (gst incl) implemented with no discounts and assuming a mid-point of $60,000 income(incl gst) for landing fees the airfield budget would be as follows(excl gst):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operational costs of airfield</th>
<th>$363,782</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income Land Rental</td>
<td>$193,687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Landing Fees ($60k gst incl)</td>
<td>$52,173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance (equals net direct cost to Council to operate airfield)</td>
<td>$117,922</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.1.2. Under that scenario the subsidy from rates for the Airfield Operation would be approximately $118,000 which represents approximately 32.4% of the total direct costs of operating the airfield.

6.1.3. Note that with the proposed staged increase of landing fees it will take 3 – 4 financial years to achieve that outcome.
6.2. **Community Implications**

If the recommendations in this report are implemented it will reduce the rating impact on the wider community rate payers.

6.3. **Risk Management**

6.3.1. Risk of complaints from airfield users. Any increase in land user charges or ground rental will be unpopular with the existing airfield users. There is a group currently working who are opposed to the Council proposed charges. This risk is best managed by offering the opportunity for that group to address the Community and Recreation Committee.

6.3.2. If the current charges are not increased there is a real risk that any future increase will meet with more opposition as the current increase is proposed to be staged over 3 years.

6.4. **Health and Safety**

Not applicable to this report.

7. **CONTEXT**

7.1. **Policy**

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

7.2. **Legislation**

Local Government Act

7.3. **Community Outcomes**

People will involve themselves in a range of recreation activities

7.4. **Delegations**

The Council is the appropriate decision making body.
1. SUMMARY

1.1 This report is seeking approval from Council for funding to renew some elements of Cust Community Centre during 19/20 financial year.

1.2 There are two aspects to the proposed upgrade: one relating to fire code compliance and the other relates to cosmetic upgrades such as curtains and furniture.

1.3 The total budget requested is $390,765 to be funded from the Community Buildings Renewals account which means that there will be no impact on rates.

Attachments:

i. Holmes Fire Cust Community Centre Analysis (Trim 190318035076)

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 190506064053

(b) Notes the report from Holmes Fire regarding fire safety compliance.

(c) Approves a budget of $335,990, funded from the Community Facilities Renewals account for the necessary compliance and cosmetic upgrades to the Cust Community Centre as listed in this report.

(d) Notes that staff will work with the Cust Community Advisory Group on the details of the replacement and centre upgrades.

(e) Circulates this report to the Rangiora Ashley Community Board.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1 Cust Community Centre has not had any upgrade work for many years.

3.2 When seismic assessments were carried out of all Community Buildings after the earthquakes it was found that the main hall at Cust Community Centre was earthquake prone with a NBS of 20% but the balance of the building was assessed at 100%.
3.3 Once the assessment was received the main hall was closed and Council approved funding for the remedial work to be performed. The remedial work effectively was connecting new bracing brackets between the roof trusses and the wall columns.

3.4 A building consent exemption was granted for that work so no other compliance reports were necessary and the work was completed in 2014.

3.5 Part of the ongoing for building compliance has subsequently highlighted an issue with the current fire safety systems for the building which means that the operation of the building is severely curtailed.

3.6 For buildings with a total occupant load of greater than 250 people a Type 4 smoke detection and alarm system with manual call points is required.

3.7 Holmes Consultants were engaged to undertake an assessment of the fire safety precautions need for compliance with the fire safety requirements of the building code.

4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1 Holmes Fire Report Findings:

   4.1.1. A new Type 4 fire alarm system is required to be installed throughout the building with a direct connection to FENZ.

   4.1.2. A need to upgrade the existing emergency lighting system

   4.1.3. An upgrade of the existing lighting, in particular the downlights.

4.2. Occupancy loading

   4.2.1. Once the upgrades are completed the building will be able to accommodate a maximum of 372 people – the following table identifies the numbers for each area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Space</th>
<th>Risk Group</th>
<th>Area [m²]</th>
<th>Density [m²/person]</th>
<th>Occupant Load [people]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ground</td>
<td>Main Hall</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>207²</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground</td>
<td>Stage</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground</td>
<td>foyer</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mezzanine</td>
<td>Riffe-Club Room</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground</td>
<td>Meeting Room</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground</td>
<td>Multipurpose Room</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>36³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground</td>
<td>St Johns Office</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground</td>
<td>Play Centre</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total for Building</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>372</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   4.2.2. Staff will manage this through the booking process as is done for the other community facilities.

4.3. Building consent

   4.3.1. A building consent will be required for the work and that will necessitate updating the accessibility of the building to current code.

   4.3.2. There are steps to the main entrance of the building as well as steps to the exterior toilets (note the exterior toilets are designed to provide service to the users of the Grounds).

   4.3.3. It is also likely that the accessible interior and exterior toilets will need upgrading to meet current code.
4.3.4. There has been no design work undertaken but staff have included a provision for this work in the budget in Section 6 of this report.

4.4. Assessment of other Community Facilities.

4.4.1. As part of the refinement of the Greenspace Activity Management Plan, staff are working to improve the data collection of the community facilities assets and internal fixtures.

4.4.2. This will allow replacement budgets to be set at the right amount to ensure the buildings are kept up to the right standard. It will also inform a priority list of required upgrades/renewals that staff will work through.

4.4.3. It is planned to have the updated information into the Asset Management System in Tech 1 prior to the next LTP.

4.4.4. Staff are not aware of any other community facilities that require significant upgrades to fire systems as most were addressed as part of building consent requirements related to earthquake strengthening.

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

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. Groups and Organisations

5.1.1. There have been no community views sought on this report as it is largely compliance based.

5.1.2. The Cust Community Centre Advisory Group will be involved with the upgrade and the details of the refurbishment.

5.2. Wider Community

5.2.1. The views of the wider community have not been sought but the Cust Community Centre is well used and is a significant facility for the District.

6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1. Financial Implications

6.1.1. The estimates for the work are separated into two tables. One is the estimates for the building compliance work and the other relates to the other recommended replacement/upgrade items for furniture and fittings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building compliance</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Replacement Fire Alarm Type 4</td>
<td>Supplier estimate</td>
<td>$22,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement Emergency Lighting</td>
<td>Supplier estimate</td>
<td>$22,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.1.2. This table lists the recommended replacement work that is required for the building.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Furniture and Fittings</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Replacement Stage Curtains</td>
<td>Staff estimate</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement Window curtains/blinds</td>
<td>Staff estimate</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement chairs (220) for main hall</td>
<td>Staff estimate (220 @ 180)</td>
<td>$39,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair Trolley</td>
<td>Staff estimate (3 @ 950)</td>
<td>$2,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement electric stoves (2)</td>
<td>Staff estimate (2,000 per stove)</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement tables</td>
<td>Staff estimate (16 wheeled tables @ 750)</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement fridge</td>
<td>Staff estimate (1 domestic)</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>$95,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency – 10%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$9,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$104,990</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.1.3. The Community Buildings Renewal Account has a current balance of $574,479 and it is proposed to fund the required renewals at Cust Community Centre from that budget.

6.1.4. If the renewals, to a total of $335,990, are funded from the renewals account there will be no impact on rates.

6.2. Community Implications
6.2.1. It is important for the community to have the Cust Community Centre fully operational and safe for the community to utilise.

6.3. Risk Management
6.3.1. There is a risk that further work will be required for a building consent but the contingency sum should cover unexpected additional work.
6.3.2. This will be addressed through the design and construction processes.

6.4. Health and Safety
6.4.1. This will be addressed through the design process of proposed building upgrades.

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
Building Act 2004

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

7.4. Delegations
The Council is the appropriate decision making body
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INTRODUCTION TO BUILDING CODE
The purpose of this report is to identify the gaps and determine the minimum fire safety precautions required within the existing Cust Community Centre at Mill Road, Cust to demonstrate compliance with Section 112(1) of the New Zealand Building Act 2004 with respect to the fire regulations.

Despite subsection (1), a territorial authority may, by written notice to the owner of a building, allow the alteration of an existing building, or part of an existing building, without the building complying with provisions of the building code specified by the territorial authority if the territorial authority is satisfied that,—

a) if the building were required to comply with the relevant provisions of the building code, the alteration would not take place; and

b) the alteration will result in improvements to attributes of the building that relate to—

(i) means of escape from fire; or

(ii) access and facilities for persons with disabilities; and

c) the improvements referred to in paragraph (b) outweigh any detriment that is likely to arise as a result of the building not complying with the relevant provisions of the building code.

This is a legal requirement whereby it must be shown that after the completion of works, the objectives of the New Zealand Building Code relating to means of escape from fire are satisfied to the extent required by the Act.

This Fire Engineering Strategy report includes a performance based Scope of Works advising of fire safety issues affecting architecture, building services and structure in accordance with the requirements of the New Zealand Building Code. This Fire Engineering Strategy must be read in conjunction with the accompanying fire safety sketches which are marked up on drawings prepared by other consultants.

This is not a ‘For Construction’ document, but a performance document that is intended to be used by the Architect and other consultants in implementing their detailed designs and preparing their working drawings and specifications. The consultants whose documentation is required to incorporate the requirements of this Fire Engineering Strategy are expected to have read this report, understood the implications as it affects their scope of work, and incorporated the relevant fire requirements into their drawings, specifications, and other construction documents.

This report is issued for the purpose of allowing the design to develop in compliance with the fire safety requirements of the Building Code.

Additional comments have been included in shaded boxes similar to this to give further information for consideration by the design team.

This report will not be suitable for submission for Building Consent until all issues are resolved, options selected and these shaded boxes removed from the report and also the report developed to include the assessment of compliance with C/AS4 for review by the Building Consent Authority.
EXTENT OF WORK
The existing building is a single level building that consists of a Main Hall, Play Centre, Meeting room/Multipurpose Hall, Kitchen and Office. An intermediate floor is located above the meeting room with access via the Main Hall. The building has its own toilet facility but also includes female and male public toilet that can only be accessed from outside the building. The building currently does not have any fire safety system such as automatic detection system or manual call points.

The purpose of this report is to provide a full building means of egress assessment to the Building Code Acceptable Solution C/AS4 and identify any deficiencies inside the building and potential solutions to close the gap identified.

WORK BY OTHERS
Access Routes
Escape route widths specified in this fire engineering strategy are the minimum widths for fire safety only, and may not specifically address requirements for access for people with disabilities. Other escape routes features that are not related to fire safety - and hence not specified in this Fire Engineering Strategy - may be required for compliance with Clauses D1 of the New Zealand Building Code.

Visibility in Escape Routes
The design of systems to achieve compliance with F6 of the NZBC is outside the scope of this report. Any comments in the Fire Engineering documentation for visibility in escape routes are for purposes of assisting the designers responsible for F6 compliance.

The design of systems to provide artificial lighting to escape routes (both internal and external parts) in compliance with G8 of the NZBC is outside the scope of this report. To assist, the fire strategy identifies the intended escape routes.

Wayfinding/Signage
The design of exit signage for compliance with F8.3.3 a) of the NZBC is outside the scope of this report. Any comments in the Fire Engineering documentation for exit signage positioning are for purposes of assisting the designers responsible for F8.3.3 a) compliance.

HSNO
This Fire Engineering Strategy does not specifically consider requirements for Hazardous Substances and New Organisms (HSNO). Therefore, clause C5.7 c) of the NZBC is not addressed by this report.

Other
Details and approval of the Evacuation Scheme, are to be provided by others.

Operational Management plan to support the Fire Engineering Strategy, are to be provided by others.

DESIGN APPROACH
Parameters
The following key parameters form the basis of this design. These parameters have been verified by the appropriate parties:
1. No unit title or similar other boundary arrangements exist or are proposed.
2. There are no Memorandum of Encumbrances or similar that exist or proposed which relate to fire.
3. The Building Importance Level is not IL4 or IL5.
4. The fire design is based around a building wide evacuation strategy. In this building all occupants evacuate to a place of safety outside the building.
5. There are no past agreements with the Building Owner and the Building Consent Authorities for progressive fire safety upgrades or similar.
6. The Building has a current Building Warrant of Fitness.
7. There are no solid fuel, gas burning, and oil fired appliances and open fires, proposed in the works.

Identification of the existing fire safety features is a result of site observations. It is inherently assumed that such features have been approved by the Building Consent Authority (BCA)/Territorial Authority (TA).

Where reference is made to existing fire safety features within the building, we assume that as a result of the Building Warrant of Fitness process that such features currently comply with the performance requirements that are identified in the Scope of Works.

**Philosophy**

To demonstrate compliance with the relevant fire safety clauses of the Building Code, following Compliance Documents have been adopted as the design basis:

SCOPE OF WORKS
The Scope of Works below lists the fire safety precautions needed for compliance with the fire safety requirements of the Building Code. This Scope of Works should be read with the plans appended to this report. Information contained within the Appendices of this report identify the gaps and is technical information intended to assist in the approvals process.

1  FIRE DETECTION, WARNING SYSTEMS

1.1 Alarm / Detection Systems Requirements

1.1.1 A new Type 4 fire alarm system is required to be installed throughout the building in accordance with NZS 4512:2010. A direct connection to the Fire and Emergency New Zealand is required.

1.1.2 The proposed location for the indicator panel is indicated in the fire strategy sketches. Access to the indicator panel shall be available at all times and not obstructed by security gates or similar.

1.2 First Aid Firefighting Equipment

1.2.1 Existing portable hand held extinguishers are required to be retained and maintained in accordance with the standard to which they were originally installed/are currently maintained.

2  ESCAPE ROUTE REQUIREMENTS

2.1 Fire Design Occupant Loads

2.1.1 Fire design occupant loads for each space that are used for the fire egress assessment are noted in Appendix A and on the attached sketches.

2.1.2 The basis of the fire design relies on a special control on the occupant load in the Main Hall to 228 people. The building owner shall provide a management procedure suitable for monitoring and maintaining the space as part of the building consent application.

2.2 Dimensions

2.2.1 All new horizontal escape routes are to have minimum clear widths not less than those outlined in the following table, unless specifically identified otherwise in the fire safety sketches. All existing horizontal escape routes comply with the requirements outlined in Table 1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Min. Clear Width [mm]</th>
<th>Min. Clear Door Width Into/Within [mm]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Horizontal egress routes in open path travel with less than 50 people – not an accessible route</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Allowable minor obstructions to the widths noted are as defined by D1/AS1.

2.2.2 All new vertical escape routes are to have minimum clear widths not less than those outlined in the following table, unless specifically identified otherwise in the fire safety sketches. The existing vertical escape routes comply with the requirements outlined in Table 2 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Min. Clear Width (^1) [mm]</th>
<th>Min. Clear Door Width Into/Within [mm]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Horizontal egress routes in open path travel with greater than 50 people – not an accessible route</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizontal egress routes in open path travel – accessible route</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>760</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Allowable minor obstructions to the widths noted are as defined by D1/AS1.

2.2.3 Loose seating is only permitted on level floors and shall be arranged so that:
   a) Direct access to the aisles is available
   b) The number of seats in a row is no greater than that specified in Table 3 below
   c) The clear walkway width between rows is no less than that specified in Table 3.3, and

Although consent is not required for the setting up of the loose seating, the layout shall still follow the requirements listed below in section Scope of Works section 2.2.3 to 2.2.5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: Vertical escape route width</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vertical egress routes in open path travel with less than 50 people – not an Exitway or an accessible route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vertical egress routes in open path travel – accessible routes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Allowable minor obstructions to the widths noted are as defined by D1/AS1.

2.2.3 Loose seating is only permitted on level floors and shall be arranged so that:
   a) Direct access to the aisles is available
   b) The number of seats in a row is no greater than that specified in Table 3 below
   c) The clear walkway width between rows is no less than that specified in Table 3.3, and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3: Walkways in fixed seating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum walkway width (mm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The area occupied by each seat plus the walkway in front of it has a total dimension of at least 760 mm from seat back to seat back measured horizontally at right angles to the rows of seats (see Figure 1). The seat width must be at least:

i) 500mm where arms area provided (see Figure 1), and

ii) 450 mm where arms are not provided.

2.2.4 Aisles shall provide access to final exits or escape routes (see Figure 2). The aisle width shall be no less than:

a) 750 mm when serving up to 60 seats

b) 900 mm when serving over 60 seats on one side only, or

c) 1100 mm in all other cases.

The minimum width shall occur at:

d) If discharge is in one direction only, the point furthest from the exit door in aisles, or

e) If discharge is in two directions, the mid-length of an aisle to separate cross-aisles or to separate exit doors.

There is nothing to prevent an aisle being made wider than the minimum required. However, to avoid restrictions, this shall be done only in the direction of travel.

2.2.5 Each cross-aisle shall have a width of no less than that of the widest aisle it serves plus 50% of the sum of the widths of all other aisles served.
2.3 General

2.3.1 For means of escape provisions, all manually operated doors on escape routes shall have door handles complying with D1/AS1 and door opening forces that do not exceed 67 N to release the latch, 133 N to set the door in motion, and 67 N to open the door to the minimum required width. The existing door handles comply on an ANARP basis.

2.4 Locking Devices/Security

2.4.1 All new locking devices proposed in the future on doors on escape routes until reaching the defined place of safety shall be clearly visible, located where such a device would normally be expected, designed to be easily operated without a key or other implement and allow the door to open in a normal manner. The existing locking devices on doors comply on an ANARP basis.

2.4.2 Crash bars are required to doors on escape routes as identified in the fire strategy sketches in Appendix B. The associated actuating portion shall consist of a horizontal bar that is not less than half the width of the escape route door leaf and be located between 800 mm and 1200 mm above the floor. The horizontal force is not to exceed 67 N and the door lock is to release allowing the door to swing freely.
3 LIGHTING AND SIGNAGE

3.1.1 The existing emergency lighting system shall be inspected by a qualified emergency lighting contractor to confirm the existing coverage and upgrade as necessary throughout the building to comply with F6.

3.1.2 The existing emergency exit signage system shall be inspected by a qualified emergency lighting contractor and upgrade as necessary throughout the building to comply with F8.

3.1.3 Signage for the fire related safety features is required to be installed as part of the fire safety system upgrade throughout the building in accordance with F8.

4 CONTROL OF INTERNAL HAZARDS INCLUDING SURFACE FINISH REQUIREMENTS

4.1.1 The timbers and MDF board on the Main Hall and the Foyer walls shall be upgraded meet the following early fire hazard indices limitations [when tested to ISO 9705:1993 as per C/VM2 Clause A1.2, or ISO 5660:2002 as per C/VM2 Clause A1.3]. Refer to Clause 4.1.2 for exceptions.

Table 4: Group Number limitations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Elements</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Maximum Material Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ceilings</td>
<td>Crowd spaces (All spaces except office/storage)</td>
<td>2S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walls</td>
<td>Crowd spaces (All spaces except office/storage)</td>
<td>2S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceilings and walls</td>
<td>All other occupied spaces (office/storage)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1.2 Note surface finish controls do not apply to:

- Small areas of non-conforming product within a space with a total aggregate surface area not more than 5.0 m².
- Electrical switches, outlets, cover plates and similar small discontinuous areas.
- Pipes and cables used to distribute power or services.
- Handrails and general decorative trim of any material such as architraves, skirtings and window components including reveals, provided these do not exceed 5% of the surface area of the wall or ceiling to which it is attached.
- Damp-proof courses, seals, caulking, flashings, thermal breaks and ground moisture barriers.
- Timber joinery and structural timber building elements constructed from solid wood, glulam or laminated veneer lumber. This includes heavy timber columns, beams, portals and shear walls not more than 3.0 m wide, but does not include exposed timber panels or permanent formwork on the underside of floor/ceiling systems.
- Individual doorsets.
- Continuous areas of permanently installed openable wall partitions not more than 3.0 m high and having a surface area of not more than 25% of the divided room floor area or 5.0 m², whichever is less.
4.1.3 The correlation of wall and ceiling surface finishes derived from Australian or European classifications to the Group Number requirements of NZBC Clause 3.4(a) can, without the need for further testing, be taken as described in the following.

Table 5: Australian or European correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1S</td>
<td>Group 1, and a smoke growth rate index not more than 100</td>
<td>Class A1, A2 or B and smoke production rating s1 or s2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>Class A1, A2 or B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2S</td>
<td>Group 2, and a smoke growth rate index not more than 100</td>
<td>Class C and smoke production rating s1 or s2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>Class C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>Class D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1.4 Any foamed plastic building materials or exposed combustible insulating materials forming part of a wall, ceiling or roof system are required to have a completed system (foamed plastic and/or foamed plastic plus a surface lining) meeting the above maximum material group number as applicable for the location of this building material. In addition, the foamed plastic is to meet the flame propagation criteria as specified in latest versions of AS 1366. It is strongly recommended that foamed plastic materials are not used. No foamed plastics are proposed for use.

4.1.5 Throughout the building, any new flooring proposed as part of the upgrades shall meet the following critical radiant flux limitations (when tested to ISO 9239-1:2010).

Table 6: Critical flux limitations for flooring.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Building</th>
<th>Minimum Critical Radiant Flux [kW/m²]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Firecells accommodating over 50 people (Main Hall)</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other occupied spaces</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1.6 Throughout the building, any new downlights proposed as part of the upgrades are required to be designed and installed to C/AS1 to C/AS6 Part 7 and the manufacturer’s requirements or alternatively, downlights can be considered to have achieved compliance with C2.2 if compliance is demonstrated using the Electrical (Safety) Regulations and subject to a condition of consent.

4.1.7 At the completion of the installation of the lighting, in particular downlights, shall be achieved by a Declaration of Conformity by a Registered Electrician.
5 FIRE AND SMOKE SEPARATIONS

5.1 Internal Passive Fire and Smoke Separations

5.1.1 Bounding construction of the existing fire separations (intermediate floor) as indicated in the fire strategy sketches is required to achieve/maintain a fire resistance rating of that indicated on the sketches. The performance of the construction is to be retained as existing, subject to any on site discovery for remedial works.

5.2 Closures and Penetrations in Fire and/or Smoke Separations

5.2.1 All penetrations through fire separations (created by wires, cables, pipes, flush boxes, etc.) or any gaps, or control joints, that are created or uncovered as part of the upgrades are required to be fire stopped with systems (collars, wraps, sleeves, mastics, etc.) that are approved for the proposed use [e.g. rating, orientation, penetration type, construction type] in accordance with AS 1530.4 2005 and AS 4072.1:2005. Where fire stopping systems to AS 4072.1:2005 are not able to be provided, it is acceptable to incorporate systems tested to BS EN 1366.3:2009, or UL 1479. Fire stopping systems are required to be installed strictly in accordance with the manufacturer’s instructions.

5.2.2 Where work is undertaken that alters the current performance of existing fire separations, the works must be undertaken and treated to achieve nominated performance within the Scope of Works. If build work is undertaken that exposes defects in the performance of existing nominated separations then each specific case that is uncovered will be discussed with the Building Consent Authority if works to appropriately rectify the defects are not undertaken.

5.2.3 Penetrations shall be supported to resist movement or collapse during fire. Supports shall not prevent normal expansion and contraction of the penetration.
Appendix A  Verification

A.1  Background Information
The existing Cust Community Centre building is a single level building that consists of a Hall, early childhood centre, meeting rooms, kitchen, offices and a mezzanine inside the Hall. The building currently does not have any fire safety system such as automatic detection system or manual call points.

The following table is a summary of the floor areas, design occupancies, and risk group classification within the relevant areas of the building. Representation of the varied areas is as shown on the Appended verification sketches.

Table 7: Summary of Risk Groups and Occupant Loads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Space</th>
<th>Risk Group</th>
<th>Area [m²]</th>
<th>Density [m²/person]</th>
<th>Occupant Load [people]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ground</td>
<td>Main Hall</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>207¹</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground</td>
<td>Stage</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground</td>
<td>Foyer</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mezzanine</td>
<td>Rifle-Club Room</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground</td>
<td>Meeting Room</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground</td>
<td>Multipurpose Room</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground</td>
<td>St Johns Office</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground</td>
<td>Play Centre</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total for Building</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>372</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The foyer is used as a break out/circulation space for the occupants inside the Main Hall thus not included in the total occupant load to avoid double counting.
2. As the only entry into the mezzanine Rifle-Club is via the Main Hall, thus it is unlikely that the Rifle-Club will be meeting while an event is happening in the Main Hall thus the occupant load in the Rifle-Club is not included in the total occupant load to avoid double counting.

The above occupant loads are based upon the methods recommended in the Acceptable Solutions C/AS1 to C/AS7 as applicable to this project.

A.2  Fire Safety Precautions and Fire Resistance Ratings
The following summarises the fire safety precautions for the building from C/AS1 to C/AS7 [as applicable to this project].

Table 8: Fire Safety Systems Required

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Group</th>
<th>Occ. Load</th>
<th>Escape Height</th>
<th>Systems</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>100 to 1000</td>
<td>4.0 m to 25 m</td>
<td>4, 9, 18¹</td>
<td>A Type 3 with supplementary smoke detection may be substituted if the environment is challenging for smoke detection.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In single storey early childhood centres, dedicated sleeping areas are required to be protected with supplementary smoke detectors. The alarm system and any smoke detection system shall comply with NZS 4512.

1. Not required where Fire Service hose run distance from the point of Fire Service vehicular access to any point on any floor is less than 75 m. However, a building fire hydrant system is required in all cases where the height from the Fire Service attendance point to any floor is greater than 15 m.

**Table 9: Fire Resistance Ratings Required**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Group</th>
<th>Life Rating</th>
<th>Property Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>60 min</td>
<td>120 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB</td>
<td>60 min</td>
<td>120 min</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given the above the proposed fire safety features are shown below with comparison to the requirements of C/AS1 to C/AS7 as appropriate.

**Table 10: Proposed Fire Safety Precautions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>C/ASx Requirement</th>
<th>Existing Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fire Rating</td>
<td>(60)/60/60 between firecells.</td>
<td>The building is a single firecell and there is no internal fire separation required. No gap identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30/30/30 to intermediate floors and supporting elements.</td>
<td>No fire rating to the existing intermediate floors and supporting elements. Refer to further discussion below about existing features.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alarm System</td>
<td>A Type 4 automatic fire alarm system with smoke detectors throughout the building. A direct connection to the Fire Service is required.</td>
<td>The building currently does not have any fire safety system. Refer to further discussion below about existing features.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate Floor Limitations</td>
<td>One intermediate floor with less than 100 people, 20% of the floor area where enclosed or partitioned</td>
<td>Intermediate floor is enclosed, and the area is within the limit. The occupant load calculated on the intermediate floor is less than 100 people. No gap identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature</td>
<td>C/ASx Requirement</td>
<td>Existing Features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Hydrant System</td>
<td>Required where the Fire Service hose run distance exceeds 75 m.</td>
<td>Not required as Fire Service hose run distance is less than 75 m and the height from the Fire Service attendance point to any floor is less than 15 m. No gap identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand held fire fighting equipment</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Existing fire hose reels and hand held fire extinguishers are to be retained as is and be maintained in accordance with the maintenance requirements of NZS 4503. No gap identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal surface finishes</td>
<td>Requirements are as per C/ASX and documented in the Scope of Works</td>
<td>Refer to further discussion below about existing features.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11: Other Precautions Related to Means of Escape

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>F6/AS1 and F8/AS1 Requirement</th>
<th>Existing Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visibility in Escape Routes</td>
<td>Emergency lighting fixtures to be provided in accordance with F6.</td>
<td>Emergency lighting fixtures is observed during site inspection although the extend of coverage cannot be determined during the site inspection. The emergency lighting shall achieve compliance in accordance with F6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit &amp; Directional Signage</td>
<td>Exit and directional signage required accordance with F8.</td>
<td>Exit and directional signage required accordance with F8.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A.3 Discussion on Existing Features

**Fire Rating of Intermediate Floor**

The existing intermediate floor stair is constructed from 20mm thick MDF boards with unprotected steel post supporting elements as shown below in Figure 3. The intermediate floor is located above the meeting room which have plasterboard ceiling. Although the thickness of the plasterboard ceiling cannot be determined without destructive testing, it is common practise to use 13mm thick plasterboard rather than 10mm for ceilings to prevent sacking. According to the GIB Fire Rated Systems Specification and Installation Manual issued Oct 2012, timber joists with 1 layer 13 mm plasterboard provides approximately 15 minutes fire resistance rating (FRR 15/15/15). Therefore, from our observation on site, the intermediate floor, stair and its supporting elements does not achieve the required 30-minute fire resistance rating (FRR of 30/30/30).

It is very difficult to upgrade existing structures to achieve full compliance without major construction work. Therefore, it is proposed to close the gap as nearly as is reasonably practicable by upgrading the intermediate stair and its supporting elements to achieve the required FRR of 30/30/30. The stair shall be upgraded by adding fire rated plasterboard from the underside to achieve an FRR of 30/30/30 while the steel supporting elements shall be treated with intumescent paint to achieve an FRR of 30/-/--. Since the existing intermediate floor provided approximately 15 minutes fire resistance rating and the cost to
upgrade the floor to achieve full compliance would be significant due to the amount of work involved, it is
proposed the intermediate floor shall continue to comply as nearly as is reasonably practicable under
Section 112 of the Building Act. It is recommended that upgrades to the intermediate floor / Meeting Room
ceiling shall be carried out in the future when any modification is proposed to the Meeting Room.

To fully comply with the New Zealand Building Code C/AS4, the intermediate floor, its stair and
supporting elements shall achieve a fire resistance rating (FRR) of (30)/30/30.
The existing intermediate floor provided an inherent FRR of 15/15/15 while the existing stair and its
supporting elements achieve no fire resistance rating at all.
Should the property owner choose to improve the intermediate floor system as nearly as is reasonably
practicable, it is recommended to provide fire resistance rating to the stair by adding fire rated
plasterboard from the underside to achieve an FRR of 30/30/30 while the steel supporting elements be
treated with intumescent paint to achieve an FRR of 30/-/-. 

**Figure 3: Intermediate floor and stair**

**Alarm Systems**
The building currently does not have any fire safety systems. As the total occupant load in the building is
greater than 250 people, a Type 4 Smoke detection and alarm system with manual call points is required.

The installation of a Type 4 system would provide early detection and warning to the large number of
occupants in the event of a fire which promote early evacuation. The lack of automatic detection system
within a building that have the capacity to hold a large crowd is considered significant gap. Therefore, it is
proposed that a Type 4 system shall be provided throughout the building.

**Visibility in Escape Routes**
Emergency lighting fixtures appear present in the building although the exact coverage is unknown. The
coverage of the emergency lighting and compliance (or lack of) to F6 shall be confirmed by the emergency
lighting designer. Where non-compliance is identified, they shall be rectified to achieve full compliance.

**Exit Signage**
Internally illuminated exit signage observed above the egress doors from the Main Hall and the foyer. Non-
compliant exit signage observed from the Play Centre as identified on the drawing in Appendix B. Lack of
exit signage observed from the multi-purpose room leading to a safe place outside as indicated on the
drawing in Appendix B.

The existing emergency exit signage system shall be inspected by a qualified emergency lighting
contractor and upgrade as necessary throughout the building to comply with F8.
**Existing Internal Surface Finish Requirements**

The following table summarises the existing surface finishes within the building.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Hall</td>
<td>Timber</td>
<td>MDF to 2.15m above floor height / Plasterboard</td>
<td>plasterboard</td>
<td>3 / 2</td>
<td>Stage</td>
<td>Timber</td>
<td>plasterboard</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage</td>
<td>Timber</td>
<td>plasterboard</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Foyer</td>
<td>Carpet</td>
<td>MDF to 2.15m above floor height / Plasterboard</td>
<td>3 / 2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foyer</td>
<td>Carpet</td>
<td>MDF to 2.15m above floor height / Plasterboard</td>
<td>3 / 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rifle-Club Room</td>
<td>Carpet</td>
<td>Timber / MDF to 2.15m above floor height</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Room</td>
<td>Carpet</td>
<td>MDF to 2.15m above floor height / Plasterboard</td>
<td>3 / 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Multipurpose Room</td>
<td>Vinyl</td>
<td>MDF to 2.15m above floor height / Plasterboard</td>
<td>3 / 2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Johns Office</td>
<td>Carpet</td>
<td>Plasterboard</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>Vinyl</td>
<td>MDF to 2.15m above floor height / Plasterboard</td>
<td>3 / 2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>Vinyl</td>
<td>MDF to 2.15m above floor height / Plasterboard</td>
<td>3 / 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Play Centre</td>
<td>Carpet/Vinyl</td>
<td>MDF to 2.15m above floor height / Plasterboard</td>
<td>3 / 2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The wall and ceilings in all the crowd space (everywhere except the St Johns Office) are permitted to have a maximum Group Number of 2S. This means all combustible materials such as timber and MDF boards are not permitted wall and ceiling materials as they are considered to have a Group Number of 3. Therefore, the existing MDF walls throughout the building and the timber walls in the foyer/Rifle-Club Room as shown in Figure 4, Figure 5 and Figure 6 below are not compliant to the current Building Code.

Consider the cost to upgrade the whole building would be significant and the time taken to do it would severely interrupt the community, it is proposed to carry out a partial upgrade as nearly as is reasonably practicable focusing on the Main Hall and the Foyer where large number of occupants could gather. By upgrading the Main Hall and the Foyer, this would significantly reduce the risk on flame spread in spaces where large crowds could gather. Other spaces such as Meeting Room, Multipurpose Room, Rifle-Club Room and the Play Centre each have occupant load less than 50 people and with the installation of a Type 4 system to provide early detection and warning, it is considered to comply as nearly as is reasonably practicable under Section 112.

It is noted that GIB plasterboard achieves a Group Number of 2S while plasterboard from other brands achieve a Group Number of 2. We are unable to identify the brand of the plasterboard in the building without destructive testing. Thus, it is assumed the plasterboard in the building achieves a Group Number...
of 2 for conservativeness. It is expected that the existing plasterboard throughout the remainder of the building are compliant with the Building Code surface finishes requirement at the time of installation, and we do not believe it is reasonably practicable to replace the existing plasterboard surface finishes.

Figure 4: MDF walls 2.15m high throughout majority of the building

Figure 5: Timber wall in the Foyer

Figure 6: Timber and MDF walls in the Rifle-Club Room
A.4 Means of Escape
The following summarises the configuration of the escape routes within the building.

Main Hall
The Main Hall is provided with a total of three exits. The two single leaf door exits located on either side of the stage leads directly to the outside (identified as Final Exit 2 and 3 on the drawing in Appendix B). The main egress from the Hall is a double leaf door via the Foyer (Final Exit 1).

Intermediate Floor
The intermediate floor is located above the meeting room with access from within the Main Hall. Thus, the intermediate floor has a single means of egress via the Main Hall.

Note that the intermediate floor has an existing “alternative” egress via the window that leads to the rooftop and egress down a ladder as shown below in Figure 7. This egress route is not compliant and shall not be used. The exit signage above the window shall be removed.

Figure 7: Non-compliant egress route via the window

Meeting Room
The meeting room has a single means of egress via the Foyer before reaching a safe place outside. It is noted the wall between the Meeting Room and the Multi-Purpose Room is a sliding door that can be completely opened to create one big space. The combined occupant load in the Meeting Room and the Multi-purpose Hall is less than 50 people thus single means of egress is still permitted.

Multi-Purpose Room
The Multi-Purpose room can be accessed via the Foyer by a large sliding door. As the occupant load in this space is greater than 20 people, the sliding door cannot be used as a designated egress route but rather as circulation between the two spaces. The designated egress route from the Multi-Purpose Room is the double leaf door leading to the Kitchen which then leads directly to a safe place outside.
**Play Centre**

The space directly adjacent the kitchen used to be a meeting room. The Play Centre has since expanded into this space (identified as ‘Play Centre N’ on the drawing in Appendix B).

There is a sliding door between the Kitchen and Play Centre North which is not a designated egress route but can be used for circulation.

The Play Centre can be divided into two spaces with the use of two large sliding doors as shown in Figure 8 below. Play Centre South has two designated exit routes both leads directly to the outside. The double leaf door on the south side and the sliding door on the west side (identified as ‘Final Exit 7’ and ‘Final Exit 6’ respectively). The calculated occupant load for Play Centre South is less than 20 people thus the sliding door can be used as part of the designated egress route.

Play Centre North has a single means of egress via the sliding door on the west side of the building identified as ‘Final Exit 5’ on the drawing in Appendix B. The calculated occupant load for this space is less than 20 people thus the sliding door can be used as the designated egress.

It is noted that when the sliding door is open between Play Centre North and Play Centre South, the combined occupant load is over 20 people thus the use of the sliding doors as designated egress is not permitted. In this situation, occupants can use the double leaf hinge door on the south side of the play centre (Final Exit 7).

**Figure 8: Large sliding doors that separates Play Centre North from Play Centre South**

**A.4.1 Number of Escape Routes**

The following table summarises the required and available egress routes from each independent area.

**Table 13: Summary of Available Escape Routes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Occ. Load (people)</th>
<th>No. of Escape Routes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground</td>
<td>Main Hall</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground</td>
<td>Stage</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground</td>
<td>Foyer</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mezzanine</td>
<td>Rifle-Club Room</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The above shows that the number of escape routes within the building comply with the minimum requirements of C/AS1 to C/AS7 to the extent required by the Building Act.

Escape route separations in order to determine them being deemed as “provided”, have taken into consideration the need for separate escape routes to comply with paragraph 3.6.

A.4.2 Escape Route Widths

The following summarises the allowable and actual escape route widths provided from the area noted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Occ. Load [people]</th>
<th>No. of Escape Routes</th>
<th>Horizontal Width [mm]</th>
<th>Vertical Width [mm]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground</td>
<td>Meeting Room</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground</td>
<td>Multipurpose Room</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground</td>
<td>St Johns Office</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground</td>
<td>Play Centre</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The largest escape route has been discounted by a strike through as the building is non-sprinklered.
2. Door width in open path are taken as 760 mm [accessible route] for conservatism.
3. Vertical escape routes of width 1000 mm have been adopted for conservatism.
4. Doors are permitted to impinge into the required escape route width by up to 125 mm without affecting the required horizontal travel width.
5. Handrails and minor intrusions are permitted to impinge into the required escape route width by up to 100 mm without affecting the required vertical travel width.
The above shows that the escape route widths within the building except the Main Hall comply with the minimum requirements of C/AS1 to C/AS7 to the extent required by the Building Act.

The Main Hall does not have sufficient egress capacity for the calculated occupant load of 258 people. As the building is not sprinkler protected, it is assumed a fire would start near an exit blocking that exit. Thus, the widest exit within the building has to be discounted to compensate for the absence of the sprinkler system. With the discount of the widest door (1500mm), the egress capacity calculated from the two sets of single leaf door (2x800 mm) is 228 people. This means the Main Hall shall be restricted to a maximum of 228 people at any time. As this building is existing with all work proposed solely to close the gaps of fire safety level between the existing building and the current Building Code. The level of improvement is significant such as the installation of the Type 4 system and treating the combustible surface finishes in the Main Hall and the foyer, it is proposed the restriction of the occupant load in this existing Main Hall continue to comply as nearly as is reasonably practicable under Section 112 of the Building Act.

### A.4.3 Travel Distances

The following summarises the allowable and actual travel distances for the existing building taking into account the permitted distances based on the proposed fire safety systems.

**Table 15: Summary of Actual and Permitted Travel Distances**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Alarm Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>DEOP Permitted [m]</th>
<th>DEOP Actual [m]</th>
<th>TOP Permitted [m]</th>
<th>TOP Actual [m]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ground</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Main Hall</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Stage</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>14^2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Foyer</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mezzanine</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Rifle-Club Room</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>22.5^1,2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Meeting Room</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Multipurpose Room</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>St Johns Office</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Play Centre</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Measured travel distances have been increased by a factor of 1.5 for travel across intermediate floors.
2. Measured travel distances have been increased by a factor of 1.2 for travel over stairs.

The above shows that the travel distances within the building comply with the maximum distance permitted by C/AS1 to C/AS7 (as applicable to this project) to the extent required by the Building Act.
Appendix B  Schedule of Fire Safety Sketches

Fire Separation & Means of Escape
FS 101  Rev A  Floor Plan

Occupant Load
FS 201  Rev A  Floor Plan
The existing stair leading to the intermediate floor is constructed out of doors, not providing the required fire resistance rating (WR 30 / 60 / 60).

Main Hall
1st Floor
TOP (exit 1) = 20 m
TOP (exit 2) = 21 m

Intermediate Floor
1st Floor
TOP (exit 1) = 20 m
TOP (exit 2) = 21 m

Fire separations & Means of Escape

Exit signage shall be placed above the door as indicated.

Exit signage shall be removed from above the window. Egress through the roof top is not permitted.

Existing non-compliant exit signage shall be replaced with compliant exit signage.

Exit signage is exit on the internally illuminated box. The word "EXIT" shall be printed on the internally illuminated box to comply.
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT FOR DECISION

FILE NO and TRIM NO: GOV-01-11 / 190510066599
REPORT TO: Council
DATE OF MEETING: 28 – 30 May 2019
FROM: Chris Brown, Manager Community and Recreation
       Grant MacLeod, Community Greenspace Manager
SUBJECT: Community and Recreation Department Staff Submission to the 2019-20 Annual Plan
SIGNED BY: ____________________________
Department Manager
______________________________
Chief Executive

1. SUMMARY
1.1 The purpose of this report is to request changes to Community and Recreation Budgets for Greenspace and Aquatics for the 2019-20 Annual Plan.

1.2 Table 1 below summarises the specific items that staff would like Council to consider:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Current Annual Plan Budget</th>
<th>Proposed Annual Plan Budget</th>
<th>Total $ Change</th>
<th>Capital or Operational (C or O)</th>
<th>Impact on rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Croquet Club Grant</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surf Lifesaving New Zealand</td>
<td>$82,020</td>
<td>$88,600</td>
<td>$6,580</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dudley Renewals</td>
<td>$5,280</td>
<td>$15,280</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Precinct Operational Maintenance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$66,580</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>0.07%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.3 The Rangiora Croquet Club grant of $25,000 has been requested by the club for the development of two new lawns in order to cater for their growing membership.
1.4 Surf Life Saving New Zealand are recommending no major changes to the level of service for the 2019/20 summer patrol season. While the level of service is recommended as being maintained, the cost has increased by $6,580. This increase in cost is due to increases in staff wages which has been necessary to keep up with industry market movements.

1.5 The Dudley Aquatic Centre renewals budget requires additional funding for the 2019/20 financial year to ensure that there is sufficient funding to cover any unplanned breakdown of component parts of essential plant and equipment. This report recommends additional funding of $10,000.

1.6 This report also seeks approval from Council to increase the fees for the Aquarobics Casual Community Services/Senior rate by 50 cents from $6.50-$7.00.

1.7 The Marine Precinct in Kaiapoi is planned to be operational in the second half of the 2019/20 financial year. The current budget does not contain sufficient operational maintenance funding to ensure the assets are maintained in accordance with manufacturer’s guidelines. This report recommends an additional maintenance budget provision of $15,000.

Attachments:

i. Report - Croquet Club Loan Deferral and Council Funding Contribution for Croquet (Trim 190221020363)

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 190510066599.

(b) Approves a Grant of $25,000 for the Rangiora Croquet Club as a contribution towards the development of two new Croquet Lawns

(c) Approves a $6,580 increase to the Surf Lifesaving New Zealand budget 104871002410 increasing it to a total of $88,600.

(d) Approves Surf Lifesaving services provided by Surf Life Saving New Zealand for the 2019/20 season being undertaken at Waikuku, Pegasus and Woodend Beach for a period 33, 26 and 26 days respectively.

(e) Approves an additional $10,000 allocation from the Pools renewal fund to allow for the renewal of plant and equipment located at Dudley Aquatic Centre.

(f) Approves an additional $25,000 operational budget for the maintenance of the Marine Precinct in Kaiapoi.

(g) Approves a $0.50 increase, effective from 1 July 2019 to the Aquarobics Casual Community Services/Senior rate which increases the fee from $6.50 - $7.00.

(h) Notes that recommendation (e) will have no effect on rates as the money requested is from depreciation accounts which has already been collected.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1 Rangiora Croquet Club

3.1.1. The Rangiora Croquet Club have experienced ongoing growth since the development of their facility on Millton Memorial Reserve approximately 5 years
ago. The club currently has two lawns which are shared between 47 members. In order to cater for the growing membership the Rangiora Croquet Club have requested permission to extend the club by developing two new lawns. The space to do so within Millton Memorial Reserve is available as this was always anticipated during the development of the now approved Millton Memorial Reserve Concept Development Plan.

3.1.2. Council considered a report (included as attachment i) at its April 2 meeting which provides more detailed information regarding the request from the Rangiora Croquet Club. In order to fund the development of the two new lawns the club require between $80,000 and $90,000. The Club have already been granted some funding from the Canterbury Croquet Association of $10,000. They will be applying for grants from organisations such as the Rata Foundation and also providing a large amount of work in kind from various active club members.

3.1.3. The Club have requested funding assistance from Council by way of a $25,000 grant to be used as a contribution towards the development of the two lawns.

3.1.4. This report seeks a recommendation from Council to allocate $25,000 as a grant to the Rangiora Croquet Club. Staff believe that the Croquet development should be financially supported by Council for the following reasons.

- Council has historically supported active recreation through the provision of playing surfaces. This has included the development of Croquet greens in the past.
- Rangiora Croquet have since establishing at Millton Memorial Reserve developed the club into a sustainable and viable club which is attracting more members.
- Croquet provides a recreation and social function for elderly Waimakariri residents. With projected population demographics in the Waimakariri it is important to support opportunities for elderly residents to connect through physical activity.
- The Rangiora Croquet Club have been active in seeking external funding and have shown that they also provide significant volunteer efforts towards development projects.

3.1.5. The reason this project was identified as part of the draft annual plan was due to timing. Staff were only made aware of the desire and need for two additional lawns after the draft annual plan was prepared. Timing of sports surface developments is often related to participation numbers but also the desire and willingness of the club to fundraise and partner with Council.

4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

4.1. There are number of options that the Council could consider.

4.1.1. Option 1

As recommended by staff approve a grant of $25,000. The reasons that staff recommend this option is identified in section 3.14 above.

Option 2
Decline the Request from the Rangiora Croquet Club. This option is not the recommended option.

Option 3
Allocate a different amount as a grant to the Rangiora Croquet Club. Council could choose to allocate either more or less that the recommended $25,000. Staff have had discussions with the Croquet Club who believe that they will be able to secure external funding to make up the remaining money needed to complete the development project. If less funding is allocated it is likely that the project still will go ahead however it be delayed.

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

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. Groups and Organisations

The Rangiora Croquet Club were responsible for contacting staff to propose the extension to their current lawns. Staff have met with the club and elected members to discuss the proposal.

5.2. Wider Community

The wider community has not been consulted regarding the proposal to allocated a $25,000 grant to Rangiora Croquet.

6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1. Financial Implications

6.2. This report proposes the allocation of a $25,000 one of grant be provided to the Rangiora Croquet Club. This money is currently un-budgeted and if approved would be funded from the Recreation account. This will have an overall rating impact of 0.03%

6.3. Community Implications

Rangiora and the wider district has an aging population and while Croquet can appeal to all age groups it is traditionally played by those in the older age bracket. Providing recreation opportunities and assets to meet community demand is important in ensuring connected and healthy communities.

6.4. Risk Management

While the club have indicated that if funding from Council is not supplied they will still work towards the development of the two new lawns there is a risk that this will take a considerable amount of time which will limit recreation and wellbeing opportunities for the community.

6.5. Health and Safety

If progressed the development of the two lawns will be undertaken by the Rangiora Croquet Club. Similar to the development of the original lawns Council staff will assist in ensuring health and safety legislation is followed.

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**
Reserves Act 1977

7.3. **Community Outcomes**
Public spaces and facilities are plentiful, accessible and high quality

There is a wide variety of public places and spaces to meet people’s needs.

There are wide-ranging opportunities for people to enjoy the outdoors.

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

7.4. **Delegations**
Council has the delegation to allocate funding for the development of Council owned assets.

8. **BACKGROUND**

8.1. **Surf Lifesaving New Zealand**

8.1.1. Surf Life Saving New Zealand is a charity which represents 74 Surf Life Saving Clubs in New Zealand. As a service, Surf Life Saving New Zealand offers regional beach lifeguarding to local authorities to patrol high use beaches over the summer holiday period. This is a paid service. In the Waimakariri District during the 2018/19 season Waikuku, Woodend and Pegasus Beaches were patrolled by Surf Life Saving New Zealand’s regional lifeguards. Included as attachment ii in this report is the data collected from the 2018/19 season. This data shows how many people are swimming at the patrolled beaches, when they are swimming and how many interactions the lifeguards have had.

8.1.2. Each year staff work with Surf Life Saving New Zealand to determine the appropriate level of service for the following season. This includes which beaches to patrol and the duration of the service. The start and end dates for each season generally change to coincide with school holiday starting and finishing dates.

8.1.3. For the 2019/20 season it is proposed that the service is provided to the three most popular swimming beaches of Waikuku, Woodend and Pegasus. Before the Canterbury Earthquakes Pines Beach was patrolled however following advice from Surf Life Saving New Zealand and approval from Council this service was stopped. Surf Life Saving New Zealand monitored Pines Beach in the seasons following this decision however numbers of swimmers did not increase to the point where providing a service was considered appropriate. While monitoring was not undertaken last season it is not anticipated that numbers of swimmers would have increased to the point where a lifeguard service is required.

8.1.4. The proposed service would include 33 days of patrolling at Waikuku and 26 days at Woodend and Pegasus Beaches. This length is consistent with patrolling from previous years and is supported by data as being sufficient to cover the busiest periods of beach use.

8.1.5. The budget required from Surf Life Saving New Zealand is received each year after the draft Annual Plan has been prepared. The current budget identified in the draft Annual Plan is $82,020. The budget required to provide the service has
increased by $6,580 to $88,600. The reason for the increase is increases in wage costs. The increase in wage costs is a direct result of industry increases. The Waimakariri District Council Aquatic Centre Lifeguard wages have increased. In order to continue to attract qualified and competent lifeguards, Surf Life Saving New Zealand have increased wages.

9. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

9.1. There are number of options that the Council could consider.

9.1.1. Option 1
Approve the recommended level of service as described in section 7.6.4 and associated additional budget provision of $6,580. This is the option recommended by staff and is line with what has been recommended by Surf Lifesaving New Zealand.

Option 2
Increase the current budget to provide a higher level of service which could include either the patrol of additional beaches or a longer patrol period. This is not the recommended option. The recommendation from Surf Life Saving New Zealand which is based on the data collected from the previous 2018 / 19 season is to maintain the current level of service.

Option 3
Reduce the level of service to meet the current budget provision. This is not the recommended option.

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

10. COMMUNITY VIEWS

10.1. Groups and Organisations
There has been no engagement with community groups or organisation regarding the recommendations. The recommendations request additional funding to maintain current levels of service. Staff have had no feedback from any groups or organisations to suggest that current levels of service are not adequate.

10.2. Wider Community
There has been no engagement with the wider community regarding the recommendations. The recommendations request additional funding to maintain current levels of service. Staff have had no feedback from the wider community to suggest that current levels of service are not adequate.

11. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

11.1. Financial Implications

11.2. If the recommendations in this report are approved the budget which is currently a grant to Surf Life Saving New Zealand will be increased by $6,580. This will have an overall rating impact of 0.01%.

11.3. Community Implications
The service provided by Surf Life Saving New Zealand contributes towards the safety of residents who swim at the high use beaches in the Waimakariri.

11.4. Risk Management

The Surf Life Saving service reduces the risks associated with swimming at the main beaches in the Waimakariri.

11.5. Health and Safety

Surf Life Saving New Zealand are responsible for the health and safety of their staff who are all required to have the appropriate training and qualifications.

12. CONTEXT

12.1. Policy

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

12.2. Legislation

Not Applicable

12.3. Community Outcomes

Public spaces and facilities are plentiful, accessible and high quality

There is a wide variety of public places and spaces to meet people's needs.

There are wide-ranging opportunities for people to enjoy the outdoors.

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

People enjoy clean water at our beaches, rivers and lakes.

12.4. Delegations

Council has the delegation to approve the allocation of operation and grant funding.

13. BACKGROUND

13.1. Dudley Aquatic Centre Renewals Budget and Aquarobics Casual Community Services/Senior rate increase

13.1.1. The current annual plan budget for renewals at Dudley Aquatic Centre is $5,280. The budget was set as part of a previous Long Term Plan and is informed by an asset replacement schedule held on an excel spreadsheet by Aquatics Staff. The $5,280 is anticipated for the replacement of water proofing in overflow channels in balance tanks.

13.1.2. Currently the Aquatic Centre staff are developing a more detailed asset management renewals schedule which look at individual component parts of
larger plant. This has been identified as necessary following a number of component breakdowns of larger fixed assets over the last 12 months.

13.1.3. Until this work is complete staff believe that it would be wise to increase the renewals budget for the 2019/20 year to safeguard funding encase of any further breakdowns.

13.1.4. The detailed asset replacement programme underway will be prepared for the next Long Term Plan budget.

13.1.5. The Aquarobics Casual Community Services/Senior rate increase has been recommended by the Community and Recreation Committee at their May 2019 meeting. Staff identifies an omission in report no. 190118005113. This report identified a number of fee changes to keep fees inline with relative organisations and to keep up with operational increase. A fee increase for Aquarobics Casual Community Services/Senior rate was not included in this report. Further information was supplied to the Community and Recreation Committee in report trim – 190507064831.

14. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

14.1. The additional renewals budget requested would be funded from current depreciation budgets. This depreciation funding has already been collected and therefore approving the recommendation will have no impact on rates. The Council could decline the request. If there are any required unplanned renewals staff could at that time prepare a report requesting additional funding.

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

15. COMMUNITY VIEWS

15.1. Groups and Organisations

Not applicable

15.2. Wider Community

15.3. Not applicable

16. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

16.1. Financial Implications

This report proposes an increase to the Dudley Park Aquatic Centre renewals budget of $10,000. The increase in budget will have no effect on rates as the money requested is from depreciation accounts which have already been collected.

16.2. Community Implications

Ensuring the ongoing operation of the districts aquatic centres is important in ensuring residents have opportunities to learn to swim and recreate in a safe environment.

16.3. Risk Management

Not applicable

16.4. Health and Safety
17. CONTEXT

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

17.2. Legislation
Not applicable

17.3. Community Outcomes
Public spaces and facilities are plentiful, accessible and high quality

There is a wide variety of public places and spaces to meet people's needs.

There are wide-ranging opportunities for people to enjoy the outdoors.

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

People enjoy clean water at our beaches, rivers and lakes.

17.4. Delegations
The Council has the delegation to approve funding allocation for capital renewals

18. BACKGROUND

18.1. Kaiapoi Marine Precinct Maintenance Funding
18.1.1. The Kaiapoi Marine Precinct pontoons have been approved by Council for construction with completion in the 2019/20 financial year.

18.1.2. The current 2019/20 annual plan recreation budget has no additional provision for the operation and maintenance of the Kaiapoi Marine Precinct.

18.1.3. The additional funding was not identified as part of the draft annual plan as at the time as there were many unknowns in regards to when the marine precinct would be completed to a point where it could be operational. With the recent approval of the marine dredging and pontoons contract this is now more certain.

19. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

19.1. The Council has committed to the redevelopment of the Kaiapoi Marine Precinct. In order to ensure that the assets provided in this area are safe for use, maintained to reach their expected lifespan and presented according to the communities expectation ongoing maintenance funding is required.

19.2. Staff have estimated the total cost of maintenance to be $25,000. This includes the following tasks:

- General cleaning of the pontoons
- Ongoing clearance of debris
- Yearly inspections (3rd party inspections of chains/ropes, grease pivots, lifebuoy check etc.)
- Riverview Pontoon electrical safety inspections
19.3. Council could choose not to provide additional funding however, this would likely lead to community dissatisfaction and deferred maintenance that will affect the safety and lifespan of the assets.

19.4. It is important to note that there will be additional income generated from the berthing of boats in the marine precinct area. This will assist in offsetting the operational maintenance costs. The fees for berthing and the number of boats that can be berthed have not yet been determined. This is currently being worked on by staff and will be reported back to Council.

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

20. COMMUNITY VIEWS

20.1. Groups and Organisations

There has been a large amount of community views expressed from groups and organisations during the planning for the development of the marine precinct in Kaiapoi.

20.2. Wider Community

There has been a large amount of community views expressed from the wider community during the planning for the development of the marine precinct in Kaiapoi.

21. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

21.1. Financial Implications

21.2. This report requests additional operational funding of $25,000 to be funded from the recreation account. This will have an overall rating impact of 0.03%

21.3. Community Implications

The additional funding will ensure that the Marine Precinct area and assets are maintained to a safe and acceptable standard for community use.

21.4. Risk Management

If appropriate maintenance and inspections are not undertaken there is a risk that some of the assets in the marine precinct such as the pontoons may become unsafe for public use. It is also likely to increase future costs due to the reducing in the expected life of the assets.

21.5. Health and Safety

A portion of the requested $25,000 would be used to undertake regular scheduled inspections of assets to ensure they are safe for public use.

22. CONTEXT

22.1. Policy

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

22.2. Legislation
22.3. **Community Outcomes**

Public spaces and facilities are plentiful, accessible and high quality

There is a wide variety of public places and spaces to meet people’s needs.

There are wide-ranging opportunities for people to enjoy the outdoors.

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

People enjoy clean water at our beaches, rivers and lakes.

22.4. **Delegations**

The Council has the delegation to approve operational funding for maintenance and inspections of Council assets.
1. SUMMARY

1.1 This purpose of this report is to seek a recommendation from the Community and Recreation Committee regarding the deferral of the Community Loan of $42,000 which was provided to the Rangiora Croquet Club in March 2014.

1.2 This report also provides information regarding the club's intention to extend the current croquet lawns to enable two more greens. This report seeks a recommendation from the Community and Recreation Committee regarding a Council contribution towards the cost of this development.

Attachments:

i. Millton Memorial Reserve Concept Plan Trim # 150528085342
ii. Background information provided by the Croquet Club Trim # 190221020449
iii Loan Agreement Trim # 140408036239

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Community and Recreation Committee recommends:

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 190221020363

(b) Approves the loan repayments for the Community Loan of $42,000 provided to the Rangiora Croquet Club being deferred for a further three years from April 2018 until April 2021.

(c) Notes that deferring the loan for a three year period allows sufficient time for the Rangiora Croquet Club to complete the development of two additional full size greens which are required to allow for current and future club membership.

(d) Considers as an annual plan submission a grant of $25,000 for the Rangiora Croquet Club for the development of two new croquet greens for the 2019 / 20 financial year.
3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1. In 2014 Council passed a resolution to approve two loans; each of $42,000 for the Rangiora Table Bowls Club and the Rangiora Croquet Club. The purpose of the loans was to cover the shortfall in purchasing a building to be used jointly by Table Bowls and the Croquet Club.

3.1 In August 2016 the Community and Recreation Committee passed a resolution to defer loan repayments for a two year period. This meant that loan repayments would commence again in April of 2018. The reason for the deferral was due to the clubs focus on the development of the club, its greens and associated infrastructure. This included sheds, paths, planting and building fit out. These improvements were all necessary at the time and have helped to significantly grow the clubs membership moving it towards a more financially viable and sustainable club.

3.2 The attached memo from the Rangiora Croquet Club outlines the amount of club time and income which has been used towards the development of the club over the last five years. The club has been able to raise $72,520 for the developments to date. The development of the clubs infrastructure has been a priority and according to the Rangiora Croquet Club would have been difficult if Council had not deferred the loan repayments.

4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

3.3 The Rangiora Croquet Club have now grown to have a membership of 47. This shows strong growth since they started the development in 2014. The growth in membership is very positive for the club however, it now means that the current two greens are no longer sufficient.

3.4 The club would like the opportunity to extend and develop two new greens. This extension is something which was always anticipated. In June 2015 a concept plan for the development of Millton Memorial Reserve was approved by the then Rangiora Community Board. This included space for a four green croquet club as shown on the plan below.

![Diagram of Millton Memorial Reserve with four green croquet club](image)

3.5 The two new greens will enable the club to have room for four full size greens. This is the required amount of greens to allow interclub competitions. Without the two new greens there is little room to cater for additional growth at the club.

3.6 Rangiora Croquet club-day is on a Saturday. On this day croquet is played on half-lawns, and the most that can be accommodated at one time is 32 players double-banked. This means that two groups of four are playing on one half-lawn. If there are more than 32 people wanting to play on a Saturday, some members have to stand-down for one game. This shortage of playing space presents the club with a dilemma. It is anxious to increase
its numbers but does not want enrol too many more if that is going to lead to frustration for those wanting games on Saturday but are unable to play because of lack of space.

3.7 The club has approached Council staff requesting permission to start the process of developing the two new greens. The club have received quotes for the development which are between $80,000 and $90,000. The club wish to fund the development in a number ways. The funding model proposed is described in section 6.1 below.

3.8 The funding model proposed has been created on the basis that Council would consider continuing to defer or write off the $42,000 Community Loan.

3.9 Staff undertook a briefing with the Community and Recreation Committee in February 2019 to discuss the request from Rangiora Croquet to have the $42,000 loan deferred or written off. The Committee members agreed that for equity reasons it would be appropriate to look to defer rather than write off the Croquet Club Loan until such time as the club was in a better position to be able to pay it off.

3.10 This report therefore recommends that the loan repayments for the Community Loan of $42,000 provided to the Rangiora Croquet Club be deferred for a further three years from April 2018 until April 2021.

3.11 In order to build two new greens the Rangiora Croquet Club require funding assistance. The club is not likely to need the full $80,000 - $90,000 required as they will undertake a significant amount of work using volunteer labour. This was how the first two greens were constructed which costs a total of $47,500 (this was for the greens only and did not include Council's other investment in car parking etc).

3.12 The club has been able to secure funding from Canterbury Croquet for $10,000 towards the new greens. The club is also in the process of preparing an application to the Rata foundation. The club have asked if there is the possibility that Council would make a contribution towards the development.

3.13 This report seeks a recommendation from the Committee to allocate $25,000 as a grant to the Rangiora Croquet Club. Staff believe that the Croquet development should be financially supported by Council for the following reasons.

- Council has historically supported active recreation through the provision of playing surfaces. This has included the development of Croquet greens in the past.

- Rangiora Croquet have since establishing at Milton Memorial Reserve developed the club into a sustainable and viable club which is attracting more members.

- Croquet provides a recreation and social function for elderly Waimakariri residents. With projected population demographics in the Waimakariri it is important to support opportunities for elderly residents to connect through physical activity.

- The Rangiora Croquet Club have been active in seeking external funding and have shown that they also provide significant volunteer efforts towards development projects.

3.14 The Committee has a number of options regarding both the loan deferral and proposed $25,000 grant.

3.15 Loan Deferral
• Option 1 – Decline the request from the Rangiora Croquet Club to defer the Community Loan for a further three years. Staff do not support this option as it will impact the club in terms of their ability to develop in the short term to meet community demand.

• Option 2 – Approve the loan deferral for a further three years. This is staffs recommended option.

• Option 3 – Defer the loan for a different period other than three years. Staff do not recommend this option. Staff have met with the Rangiora Croquet Club and discussed time periods for possible loan deferral. The club believe that any shorter than three years, which would run out in April 2021, would hinder the development of the two greens.

3.16 Rangiora Croquet $25,000 grant.

• Option 1 – Decline to recommend an allocation of a $25,000 grant to the Rangiora Croquet Club as a contribution towards the development of two new greens. Staff do not support this option. There is current demand for the additional greens now which is likely to grow with both population increases and demographic projects in the Waimakariri District.

• Option 2 – Approve the recommendation to support funding of $25,000 as a contribution. Staff support this option for the reason identified in section 3.13.

• Option 3 – Recommend a different contribution. Staff have discussed with the croquet club what quantum of contribution would be suitable in order to assist in allowing the proposed development to proceed. While the club would like more funding assistance they do believe that with $25,000 they will be able to proceed based on other external funding and volunteer labour efforts.

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

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. Groups and Organisations

The Millton Memorial Concept Plan was widely consulted on before its adoption in 2015. This anticipated future expansion of the Croquet Club. When the Croquet Club is in a position to start the proposed development staff will inform both the Friends of the Rangiora Dog Park and the Rangiora Table Bowls Club.

5.2. Wider Community

No wider community consultation has been undertaken.

6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1. Financial Implications

The Rangiora Croquet Club are requesting permission from Council to defer paying their community loan of $42,000 for a further three years.

The cost of interest on the loan is currently met from the Recreation account and the repayments are approximately $2,000 per annum so deferring repayments for the Croquet Club for a further 3 year period would be a total cost of approximately $6,000.
In addition to deferring the community loan this report seeks a recommendation from the Committee to allocate $25,000 as a grant to the Rangiora Croquet Club to allow them to construct two additional greens. This is to be considered as part of the annual plan deliberations. If approved this would have approximately a 0.05% impact on rates.

The total cost of the Greens is estimated by the club as being between $80,000 and $90,000. This is the cost for the greens to be built using contractors for all the work. The club however propose a three stage build process that will include a significant amount of labour in kind from club members.

The club plan on funding the new greens from the following sources:

- Grant from Canterbury Croquet Association.
  
  $10,000
- Council contribution (if successful)
  
  $25,000
- Rata Foundation (application not yet lodged)
- Work in kind from Club members

6.2. Community Implications

The Waimakariri District has a growing population. The percentage of this population that is often considered of an age to participate in Croquet is also increasing. Supporting growth of recreation facilities for elderly residents in the Waimakariri District to meet demand and provide the opportunities for physical and social wellbeing is necessary.

If the recommendations in this report are approved there will be positive impacts for the wider community.

6.3. Risk Management

There is a risk that if either the loan deferral or the $25,000 grant is not supported that members of the Waimakariri community will have the opportunity to participate in Croquet.

6.4. Health and Safety

If the club are successful in obtaining all external funding for the two new greens, Greenspace staff will work closely with the club to manage health and safety of contractors and volunteers.

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
Milton Memorial Reserve is managed under the Reserves Act 1977 as recreation reserve. The development of additional recreation facilities such as two new croquet greens is consistent with the purpose of a recreation reserve and therefore a permitted activity.

The Reserves Act 1977 requires reserve management plans to be created for all reserves. Milton Memorial Reserve is a Sport and Recreation Reserve and is therefore covered by the composite Sport and Recreation Reserve Management Plan. The development of two new greens is consistent with the policies contained within this management plan.

7.3. Community Outcomes

**Public spaces and facilities are plentiful, accessible and high quality**
- There is a wide variety of public places and spaces to meet people’s needs. ¹,²,³,⁴
- There are wide-ranging opportunities for people to enjoy the outdoors. ¹,³
- The accessibility of community and recreation facilities meets the changing needs of our community. ¹,²,³,⁴
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1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to gain approval for the Millton Memorial Reserve Concept Development Plan

1.2. This report proposes that should the Millton Memorial Reserve Concept Development Plan be approved the dog park component of the plan be implemented utilising existing capital budget allowance.

Attachments:

i. Draft Millton Memorial Reserve Concept Development Plan (TRIM)

ii. Draft Millton Memorial Dog Park Concept Plan (TRIM)

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No.150528085342.

(b) Approves the Draft Millton Memorial Concept Development Plan included as Attachment i.

(c) Approves staff implementing the Draft Millton Memorial Dog Park Concept Plan, included as Attachment ii, utilising the existing $100,000 capital budget (GL 100313.000.5223).

(d) Notes that staff propose to use a range of different specialist contractors to undertake construction of the dog park. Construction is likely to take 10 weeks depending on weather conditions.

(e) Notes that staff will continue to develop more detailed plans regarding the northern part of Millton Memorial Park and report back to the Rangiora Community Board.

3. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

3.1. Millton Memorial Park is a triangular shaped reserve approximately 9.8 hectares in size located between River Road, Millton Avenue and Cones Road in north Rangiora. The
reserve is largely undeveloped with sections currently leased for grazing. There has been recent development at the reserve and this includes:

- The development of croquet lawns, club rooms and a car park for the Rangiora Table Bowls and Rangiora Croquet Club. This development is on River Road on the southern side of the park and has recently been completed. This part of the reserve is now fenced off to the public and is maintained by the two clubs. The car park has been designed so that it can be used by the clubs and the public. This development is identified on the Draft Millton Memorial Concept Development Plan included as Attachment i.

- A stop bank has recently been installed by Environment Canterbury at the northern end of the reserve. This intersects the reserve in an east-west direction.

- The new Ashley Bridge development required a new road alignment at the northern end of the reserve (Cones Road). This new road alignment slightly reduces the size of the reserve.

3.2. In 2009 consultation was undertaken to determine how the community wanted to develop the reserve. A public meeting was held as well as a letter drop and an advertisement in the local paper. The community identified the following features for the park during the consultation:

- A dog park.

- A mountain bike area.

- The creation of walking, cycling and horse riding routes around the perimeter.

- The development of a native reserve area similar to Matawai Park.

- A children’s playground and picnic area with water feature.

- A memorable entrance to Rangiora.

- No motorised or noisy activities.

3.3. As a result of this consultation a concept plan was prepared. The concept plan included a dog park and mountain bike area to be located on the northern corner of the park.

3.4. The concept plan was presented to the Rangiora Community Board on the 14 April 2010. The concept plan was not approved. The Board resolved that staff should continue to work on the concept plan ensuring that the new plan included the entire reserve. Other issues raised include:

- The dog park needs to be fenced.

- Potential conflict with dog parks next to roads.

- The car park must meet road regulations.

- May be a necessity to have a big and small dog area.

- The entrance should not be along Millton Avenue.

- Consideration should be given to flooding potential.

- Whether grazing was allowed on a Recreation Reserve.
3.5. In order to progress the development of a concept plan a working party was re-established which consisted of Council staff members as well as two Rangiora Community Board members Keith Galloway and Murray Clarke.

3.6. The working group met in 2014 to discuss the concept plan and agreed that a dog park should be the main focus. While discussions regarding the concept plan were being held Council was also considering the home of the Rangiora Croquet Club. With approval from the working party, and the Rangiora Community Board, the club were leased land on Millton Memorial Park.

3.7. To enable the Club to locate at Millton Memorial Park a resource consent was required. The resource consent identified that croquet would be located on the southern part of the reserve and would have a car park and associated landscaping. The car park was also to be available to the public using the reserve. The resource consent identified part of the reserve as being a dog park.

3.8. **Dog Park**

3.8.1. Staff have undertaken some research into what is required in the construction of a dog park. Most of the information that can be found comes from the United States, but is still relevant.

3.8.2. A dog park aims to provide a space for dogs where they can exercise off lead, in a controlled environment, under the supervision of their owners. In general a dog park should be fenced, have a suitable water provision, car park, paths and seating, a small and large dog area, mounds, be of sufficient size, have a double gated entry and exit point, adequate drainage and shade. With this in mind staff have designed the dog park which is included in this report as Attachment ii.

3.8.3. While the general location of the dog park had already been identified, the size and layout still needed consideration. The three main things staff considered were size, budget and flood risk.

3.8.4. The size of the dog park is considered suitable with a total combined area of 2.7 hectares. To give a comparison the current Southbrook Dog Park is 0.9 hectares in size. The size of the proposed dog park at Millton Memorial Park has been governed primarily by the $100,000 available budget with fencing and path construction being the largest cost items.

3.8.5. Millton Memorial Park becomes more susceptible to both localised flooding and an Ashley River break out as you move north across the reserve. With this in mind staff have tried to keep the dog park on the dryer, southern part of the reserve.

3.8.6. The dog park includes the following features (refer Attachment ii):

- A 2.2 hectare large dog area with a 1900mm high deer fence.
- A 0.54 hectare small dog area with 1900mm high deer fence with a 500mm high mesh base.
- Two double gated entry areas.
- A 1200mm wide crusher dust pathway in both the large and small dog area.
- Two dog poo bins and bag dispensers (one in the large and small dog area).
- A drinking water facility for dogs (the large and small dog area).
- Grass mounds.
- Specimen trees and native planted beds.
- Seating, signage and rubbish bins.
- A small shade structure in the small dog area (should funding allow).
- Retention and pruning of existing established trees.
3.9. **Dog Park / agility park expansion area.**

3.9.1. While the proposed dog park is much larger than the existing Southbrook Park it is sensible to ensure that it can still be expanded in the future if required. With population increase in the Waimakariri District it is inevitable that demand for dog park use is going to increase. The expansion area also provides space for the addition of an agility area which is highly desirable. An agility area cannot be provided within the immediate proposed dog park area due to the cost.

3.9.2. A future car park to service the dog park/agility expansion area and potentially the adjacent northern parts of the reserve is proposed on Cones Road. This may not be required and an assessment of need would be undertaken should the dog park be expanded. If not required the dog park/agility expansion area would extend all the way to Cones Road.

3.9.3. The dog park/agility expansion area has been identified on the higher, dryer land contained within Millton Memorial Park. It does not extend further north due to the flood risk and condition of the land.

3.10. **Neighbourhood Reserve**

3.10.1. With the change of district zoning in the north of Rangiora, allowing more intensive housing, there is now a potential shortfall in neighbourhood park provision in this area. While the shortfall is not extensive the distance to a reserve with a developed playground is up to 1km away. Current levels of service state that we aim to provide most urban areas with a developed neighbourhood reserve within 500m or ten minutes walking distance.

3.10.2. It has been difficult to acquire land for the development of a neighbourhood park in north Rangiora as the developments have been small and fragmented. The development of a neighbourhood park on Millton Memorial Park will allow levels of service to be achieved in the north Rangiora area. This development would be subject to community consultation and approval by elected members. It is not anticipated that this process will be started until 2016.

3.10.3. In order to limit potential conflict between the proposed dog park and the neighbourhood park a planting strip has been identified. It is proposed that this would be developed as part of the dog park construction so that it is already partially established at the time the neighbourhood park is developed.

3.11. **Grazing/potential future amenity area**

3.11.1. This area is 5.71 hectares and is intersected through the middle with the new Environment Canterbury stop bank. Staff and the working group considered a number of options for this land utilising the public feedback received in 2009. Staff also undertook an investigation into the potential for this land to flood during localised events and the Ashley River breakout.

3.11.2. The land on the southern side of the stop bank is very low lying. There is an existing drainage channel which runs through the middle. This land does not perform well in localised flood events in a 200 or even 100 year event. Due to the location of the stop bank the Ashley River break out is not as much of a concern.

3.11.3. The original consultation identified that this area could be used for mountain biking and horse riding. While these two activities may have been required and suitable at that time, there have been other developments since which now need to be considered.
3.11.4. In 2012 the Rakahuri Regional Park was opened. This park contains newly developed mountain bike tracks that link to the Councils Ashley Picnic Grounds Reserve. It would be difficult to link the regional park tracks with Millton Memorial Park. In addition it is considered that now the regional park tracks have been developed demand is not expected to be as high as it would have been when consultation was undertaken in 2009.

3.11.5. In 2015 staff issued a license to occupy to a newly formed equine trust for the land directly opposite Millton Memorial Park (across Millton Avenue). This land will be developed into an equestrian hub. This limits the need to develop equestrian activities at Millton Memorial Park.

3.11.6. The stopbanks also have currently got gaps in them where they cross Cones Road and Milton Road. ECAN plan to implement solutions to fill these gaps. Liaison with ECAN river engineers will be required to determine the solution. One option includes stockpiling fill material in the vicinity of the gaps so that this material can be used to fill the gaps. An alternative long term solution could be to raise both Milton Ave and Cones Road to the height of the stopbanks at these points. Either of these solutions would have some impact on the park and it would be worth making sure that this work is completed before implementing any planting or other development.

3.11.7. In light of the above staff are recommending that the land be grazed in the short term with the potential to be planted into a native reserve in the future. The planting could include walking tracks that would complement the dog park and would be constructed in a way that would require minimal maintenance in a wet environment. If the recommendations in this report are approved staff will work on providing a more detailed concept plan for this area which would form the basis of future funding requests.

3.12. Native planting entrance feature

3.12.1. Millton Memorial Park forms the western side of the entrance to Rangiora when travelling from the north. The eastern side of the entrance, which forms part of the Ashley Picnic Ground Reserve, is well developed and maintained. Feedback received in 2009 suggested that Council should invest in developing the Millton Memorial Reserve side of the entrance to Rangiora.

3.12.2. The concept plan identifies a space that can be planted to lift the level of service and provide a much more attractive northern entrance to Rangiora. A considerable amount of landscaping will be completed as part of the new Ashley Bridge development however this will only extend as far as Cones Road.

3.12.3. Staff propose that more detail regarding the development of this area is completed in partnership with the Roading Department. The development of this part of the reserve would complement the landscaping being done as part of the new bridge and would include the park and adjacent road reserve area. Once a more detailed plan has been completed staff will report back to the Rangiora Community Board before applying for funding through the next annual plan process.

3.13. Toilets

3.13.1. Currently the concept plan does not identify the provision of any public toilets. While there are toilets in the Rangiora Table Bowls and Rangiora Croquet building, this building is owned by these clubs and there is no requirement for them to make these available for the general public. The toilets in this building do not have external access and have not been built to the standard required to withstand general use by the public.
3.13.2. Staff believe that the dog park will be very popular and will eventually require toilet facilities to be provided. Due to this it is proposed that a toilet be included into the design of the neighbourhood park area which will be completed in 2016 and will be subject to public consultation and the approval of the Rangiora Community Board.

3.14. **Maintenance**

3.14.1. This report proposes that parts of the reserve be leased out for grazing until such time as further development occurs. The reserves are managed in accordance with the Reserves Act 1977 which provides a legal framework for recreation reserve land to be leased to individuals for grazing until such time as the land is required for recreation purposes.

3.14.2. The developed dog park area would be managed under Councils current Parks and Services and Tree Maintenance contracts.

3.15. The Management Team/CEO has reviewed this report and supports the recommendations.

4. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

4.1. In 2009 Council undertook public consultation regarding the development of Millton Memorial Park. More recently staff have been working with Keith Galloway and Murray Clark from the Rangiora Community Board on the development of a concept plan for the reserve. While the consultation has not been undertaken recently, it is considered that the results are still relevant.

4.2. The feedback received in 2009, as well as the staff response, have been included in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Feedback</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The creation of walking, cycling and horse riding routes around the perimeter.</td>
<td>In 2015 staff issued a licence to occupy to a newly formed equine trust for the land directly across Millton Avenue from Millton Memorial Park. This land will be developed into an equestrian hub. This limits the need to develop equestrian activities at Millton Memorial Park. The dog park area will contain a walking track. A design will be completed for the grazing/potential future amenity area to the north of the dog park. This report proposes that this is planted in natives and contains walking tracks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of a native reserve area similar to Matawai Park</td>
<td>The future amenity area and the native planting entrance feature area have yet to be designed in detail however staff anticipate that this will include some aspects similar to Matawai park.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Community Feedback | Staff Response
--- | ---
A children’s playground and picnic area with water feature | The Draft Millton Memorial Concept Development Plan identifies a future neighbourhood park area. This would contain a children’s playground.

A memorable entrance to Rangiora | The Draft Millton Memorial Concept Development Plan has identified an area that would be developed into an entrance feature. Further design work is required for this area.

No motorised or noisy activities. | No motorised or noisy activities are proposed.

4.3. Much of Millton Memorial Park is currently leased for grazing. Approximately 12 months ago the leaseholder was alerted to the fact that there was likely to be some development on the reserve. Since then the lease has been rolled over on a month by month basis.

4.4. In 2013/14 a resource consent was approved for the development of the Rangiora Table Bowls and Rangiora Croquet Clubs. This resource consent also identified Council’s desire to build a dog park on Millton Memorial Park. The resource consent was fully notified. No responses were received in opposition to the dog park development.

5. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

5.1. If the recommendations in this report are approved staff will undertake the implementation of the dog park utilising an existing $100,000 capital budget (GL 100313.000.5223). The dog park has been sized to fit the current budget allocation.

5.2. The below table identifies the cost estimates associated with various parts of the dog park construction:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fencing</td>
<td>$34,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathways</td>
<td>$46,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$100,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3. There will be a slight increase to the Parks Services Contract for the maintenance of the dog park however this will be covered within existing operational budget provision.
6. CONTEXT

6.1. Policy

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

6.2. Legislation

Milton Memorial Reserve is a recreation reserve managed in accordance with the Reserves Act 1977.

The reserve is currently classified as a sport and recreation reserve. The Draft Milton Memorial Concept Development Plan does not contain any development that conflicts with this classification.

This report refers to the development of a neighbourhood park. It is recognised that sport and recreation reserves can serve a neighbourhood function. The provision of neighbourhood park facilities (e.g. a playground) is permitted on a sport and recreation reserve and there are many examples of this in the district including Mandeville Sports Grounds and Southbrook Park.

While the scale of amenity planting proposed in the north of the reserve would usually be reserved for a natural reserve it is not specifically prohibited in a sport and recreation reserve.

The provision of a dog park is specifically mentioned in the Community Green Space Activity Management Plan, and Sport and Recreation Reserves Management Plan, as being appropriate on sports and recreation reserves.

6.3. Community Outcomes

Public Spaces and facilities are plentiful, accessible and high quality
Draft Milton Memorial Concept Development Plan

KEY

- Native planting entrance feature (0.79 ha)
- Grazing/potential future amenity planting area (5.71 ha)
- Dog park/ligahility park expansion area (1.40 ha)
- Future car park area if required (0.14 ha & 0.049 ha)
- Department of Conservation depot
- Potential future neighbourhood park (0.3 ha)
- Proposed dog park (2.74 ha)

Version: DRAFT FOR COMMUNITY BOARD
Date: 28 May 2019

WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL
RANGIORA CROQUET CLUB DEVELOPMENT

2 Lawns opened November 2015.

Cost of development of lawns to the Waimakariri District Council (approx.) $47,500.00

Members’ contribution to site development:

Members’ contribution prior to November 2015 1610 hours

Work included: design work including preparing specifications and work schedules, obtaining quotations for heavy earthwork and post driving. Site work, including clearing the site, surveying and pegging out, installing underground pipes for irrigation system, screening and placing and laser levelling including raking out 380 cubic metres of top soil, topdressing of lawn area, preparing seed bed and assisting with sowing. Other development work, including installing stormwater drains around the building, pegging and boxing path and patio prior to concreting and spreading and levelling concrete.

Members’ contribution to site development after November 2015 770 hours

Work included: pegging and boxing path on River Road side of building, and slabs for the mower and equipment sheds, spreading and levelling concrete, effecting sheds, stacking MDF board in the clubrooms, raking grass clippings from the periphery of the lawn, and working with Keep Rangiora Beautiful to plant landscaping plants in area adjacent to the carpark.

Fit out of clubrooms:

Contractors’ prices were obtained for the fitting out the Croquet Club’s share of the TotalSpan building adjacent on the Milton Memorial Reserve adjacent to River Road, and these came to approximately $50,000.00.

It was decided that members would do as much of the work that they could reasonably do themselves, but would avoid members doing the more risky work such as painting the ceiling. Trades people were employed to do the work that must be certified such as plumbing, gas-fitting, and electrical work. Members did most of the painting and installing a kitset kitchen including making up the benchtop.

The total cost to the club for the fitout was approximately $40,000.00

Estimate of the value of members work for fitout, i.e. the difference between the contractors’ prices and the amount paid by the club approx. $10,000.00

An additional approximately $2,000.00 has been spent on a dishwasher and occasional tables. Other tables, chairs, microwave oven, photocopier and vacuum cleaner have been donated by members.
Purchases of modern playing equipment:

4 sets Dawson International croquet balls, and 4 sets Quadway hoops $10,638.00

Green keeping equipment:

Mowers $8,000.00
Air Compressor $500.00

Funds used for development contributed by the Rangiora Croquet Club

Grants from funders outside of the District $45,613.00
Grants from WD Community Board $1,700.00
Funds raised by members locally $13,562.00
Expenditure from Club reserves $11,645.00
Total spent to date* $72,520.00

Note: total excludes the value of members labour.

Members:

By May 2016 the club had a membership of more than 40 people. In 2016/17 and 2017/18 the membership remained at or slightly below this level, a people withdrew for a range of reason and were replaced by others.

In February 2018 the club has 47 members, 10 of whom are “new to croquet” this season.

The current cost of membership is $230.00, which is understood to be among the higher sums charged by croquet clubs in the Christchurch area. The club has had clear indications that if it tried to increase the cost of membership it would lose members.

The Canterbury Croquet Association (CCA) provides that if people new to croquet are charged $80.00 or less for their first year of membership, clubs do not pay any affiliation levy for them although the CCA pays the levy to New Zealand Croquet (NZC) for these people.

The total paid in levies by full members in 2018/19 has been $58.00, with $46.00 going to NZC, and $12.00 to the CCA. In the 2018/19 season therefore the club received $172.00 from these members plus the $80.00 paid by those new to croquet.

The game of croquet:

There are two forms of the game of croquet, association croquet and golf croquet. Association Croquet is the traditional form of the game, which is highly skilled and takes a number of years to master. Golf Croquet is a recent innovation, which is a shorter version of the game and its similarity to golf revolves around the fact that competing individuals or pairs of players compete to win “hoop” rather than “holes”. Most of the members of the club who
have begun to play croquet since the club was re-established play golf croquet. There are a few members who play association croquet. Members play in inter-club competitions in both forms of the game.

Croquet is a game for all ages, and everyone competes on a “level playing field”. It is a game of skill and strategy rather than strength so men and women compete together. Most of the current members of the Rangiora Croquet Club are in the older age groups, with a few in their 80s and a couple in their 90s. It is a game that older people can take up without any difficulties, and those with moderate disabilities can play croquet while they would not be able to play other games that attract older people such as golf. In this regard, the club has welcomed a number of people new to the District, some have recently retired to the area and a few are “earthquake refugees” from Christchurch. Some of those new to the District are among our most enthusiastic members, committed to helping to maintain the lawns and organise the club.

The club is also focusing on youth in croquet, supporting New Zealand Croquet’s current initiative. In December a tournament was held involving primary school children from the Loburn North, St Patrick’s (Kaiapoi) and Ouruhia (Marshlands) Schools. A school holiday programme for children was also organised over this summer holidays, and the club anticipates seeing some students from the Rangiora High School “trying their hand” at croquet in February/March this year. At its next Annual Meeting the club will be formally establishing a junior membership, as well as its full membership and its “new to croquet” membership for beginners.

**Club participation:**

The club has its opening day on the 1st or 2nd Saturday in September for outdoor croquet, and closes in early April. During the winter the floor of the clubroom is set up for indoor croquet, which is played with miniature hoops and billiard sized balls.

There are three club days per week, Tuesday, Thursday and Saturday for outdoor croquet. Twilight croquet is organised during the summer months, with matches starting at 7.00pm preceded by a barbeque which realises a modest profit which goes into club funds.

On our main club-day, Saturday, croquet is played on half-lawns, and the most that can be accommodated at one time is 32 players double-banked. This means that two groups of four are playing on one half-lawn. If there are more than 32 people wanting to play in a Saturday, some members have to stand-down for one game. This shortage of playing space presents the club with a dilemma. It is anxious to increase its numbers but does not want enrol too many more if that is going to lead to frustration for those wanting games on Saturday but are unable to play because of lack of space.

The numbers on Tuesdays and Thursdays are usually not as great as on Saturdays, or for twilight croquet. This means that members are often able to play on full-sized lawns, or on one full-sized and two half-sized lawns. This gives members interested in playing in club and inter-club competitions the opportunity to play on full-sized lawns, as all competition
croquet for both association and golf croquet are played on these lawns. The experience of playing on the larger area is significantly different than on playing on a half-lawn.

Members do all the work to maintain the lawns, including regularly mowing and line marking. They also undertake any major renovation that may be required at the end of each season, and to this end it can be necessary to close one half-lawn early to do this work before the outdoor closing day in early April.
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

"Lender"

RANGIORA CROQUET CLUB INCORPORATED

"Borrower"

TERM LOAN AGREEMENT
THIS AGREEMENT made the day of 2014

PARTIES:

A. WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL at Rangiora ("Lender")
B. RANGIORA CROQUET CLUB INCORPORATED at Rangiora ("Borrower")

AGREEMENT:
The Lender, at the request of the Borrower, has agreed to advance a loan to the Borrower according to the terms set out in the Loan Schedule and the attached Terms of Loan (together these constitute the "Agreement").

LOAN SCHEDULE

LOAN DETAILS

Loan: $42,000.00.
Availability: In one sum on the Commencement Date.
Interest Rate: Interest free until 1 April 2016 thereafter 7% (approximately) per annum.
Interest Rate Review: The Interest Rate is fixed for the term of the loan.
Commencement Date: 1st May 2014.
Repayment Date: 1 March 2026

PAYMENTS REQUIRED

The Borrower shall repay the Loan outstanding and pay interest at the Interest Rate on the Loan by 120 equal consecutive monthly payments of $500.00 each on the 1st day of each month, with the first payment due on 1 April 2016.

The Borrower may repay the balance of the loan owing at any time without penalty.

DISCLOSURE DETAILS

Address of Lender: 215 High Street, Rangiora.
Address of Borrower: 19 King Street, Rangiora.
Amount of Credit: $42,000.00.
Cost of Credit:
(a) Interest: $18,000.00
(b) Establishment Fee: Nil
(c) Other: Nil
(d) Total cost of credit: $18,000.00

Payments Required: Refer to the payments required specified in the Loan Details (above).
Place for Payment:
All payments of the principal sum, interest and other moneys owed to the Lender shall be made by automatic payment authority, direct debit authority or as otherwise directed by the Lender, free of all deductions.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT
By executing this Agreement below, the Borrower acknowledges receipt of a copy of this Agreement and certifies that it has received disclosure of such documents and their contents.

EXECUTED as an agreement.

Signed for and on behalf of WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL as Lender by:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authorised Signatory</th>
<th>Full name of authorised signatory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorised Signatory</td>
<td>Full name of authorised signatory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Common Seal of RANGIORA CROQUET CLUB INCORPORATED as Borrower was hereunto affixed in the presence of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature of President</th>
<th>Full name of President</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signature of Secretary/Committee member (Delete one)</td>
<td>Full name of Secretary or Committee Member</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. INTERPRETATION

In this Agreement:

“Business Day” means a day on which registered banks are generally open for business in New Zealand;

“Moneys Owed” means all moneys of whatever nature owed or payable by the Borrower to the Lender under this Agreement and the Security Documents;

Words referring to one gender include the other genders. Singular words include the plural and vice versa. References to a party include the representatives, successors and permitted assigns of that party, and where that party includes more than one person, each person is jointly and severally liable under this Agreement;

The Loan Schedule at the beginning of this Agreement forms part of this Agreement. Where applicable, defined terms in the Loan Schedule apply to these Terms of Loan.

2. LOAN

The Lender agrees to advance the Loan to the Borrower on the terms and subject to the conditions of this Agreement.

3. EARLY REPAYMENT

The Borrower may repay the balance of the loan outstanding at any time, together with interest to the date of repayment with no penalty.

4. COVENANTS

The Borrower represents and warrants to the Lender that it has the power to enter into and perform its rights and obligations under this Agreement and that no event of default (as specified in clause 7) has occurred or will occur as a result of making the Loan. The Borrower undertakes to the Lender that it will comply with all laws applicable to it, provide to the Lender all financial information in relation to it as reasonably requested by the Lender during the term of this Agreement.

5. INSURANCE

The Borrower covenants to insure and keep insured (to its full insurable value) the club rooms to be constructed by the Borrower and the Rangiora Croquet Club Inc. with the assistance of this loan at Millton Memorial Reserve, Rangiora.

6. EVENTS OF DEFAULT

An event of default shall occur if:

6.1 The Borrower fails to pay any amount or sum due under this Agreement on its due date (or within two (2) business days of its due date where non-payment on its due date has arisen solely by reason of a bank, technical, computer or similar error outside the control of the Borrower); or

6.2 The Borrower commits any breach of, or omits to observe or perform any of its obligations or undertakings under, this Agreement and the Security Documents on its due date; or

6.3 An application or an order is made for the dissolution or liquidation of the Borrower or the Borrower is placed in receivership; or
6.4 Any other indebtedness for borrowed money of the Borrower is not paid when
due or shall become due and payable prior to its stated maturity; or
6.5 The Borrower is unable to pay its debts when due, or is deemed to be unable
to pay its debts when due, or otherwise is insolvent; or
7. REMEDIES ON DEFAULT
Upon or at any time after the occurrence of an event of default specified in clause 7,
the Lender may at its discretion and without prejudice to its other rights and remedies
by notice in writing to the Borrower take all or any of the following actions:
7.1 Demand immediate repayment of the Moneys Owed. If so demanded the
Borrower shall immediately repay the Moneys Owed to the Lender; or
7.2 Enforce, or procure the enforcement of, its rights and remedies under this
Agreement as it thinks fit; or
7.3 Cancel any undrawn portion of the Loan.
8. SET-OFF
The Borrower irrevocably authorises the Lender (without prior notice or demand and
despite any settlement of account or other matter) at any time after the occurrence of
an event of default under clause 7 to set off against any debt or liability of the Lender
to the Borrower any part of the Moneys Owed, and to apply any credit balance held
with the Lender in satisfaction of any debt or liability of the Borrower to the Lender
under this Agreement.
9. INDEMNITIES
The Borrower indemnifies, and agrees to save harmless, the Lender from and against
all losses, claims, demands, liabilities, payments, charges and expenses which may be
made against or incurred by the Lender arising from or relating to this Agreement.
This clause shall survive termination of this Agreement.
10. PAYMENTS
All payments to be made to the Lender under this Agreement shall be made without
set-off, counterclaim or deduction and prior to 3.00 pm on the day on which payment
is due. Such payments shall be made to a bank account nominated by the Lender in
writing or, if the Lender fails to nominate a bank account, then payment shall be made
to the address of the Lender specified at the beginning of this Agreement. Payments
received after 3.00 pm shall be deemed to have been received on the following
business day. The Lender may apply any payment received by under this Agreement
to the repayment of the principal, interest, or any other amount due under this
Agreement in the order and manner as the Lender may determine from time to time.
11. NOTICES
All notices, requests, demands or other communications to or upon the parties in
connection with this Agreement shall be given or made in writing, signed by the party
or an authorised person for the party giving such notice, and served upon or delivered
to the recipient personally, or sent by post or facsimile to the recipient at the address
specified in the Loan Schedule. A notice, request, demand or other communication
shall be deemed to have been received, in the case of personal delivery on a business
day, on the date of that delivery, in the case of a letter posted by mail, on the second
business day after posting, and in the case of a facsimile sent on a business day, during
normal business hours in the place of receipt, upon successful transmission.
12. WAIVER
The failure or delay by the Lender in exercising, or the Lender’s single or partial exercise, of any right, power, discretion, remedy or privilege in connection with this Agreement shall not operate as a waiver of that right, power, discretion or remedy.

13. CONFLICT
Where any conflict or inconsistency shall arise between any of the terms, conditions and provisions (whether express or implied) of this Agreement and those of any loan offer or correspondence from the Lender, the terms, conditions and provisions of this Agreement shall prevail.

14. AMENDMENT
This Agreement shall not be amended or varied except in writing signed by the Borrower and the Lender.

15. ASSIGNMENT
The Borrower shall not assign or transfer any of its rights or obligations under this Agreement. The Lender may assign all or part of its rights and benefits under this Agreement without the consent of the Borrower.

16. PRIVACY ACT 1993
The Borrower consents to the Lender obtaining such information and making such enquiries about it from any source, including credit reference agencies and companies related to the Lender, in relation to the Loan and the disclosing of information about it to credit reference agencies, companies related to the Lender, sureties or assignees or anyone who is considering becoming a surety or assignee. A person has the right to access personal information (within the meaning of the Privacy Act 1993) held by the Lender and request correction of any errors in that information.

17. LAW
This Agreement shall be governed by and construed in accordance with New Zealand law.
1. **SUMMARY**

1.1 The purpose of this report is to provide the Indicative Business Case for the Civic Accommodation, seek approval of the recommendations in the Business Case and budget provision to deliver the first phase of the project, being the refurbishment of the building.

1.2 The business case is needed to provide confidence that further investment in the existing site is appropriate and represents value beyond the current Long Term Plan period. It explores and assess the optimum approach to development of the Civic Offices, and specifically, the location, size, scale and configuration of the facility. The business case follows the five case model promoted by Treasury in order to ensure there is a robust and defensible basis for decision-making.

1.3 The business case identifies key strategic drivers, defines the problems with the existing arrangements and the benefits of investment, and assesses a range of options to make a recommendation. It notes the uncertainty in forecasting the size of the organisation in the future and recommends that flexibility to allow alternative uses and staged expansion is incorporated into any development.

1.4 It concludes that retaining the existing building, with a full refurbishment, and a staged expansion outside the current footprint represents the best balance between cost and providing a modern and adaptable fit for purpose building.

1.5 Although a new building would better realise all the benefits, the cost over 30 years is approximately 63% greater than the recommended ‘refurbish and extend’ approach.

1.6 Future phases signalled in the Infrastructure Strategy involve expansion on this site, outside of the current footprint. In addition, a future library expansion on this site is planned and budgeted for in 2022-24.

1.7 As a result, it is recommended that a preliminary master planning process is progressed for the whole ‘civic precinct’ that seeks to co-ordinate and optimise the development of the library and civic offices as well as improve the relationship between these buildings, Victoria Park and surrounding streets.

1.8 The design team appointed in late 2018 for the existing refurbishment project have progressed concept designs, which were presented to Council in March 2019.
1.9 With additional floor space and more detailed information now informing quantity
surveying, a revised cost estimate of just under $5.3 million is now anticipated on the basis
of a design broadly similar to the original feasibility concept.

1.10 However, an alternate full refurbishment option presented by the design team improves
the amenity of various areas, including customer services and public spaces, and better
aligns better with likely future site developments. This includes the following key elements;

- Foyer, Customer Services & Ground Floor Toilets Alterations
- Council Chambers Relocation
- First Floor Kitchenette and Toilet Alterations

These options are shown in Attachment 2 and are estimated to cost a further $1.435
million, over the base option.

1.11 The total budget for the full refurbishment option referred to above is estimated at $6.735
million, an increase of $2.735 million over the existing budget for the project.

Attachments:
- i. Indicative Business Case (190521071636)
- ii. Rangiora Service Centre Concept Design (190521071637)

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 190521071635.

(b) **Receives** the Civic Accommodation Indicative Business Case (190521071636).

(c) **Notes** that the Accommodation Indicative Business Case has been peer reviewed and
updated in response to the reviewers’ comments.

(d) **Notes** that the Indicative Business Case recommends Option B: Full refurbishment of
existing building & staged expansion outside envelope as the best balance between the
whole of life cost and investment objectives.

(e) **Notes** that the 30 Year Infrastructure Strategy allows for expenditure on extensions of both
the Rangiora Library and Service Centre on the current site. This will be allowed for in the
next Long Term Plan to reflect the changes.

(f) **Agrees** that the existing site (215 High Street, Rangiora) will be Council’s long term
Administrative Headquarters and primary Service Centre.

(g) **Notes** that revised concept plans prepared by Council’s architect for refurbishment of the
existing building:

- i. increases the useable floor space for office functions,
- ii. provides enhanced public meeting spaces with better separation from staff areas,
- iii. improves customer service areas; and
- iv. better aligns the refurbishment project with the future service centre and library
extensions.

(h) **Approves** a budget variation of an additional $2.735 million in the 2020/21 financial year,
with the revised total project budget of $6.735 million.

(i) **Approves** progressing to the developed design phase, with a further report to be
presented to Council in September 2019.
3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1 The project to refurbish the Rangiora Services Centre has been in development for several years driven by significant performance issues with the current building and the growing size of the organisation.

3.2 Following a feasibility study in late 2017, a budget of $4 million was approved in June 2018.

3.3 In considering the scope and approach to the project, there are a number of external influences which also need to be considered, including:

   a. The District is fast growing and diverse, which means that the scope and scale of service provided by Council to the community will also grow and may evolve;

   b. There are a number of work streams by Central Government which may affect the focus and powers of local government as determined by central government, not least the Three Waters Review, leading to some uncertainty in the future scope and size of the organisation.

   c. Workplace trends are towards more flexible workspaces and higher density accommodation, acknowledging the benefits of staff health and wellbeing on performance and productivity of higher performance workplaces.

3.4 While discussions to date have centred around options for refurbishing the existing building, the size of the issues and awareness that a major expansion in accommodation will be required in the future, a robust investigation into the long term options, benefits and life cycle costs has been undertaken to consider the appropriate strategic approach.

3.5 This has led to the commissioning of the attached Civic Accommodation Indicative Business Case. It has been prepared by Kerr+Partners Ltd (Rob Kerr) in accordance with the Treasury Guidance for Better Business Cases.

4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

   **Indicative Business Case**

4.1. In considering the need for investing in Civic Accommodation, a range of problems have been identified which could be addressed by such an investment:

   - **The Rangiora Service Centre Building is aging and struggles** to provide a safe, compliant and comfortable environment, leading to reduced productivity, less adaptable working spaces and higher operating costs.

   - **There is uncertainty in the future size and scope of Council activities**, leading to uncertainty with regard to how much to invest in civic accommodation right now.

   - **The current split campus encourage silo'd working arrangements** leading to a lower quality of service and impeding greater levels of collaboration; and

   - **The urban form of the Rangiora civic precinct (with Library and Victoria Park) is confusing**, leading to lower public use of the precinct.

4.2. Within the potential scope of this proposal, five 'dimensions of choice were identified, responding to the following questions:

   - **Size and Scale**: What size of office space should be provided?

   - **Configuration**: How should the offices be configured? Centralised, decentralised and/or multi office?

   - **Location**: Where should the offices be located?

   - **Workspace Quality**: What quality of accommodation is optimum?

   - **Building Standard**: What is the optimum building standard?
4.3. Through analysis of the dimensions against the investment objectives, a long and then short list of options was developed and assessed.

4.4. Each of the short list options was ranked, considering the degree to which the options meet the objectives, delivers the benefits, carries risk and the relative Net Present Value of expenditure.

4.5. Of note, the analysis discarded a multi-office or decentralised approach to office provision. While having the initial appearance of promoting flexibility, when assessed against the Investment Objectives and Critical Success Criteria it was found to undermine the overall investment proposition.

4.6. It has also discarded a development located outside central Rangiora, including in Kaiapoi, due to the negative effects on the town centre and limited other benefits that would come from such a relocation.

4.7. Three broad options were considered against a base case representative of the current arrangement (Option A in the Table below).

Table One: Short List of Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Net Present Value (4%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Base Case - Minimum refurbishment with leasing of additional space</td>
<td>$32-$41 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Refurbishment of existing building with future expansion outside envelope</td>
<td>$27-$40 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Staged development of new building</td>
<td>$44-$59 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Development of new building in single stage</td>
<td>$47-$61 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.8. The analysis shows that the Base Case (do minimum) does not meet the investment objectives, delivers low levels of benefit and in particular, provides a declining level of quality accommodation for staff in a building with major elements nearing the end of their useful life.

4.9. This option is ultimately more costly over the long term, does not cater to growth and would challenge the organisation’s desire for delivery of services to the community, a highly productive staff, and enabling the culture of Ta Matau Mauri.

4.10. The options (option C and D) which involve a new purpose-built facility would best meet the investment objectives, provide the greatest benefits and offer the widest ability to adapt to changes in organisational size.

4.11. However, these options are approximately 63% more expensive than Option B (on a net present value basis) and would require the bringing forward of substantial budget from outside the current Long Term Plan period.

4.12. The variations to option C and D which involve demolishing the existing building and rebuilding a new purpose-built facility on the existing site would also cause the loss of embedded carbon in the building and challenge the government’s goals regarding carbon sustainability.
4.13. It is worth noting, that the financial analysis found that the selection of the existing or a new site makes only a $3 million difference in the 30 year cost analysis, accounting for building demolition or sale and land acquisition. Both options remain considerably more expensive than option B, regardless of sub-options referred to above.

4.14. The analysis in the Business Case concludes that the additional cost of building a new facility over refurbishing and extending the existing building outweighs the advantages of a new purpose-built and flexible facility.

4.15. Option B makes best use of the existing building through extensive refurbishment, and then staged extension to accommodate the organisation as it grows. Scope exists to create flexibility in the scale and type of accommodation, provide desirable spaces to work and future proof for changes in technology and different ways of working.

4.16. The removal of the heavy roof and associated structural walls provide the opportunity to reconfigure the existing accommodation to better promote collaboration and productivity. This will be enhanced with the future extension project, after which other groups currently in Farmers and Ashley buildings can be accommodated under one roof.

4.17. On the basis of the above attributes, Option B offers the optimum balance between cost, flexibility and benefits.

4.18. There is a long term opportunity to reconfigure the civic precinct to improve the site lines, readability and pedestrian connections with Victoria Park, and integrate with future library expansion. It is recommended that sufficient master planning be undertaken prior to finalising the plans for the current refurbishment to avoid or minimise any sunk expenditure.

4.19. On the basis of the above assessment, the recommended option in the Business Case is:

Option B: Refurbishment of existing building & future expansion outside footprint.

Scope of refurbishment

4.20. The existing refurbishment project (PJ 100883.000.5013) was based on a feasibility assessment in late 2017. This was approved in June 2018 and the design team was appointed in September 2018, led by Athfield Architects.

4.21. The design team have progressed concept designs which were presented to Council in March 2019. This is attached as Appendix 2.

4.22. With additional floor space and more detailed information now informing both design and quantity surveying, a revised cost estimate of just under $5.3 million is expected. This is on the basis of a design broadly similar to the original feasibility concept.

4.23. However, an alternate full refurbishment option presented by the design team improves the amenity of various areas, including customer services and public spaces, and better aligns better with likely future site developments.

4.24. This includes substantial changes and improvements to the following key areas;

- Foyer, Customer Service & Ground Floor Toilets Alterations
- Council Chambers Relocation
- First Floor Kitchenette and Toilet Alterations

4.25. This is estimated to cost a further $1.435 million, over the base option.
4.26. The total budget for the full refurbishment option referred to above is estimated at $6.735 million, an increase of $2.735 million over the existing budget for the project. The rates impact of this change is an increase of 0.28%.

4.27. As the design work and cost estimates were only completed in early 2019 these were not able to be included in the Draft Annual Plan considerations and consultation.

4.28. The alternate or full concept plans for refurbishment of the existing building:
- increase the useable floor space for office functions,
- provide enhanced public meeting spaces with better security and separation from staff areas,
- improves customer service areas; and
- better aligns the refurbishment project with the future service centre and library extensions.

4.29. The full concept plans are recommended as the preferred design. If approved the design team will progress over the next three months the developed design work with the aim of presenting these to Council in September 2019, together with any revised cost estimates.

4.30. A relocation plan for temporary accommodation will also be presented at the September Council meeting. It is not considered feasible to remain in occupation of the building while it is being refurbished. Alternate temporary accommodation is likely to include a mix of utilising existing Council facilities, leasing office space and the use of Portacoms.

4.31. If the developed design is approved at the September Council meeting the design team will prepare detailed plans and specifications to inform tender documentation and in order to submit an application for a building consent.

4.32. It is anticipated that the tender for construction will be released in January 2020 with an approvals report to Council in April 2020 and commencement of works in May 2020. These are provisional dates and will be reviewed following approval of the developed design.

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

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. Groups and Organisations
Not sought

5.2. Wider Community
Not sought. As the design work and cost estimates were only completed in early 2019 these were not able to be included in the Draft Annual Plan considerations and consultation.

6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1. Financial Implications
The recommended option involves a full refurbishment of the existing building at an estimated cost of $6.735 million.

The following Table provides a high-level break down of the costs as prepared by Aecom Quantity Surveyors.
Construction 3,913,750  
Design Development Contingency (7.5%) 293,500  
Preliminary & General (12%) 505,000  
Margin (5%) 235,750  
Escalation (3%) 148,000  
Construction Contingency (10%) 510,000  
Building Consent 50,000  
Consultant’s Fee’s (12%) 679,000  
Furniture & Equipment/Decanting/Temp Accom¹ 400,000  
Total (excl GST) $6,735,000

¹ Allows for the sale of 4 Portacoms with an offset of $100,000

This is $2.735 million greater than the budget in the Long Term Plan and it is recommended that the Council increases the budget provision accordingly in the 2020/2021 year.

The rates impact of this change is a rates increase of 0.28 %.

6.2. Community Implications

The approach to master planning the Civic precinct, and potential loss or relocation of car-parking is likely to attract interest from the community.

6.3. Risk Management

The Business Case sets out the main risks associated with the project.

6.4. Health and Safety

There are no health and safety implications.

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

There are no specific legislative references

7.3. Community Outcomes

Provision of suitable accommodation for the organisation to support the Council’s ability to deliver against all Community Outcomes in the Long Term Plan 2018-2028

7.4. Delegations

This is a matter that the Council is required to consider.
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Executive Summary

Introduction

This Indicative Business Case seeks agreement on the strategic approach to provision for civic accommodation for the Waimakariri District Council and recommends that the existing building is retained, substantially refurbished and a masterplan developed for the civic precinct that allows for significant further expansion of the building’s footprint in the future.

It is an Indicative Business Case that assesses the optimum scope, location, configuration and scale of civic accommodation. This draws on work undertaken of the last two years that resulted in a refurbishment project being approved for the existing Rangiora Service Centre building.

Concept design options for the refurbishment have been developed and one of these options provides elements that align to projects signalled for the site, but not yet progressed. Due to that connectivity, and the scale of future investment in the site, it was deemed appropriate to undertake the current Business Case work. This is intended to either validate or challenge the rationale for investing in the site. A further detailed business case is recommended to support the master planning process and optimise design, procurement and financial decisions.

This business case follows the Treasury Better Business Cases guidance and is organised around the five-case structure designed to systematically ascertain that each investment proposal:

i is supported by a compelling case for change – the ‘strategic case’

ii optimises value for money – the ‘economic case’

iii is commercially viable – the ‘commercial case’

iv is financially affordable – the ‘financial case’

v is achievable – the ‘management case’.

Strategic Case

The Strategic Case outlines the strategic context for the investment proposal and concludes that there is a robust case for change and investment in improving the civic accommodation.

Strategic Context

In deciding on this investment, there are a range of material external influences that should be considered and particularly:

- The district is fast growing and diverse, which means that the scope and scale of service provided by council to the community will also grow and may evolve;

- There is a clear organisational purpose and culture emphasised through Ta Matau Mauri;
There is a robust Long-Term Plan and affordability policies that seeks the best value for money for the ratepayer, considering both the short-term needs and benefits and longevity of the council.

The current civic accommodation sits within the Rangiora Town Centre, where there is an ongoing programme of revitalisation;

There are a number of workstreams by central government which may affect the focus and powers of local government as determined by central government, not least the Three Waters Review.

Workplace trends are towards more flexible workspaces and higher density accommodation, acknowledging the benefits of staff health and wellbeing on performance and productivity of higher performance workplaces. Sustainability and resilience are also key considerations.

There is national guidance on public service accommodation, and this is supported by the council’s staff design principles and used to inform Athfield’s current concept designs.

Population is expected to grow by 63% by 2048 with similar growth in staff numbers. This is however also influenced by central government mandate and so there is the potential for a contraction of up to 30 people¹ and/or increase in staff numbers by 63%. For forecasting purposes, the following table provides an upper and lower bound, with the upper bound seeing a growth equivalent to population growth, and the lower bound growing 1% per annum, plus a loss of 25 people with the mandate for the Three Waters Review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2028</th>
<th>2048</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Upper Bound</strong></td>
<td>240</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lower bound</strong></td>
<td>240</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Problem Definition and Business Needs**

In considering the need for investing in Civic Accommodation, a range of problems have been identified which could be addressed by such an investment:

A. **The Rangiora Service Centre Building is aging** and struggles to provide a safe, compliant and comfortable environment, leading to reduced productivity, less adaptable working spaces and higher operating costs.

B. **There is uncertainty in the future size and scope of Council activities**, leading to uncertainty how much to invest in civic accommodation right now.

C. **The current split campus arrangements encourage siloed working**, leading to a lower quality of service and impeding greater levels of collaboration; and

---

¹ 30 in the main office, plus a further 20 from the Water Unit.
D. The urban form of the Rangiora civic precinct (with Library and Victoria Park) is confusing, leading to lower public use of the precinct.

Investment Objectives and Business Needs

Based on the problem statements and business needs articulated above, four investment objectives have been developed to address the problems and benefits identified. This case for change is summarised for each investment objective below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment Objective One</th>
<th>To provide office space for a minimum of 290, and up to 391 staff by 2048 at or below the average cost across the public sector.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Arrangements</td>
<td>The main RSC building is part of a campus of three office buildings housing staff in Rangiora. The other two are the Ashley building and the Farmers building. Overflow is currently addressed with two portacan buildings on site where the new library expansion is proposed in the future. Together they accommodate 240 staff, however staff numbers are forecast to rise to between 290 and 391 by 2048.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Business Needs           | • Accommodation of the current and future staff necessary to deliver it’s functions to the level of service expected by the Community and set out in the Long term Plan  
• The council has clear affordability thresholds and must manage its finances within those constraints and exercise prudent financial management of public funds. As a benchmark, and of most relevance WDC, is the average Total Occupancy Cost reported by Colliers (2018) for ‘Rest of NZ’ is $5,424 per person p.a ($309/m²). |
| Potential Metrics        | Average Total Occupancy Cost                                                                      |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment Objective Two</th>
<th>To provide flexible office space for all staff by 2029 that meets the design principles, government guidance and enables new technology to be incorporated.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Arrangements</td>
<td>The Rangiora Service Centre Building is aging and struggles to provide a safe, compliant and comfortable environment leading to reduced productivity, less adaptable working spaces and higher operating costs. This is coupled with the spilt accommodation across multiple buildings which creates siloed working cultures. The office accommodation is no longer aligned with current building standards, government quality guidelines or meets the principles of Ta Matou Mauri and presents a risk to the functionality and continued performance of the organisation. Recommendations from the review following the Ashburton WINZ murders included alterations to customer service and office areas to improve security.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Needs</td>
<td>• Safe, secure and comfortable accommodation to staff to both meet current building standards, government quality guidelines and meet the principles of Ta Matou Mauri.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Potential Metrics</strong></td>
<td>Adaptable and flexible provision of accommodation to allow technology and other ways of working to be implemented and productivity enhanced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Investment Objective Three</strong></td>
<td>A minimum of 35% of the office able to be cost efficiently adapted for alternative uses if the organisation size changes after 2029.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Arrangements</strong></td>
<td>There are a range of pressures that have the potential to affect staff numbers in the future, including:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mandate from central government, including the Three Waters Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Changes to technology and ways of working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Forecast growth of district population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Changing demographic of staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Need to continually attract new talent to the organisation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39% of staff are stationed outside the in building in the Framers, Portacabins or Ashley Building (total 93 staff).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business Needs</strong></td>
<td>Forecast lower (290) and upper bound (391) staff numbers by 2048 indicate that there could be a 35% variation in demand for office space. Maintain flexibility in the scale and type of provision of accommodation with floor space able to be adapted for alternative uses at a low cost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A long term plan that ensures value for money investment in accommodation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Potential Metrics</strong></td>
<td>Average floor area per staff member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unused or inefficiently used space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Area of medium-term expansion space available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Investment Objective Four</strong></td>
<td>To improve the pedestrian connectivity between High Street and Victoria Park by 2029.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Arrangements</strong></td>
<td>The external layout around the civic precinct is unclear and impedes the connection through and around the building, the library and Victoria Park, leading to a decreased urban quality and reduced community use of the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business Needs</strong></td>
<td>Use of any reconfiguration, relocation or expansion of the civic buildings improves the urban functioning and connectivity of the civic precinct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Potential Metrics</strong></td>
<td>Number of pedestrians visiting precinct</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Economic Case**

Within the potential scope of this proposal, five ‘dimensions of choice were identified, responding to the following questions:

- **Size and Scale**: What size of office space should be provided?
- **Configuration**: How should the offices be configured?
- **Location**: Where should the offices be located?
- **Workspace Quality**: What quality of accommodation is optimum?
- **Building Standard**: What is the optimum building standard?

Through analysis of the dimensions against the investment objectives, the following shortlist of options was developed and assessed. Each was ranked considered the degree to which the options meet the objectives, delivers the benefits, carries risk and the relative net present value of expenditure.

Of note, the analysis has discarded a multi-office or decentralised approach to office provision. While having the initial appearance of promoting flexibility, when assessed against the Investment Objectives and Critical Success Criteria it was found to undermine the overall investment proposition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Variations</th>
<th>Net Present Value (4%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Base Case - Minimum refurbishment with leasing of additional space</td>
<td>i. nil</td>
<td>$32-$41 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Refurbishment of existing building with future expansion outside envelope</td>
<td>i. Building performance ii. Size of building</td>
<td>$27-$40 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Staged development of new building</td>
<td>i. Location ii. Building performance iii. Size of building</td>
<td>$44-$59 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Development of new building in single stage</td>
<td>i. Location ii. Building performance iii. Size of building</td>
<td>$47-$61 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The Preferred Way Forward**

The analysis shows that the Base Case does not meet the investment objectives, delivers low levels of benefit and in particular, provides a declining level of quality accommodation for staff in a building with major elements nearing the end of their useful life. This option is more costly over the long term, does not cater to growth and would challenge the organisation’s desire for delivery of services to the community, a highly productive staff, and enabling the culture of Ta Matau Mauri.

The options (option C and D) which involve a new purpose-built facility would best meet the investment objectives, provide the greatest benefits and offer the greatest ability to adapt to changes in organisational size.
However, these options are approximately 63% more expensive than Option B (on a net present value basis) and would require the bringing forward of substantial budget from outside the current Long Term Plan period.

The variations to option C and D which involve demolishing the existing building and rebuilding a new purpose-built facility on the existing site would also cause the loss of embedded carbon in the building and challenge the government’s goals regarding carbon sustainability.

This additional cost of building a new building over refurbishing and extending the existing building appears to outweigh the advantages of a new purpose-built and flexible facility. On this basis, the option which make best use of the existing building through extensive refurbishment, and then staged extension to accommodate the organisation as it grows, offers the optimum balance between cost, flexibility and benefits.

Prudent decision-making will be necessary during the master planning and design stages to minimise sunk expenditure on elements of the building that would be lost in future extensions and ensuring there is flexibility for alternative uses.

If Council desires to reconfigure the entire precinct to improve the site lines, readability and pedestrian connections with Victoria Park, and integrate with future library expansion it is highly recommended that sufficient master planning be undertaken prior to finalising the plans for the current refurbishment.

On the basis of the above assessment, the preferred way forward is **Option B: Refurbishment of existing building & future expansion outside footprint.**

### Commercial Case

The Commercial Case proposes that the project is delivered in multiple phases, specifically

- Master planning phase and
- A staged delivery phase

For the master planning phase, direct appointment of suppliers is recommended as quality is a key determinant of selection as costs are modest, while there are a range of procurement methods for each stage of the delivery phases. These will be assessed in the Detailed Business Case.

### Financial Case

The current budgets in the Long-Term Plan are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>When</th>
<th>Amount (2018$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Service Centre Alterations</td>
<td>2018/20</td>
<td>$3.9 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Library Extension</td>
<td>2022/24</td>
<td>$6.5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Service Centre Extension</td>
<td>2029/30</td>
<td>$18 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on current estimates, the anticipated cashflows for the investment proposal until 2048 have been analysed. Although these forecasts should not be used for accurate budgeting purposes, this analysis shows that additional funding over existing budgets in the LTP/Infrastructure Strategy is required to deliver the preferred way forward as follows:

- $2.7 million in FY 2020 for refurbishment

**Management Case**

The key aspects of the project plan are shown in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed key milestones</th>
<th>Estimated timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masterplan and detailed business case</td>
<td>End 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed design for Stage One</td>
<td>End 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Stage One (refurbishment)</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Next Steps**

Subject to council approval of the recommendations of this Business Case and associated budget processes, work will commence on developing the design of the refurbishment works, site master planning and development of a Detailed Business Case. These will support decision-making that encompasses the scope, staging and delivery of civic accommodation for the council.
Introduction

What this Business Case seeks

This Indicative Business Case seeks agreement on the strategic approach to provision for civic accommodation for the Waimakariri District Council.

The purpose of this indicative business case is to:

- confirm the strategic context and fit of the proposed investment
- confirm the need to invest and the case for change
- identify a wide range of potential options that meet current and future needs
- recommend a preferred way forward for further development of the investment proposal
- seek the approval of council to develop a Detailed Business Case with accompanying site master plan, based on a preferred way forward.

It is the first stage in the Business Case process and subject to council approval of the recommendations of this Business Case, will be followed by a Detailed Business Case to support decision-making and master planning processes that encompass the scope, staging and delivery of civic accommodation for the council. This process is set out in the diagram below:
The Scope of this Business Case

The scope of this Business Case is defined by the key questions that it seeks to answer:

- What is the size and scale of accommodation required for the organisation?
- A centralised or decentralised administration function?
- If centralised, Kaiapoi, Rangiora or other locations?
  - If Kaiapoi, Mixed Use Business or Business 2 zone
  - If Rangiora - Business 2 zone, town centre fringe or town centre?
  - If town centre, existing site or alternate such as north of High Street?

How this Business Case is Structured

The Business Case process is organised around a five-case structure designed to systematically ascertain that the investment proposal:

- is supported by a compelling case for change - the 'strategic case'
- optimises value for money - the 'economic case'
- is commercially viable - the 'commercial case'
- is financially affordable - the 'financial case'
- is achievable - the 'management case'.

What is driving this investment

The following drivers have been identified behind this potential investment:

E. The Rangiora Service Centre Building is aging and struggles to provide a safe, compliant and comfortable environment, leading to reduced productivity, less adaptable working spaces and higher operating costs.

F. There is uncertainty in the future size and scope of Council activities, leading to uncertainty how much to invest in civic accommodation right now.

G. The current split campus arrangements encourage siloed working, leading to a lower quality of service and impeding greater levels of collaboration; and

H. The urban form of the Rangiora civic precinct (with Library and Victoria Park) is confusing, leading to lower public use of the precinct.
The Strategic Context

The Strategic Context provides an overview of the key external factors which influence decision-making on this investment.

A fast growing and diverse district

The Waimakariri District has a population of 59,200, with 99% of people living within a 30-minute drive from one another. More than 80% of the population is concentrated in the eastern part of the district with its largest towns being Kaiapoi, Rangiora and Woodend/Pegasus. Oxford is the largest town in the western part of the district 2. Rangiora has the largest centralised catchment area within the district.

The district also has a large number of people living on small holdings in the rural zone with approximately 3,500 households living in rural areas on lots of between 0.5 and 4 hectares.

The district’s close proximity to Christchurch makes it an attractive location for those wanting to live near a city but enjoy the country environment. The council is projecting the district’s population will grow to approximately 74,500 by 2028 (26%) and 97,000 by 2048 (63%).

The scale of work undertaken by the council will continue to grow to service the increasing population of the district.

A broad and proactive strategic purpose and strong internal culture

The council’s purpose (as articulated in the 2018-2028 Long-Term Plan) is: To make Waimakariri a great place to be, in partnership with our communities guided by our outcomes, actioned through the following roles:

1. As a service provider;
2. As a funder of activities by others;
3. As an advocate on behalf of our community;
4. As a regulator under legislation.

2 Long Term Plan 2018-2028 Waimakariri District Council
The council has adopted ‘Ta Matou Mauri’ as the principles by which the organisation will pursue this purpose.

This emphasises customer service and integrity through a series of values and a vision: ‘We are a respectful, progressive team delivering value for our customers’. This is underpinned by a wellbeing strategy that has the goal: ‘To support and promote the physical, emotional and mental health and wellbeing of our people, with the aim of developing more engaged and connected employees, working within a supportive and productive organisation’.

**Rangiora Town Centre Strategy 2010**

The Rangiora Town Centre Strategy provides a decision-making framework for the council to use to make positive changes to the Rangiora town centre from now until the year 2020 and beyond. The vision for the Strategy is “A town centre, which is sustainable, prosperous, vibrant, easily accessible, contains safe and attractive pedestrian-oriented streets and spaces, with High Street as its heart in reflecting Rangiora’s unique character and identity.”

In regard to the ‘Council Precinct’ identified in the strategy, the consultation document depicted a clear laneway between High Street and Victoria Park as a desired outcome. With the council’s purchase of the property to the east of the Rangiora Service Centre (Ashley building), there is more scope for opening up this area and maintaining the ‘line of sight’ connection with Victoria Park until the construction of the library extension (see figure right).

A review process has recently commenced. Preliminary feedback from the review team is that options that activate and open up the access and site lines between High Street and Victoria Park are highly desirable.

They have also observed that council’s offices and service centre act as an important anchor for the western end of the town centre and its current location encourages pedestrian traffic movement along High Street. They see this as beneficial.

**The ever-changing focus and powers of local government**

The Local Government Act 2002 (LGA) states that the dual roles for local government in New Zealand are:

- to enable democratic local decision-making and action by, and on behalf of, communities and
- to meet the current and future needs of communities for good quality local infrastructure, local public services, and performance of regulatory functions in a way that is most cost-effective for households and businesses.

The functions and roles of local government have been frequently restructured and reshaped over the years by central government through legislative change. For example, the Local Government Amendment Act 2012 changed the second of the two purposes of local government (noted above).

Previously, the original purpose was to promote the four wellbeings of communities (social, economic, environmental and cultural). However, at the time of writing, the Local Government
(Community Well-being) Amendment Bill – which restores the four wellbeings as a core purpose of local government – had progressed to the ‘Committee of whole House’ stage, and so the council will probably see a reinstatement of a broader role for local government.

The New Zealand Productivity Commission is currently investigating local government funding and financing and has identified a range of pressures on the current funding model that constrains local authorities being able to achieve the outcomes sought by their communities. Over the medium-term, this could inform a revised range of funding options for local authorities to consider.

The council may have the opportunity to broaden its role and activities in order to better achieve the community outcomes articulated in the long-term plan. This will require additional resources and potentially different ways of working.

Probable change in delivery model of Three Waters Services

The government is reviewing how to improve the regulation and supply arrangements of drinking water, wastewater and stormwater (Three Waters) to better support New Zealand’s prosperity, health, safety and environment.

This review is also investigating high-level options for service delivery as part of a longer conversation. Ongoing policy work is being undertaken within a broader context of community wellbeing, financing and funding of local government, and how central and local government can work together to promote and enhance this.

The Minister for Local Government considers that ‘the scale of the challenges indicates that the status quo is not sustainable in the long term. There is, moreover, an opportunity to do things differently’\(^3\). The key milestones set out in the review are:

- In June 2019, the Ministers of Local Government, Environment, and Health will report back to Cabinet with detailed policy proposals for regulation of drinking water, wastewater, and stormwater, to enable drafting of legislation to commence.

- In late 2019, the Minister of Local Government will report back to Cabinet with detailed policy proposals for service delivery arrangements, to enable drafting of legislation to commence, if required. These decisions will be informed by ongoing engagement with local government and other stakeholders, led by the Minister of Local Government, about reform options.

One of the major options being considered involves creation of an aggregated system of dedicated, publicly owned drinking water and wastewater providers, configured on a regional basis, with approximately 12 providers; or on a multiregional basis, with approximately three to five providers. Other options involve maintaining the current institutional arrangements, however with the opportunity for voluntary reconfiguration of the service and/or additional funding sources.

The implications of this is that a substantial portion of the council’s current activities, averaging approximately $20 million per annum of annual capital expenditure, along with operating costs and associated direct and indirect staffing could be transferred to a dedicated...

\(^3\) Cabinet Paper: ‘Future state of the three waters system: regulation and service delivery’ Nov 2018
Further development of civic accommodation should be mindful that there could be a material contraction in staffing numbers required in 2020 or 2021, however there are also pressures to grow the staffing numbers as population grows.

The flexibility, timing, staging and future alternative uses of office space should be important considerations.

### Workplace trends and well-established principles inform best practice

**Workplace Trends and Occupational Survey Data**

Colliers International publishes a biannual workplace trends report. Relevant findings from their 2018 report\(^5\) are:

- The increase in density (less space per person) achieved in higher quality and new premises between our 2016 and 2018 surveys has been overshadowed by the nominal shift in increased density recorded in the overall New Zealand results.
- Tenants with the ability to move into new, higher specification, technology driven premises are experiencing significant gains in occupancy ratios, combating the higher total occupancy costs associated with premium and A-grade buildings.
- Density rates in new buildings are approaching a natural rate of efficiency that once surpassed can forego benefits made in staff productivity, retention and talent attraction. This is despite using Activity Based Working (ABW) practices, biophilic environments and bespoke zones.
- Many organisations have massive periods of idle desk use, with some organisations Colliers has surveyed suffering up to 45% vacancy periods.
- Data-driven occupation strategies are rising in popularity amongst landlords and occupiers to more quickly and accurately optimise office space usage, identify space for bursts of high utilisation as well as boost staff productivity and wellbeing.
- Although technology is driving greater understanding in this area, privacy and data ownership remain key points of contention.

---

\(^4\) 10 staff Three Water Unit plus estimated 50% of Project Delivery Unit  

\(^5\) Colliers International - Office Workspace Trends 2018
The benefits of staff health and wellbeing on performance and productivity is well documented, but the New Zealand office market will be slow to implement certification due to a limited number of occupiers requiring formal accreditation over and above the best practices already being employed.

To counteract the elevation in flexible workspace popularity amongst staff and occupiers, landlords are incorporating more flexible workspace initiatives into their buildings/portfolios. Ranked highly amongst these initiatives is the ability to deliver a collaborative aspect and feel to the premises by incorporating new software and employing community managers to connect staff with landlord intentions and building operations.

The average CBD office density for longer, fixed-term workplace leases in New Zealand has increased (less space per person) between the 2016 and 2018 surveys to 16.5 sqm per person compared to 17.2 sqm per person respectively (Christchurch 17.5 sqm per person).

Total occupancy cost (TOC) per sqm has increased from $427 per sqm to $439 per sqm while cost per person decreased, from $7,328 to $7,242 since the 2016 survey. The decrease per person was due to the office density sqm per person increasing (Christchurch CBD TOC $363/m² or $6,357 cost per person)

Of most relevance to Rangiora is the average TOC for ‘Rest of NZ’ at $5,424 per person p.a ($309/m²).

**Sustainability and disaster resilience standards**

**Disaster Resilience**

Clause A3 of the Building Code defines the significance of a building by its importance level (IL), which is related to the consequences of failure. There are five levels of importance, considered by the importance of the building to society and the required level of seismic performance increases with each level of importance. In general, important structures, such as hospitals, communications centres and those that provide occupation for many people, are designed for a greater level of earthquake shaking than ordinary commercial structures.

The two relevant for the Civic offices, and in particular relating to its role in emergencies are:

- **Level 3**: Structures that may contain crowds, have contents of high value to the community or pose a risk to large numbers of people in close proximity, such as conference centres, stadiums and airport terminals.

- **Level 4**: Buildings that must be operational immediately after an earthquake or other disastrous event, such as emergency shelters and hospital operating theatres, triage centres and other critical post-disaster infrastructure.

**Sustainability**

Sustainably standards (with the most common being such as Green Star in New Zealand) measures the environmental sustainability of a project. Green Star is a tool to support stakeholders in the property and construction sectors to design, construct and operate
projects in a more sustainable, efficient and productive way. The Green star rating system is shown in the diagram below.

![Green star rating system diagram]

### The Government National Property Strategy & Principles

NZ Government National Property Strategy & Principles\(^6\) sets out general expectations into enduring themes, objectives and principles for Crown agency accommodation (refer left). Well not mandatory for local government, these can be considered best practice in the provision of public service accommodation and support achieving value for money from the property portfolio.

### WDC Design Principles for Civic Accommodation

Drawing on the abovementioned government workplace principles, a facilitated workshop series was undertaken to develop organisational specific design principles. A full explanation of the outcomes of this process is included in appendix A and summarised in Table One below.

#### Table One: WDC Design Principles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design principles</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DP1 A safe secure and comfortable work environment</td>
<td>Enhancing the work environment to optimise productivity and create an enjoyable environment. This includes physical (heat and light) as well as safe (security) and aesthetic (furnishings).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP2 A range of shared workplace settings</td>
<td>Improve the way in which teams interact and work cohesively. Creating opportunities to interact and improve our services to the community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^6\) Government Property Management Centre of Expertise, March 2013
Design principles  |  Explanation
--- | ---
**DP3** An adaptable open-plan working environment  | Create spaces which can grow with the organisation and be adapted to different working styles and priorities as the organisation changes.
**DP4** Consistent and fair design  | Ensure that departments and roles are provided with the right spaces they require using consistent methodologies to be fair to all people.
**DP5** Effective utilisation of technology  | Update and improve the connectivity in our workspaces to promote responsiveness, flexible working and reduce travel and physical meetings.
**DP6** Efficient and effective space utilisation  | To deliver the best efficiency for the building by utilising dead spaces and making the building work for us.

The themes and design principles provide a benchmark for fit-for-purpose accommodation.

**Budgets and workload established**

**Long-term Plan budgets**

The Council’s 10-year Long-Term Plan (LTP) is refreshed every three years and responds to and considers changing community priorities and issues facing the district. It is the key strategic policy document that is relevant for this investment.

The 2018-2028 LTP establishes a capital budget of $440 million (with $142 million in the first two years, and then averaging $30-40 million thereafter) and an annual operating cost of $93 million raising to $122 million over the next ten years.

The Financial Strategy in the Council 2018-2028 Long-Term Plan outlines the key financial parameters and limits within which the council will operate over the next 10 years. It also provides a guide against which proposals for expenditure and funding may be considered and gives a context for public disclosure of the overall effect of long-term expenditure proposals on levels of service, rates, debt and investments.

This strategy looks both short and long-term, setting the affordability thresholds for the council to drive value for money, including the aspects of loan funding and intergenerational equity.
The council’s debt will increase from $148 million to $196 million in 2027/28, having peaked at $217 million in 2021/22. Debt levels remain within the council’s borrowing policy limits even after allowing for financial capacity or ‘headroom’ to pay for a rebuild should a significant disaster occur within the next 10 years.

There is a robust Long-Term Plan and affordability policies that seek the best value for money for the ratepayer, considering both the short-term needs and benefits and longevity of the Council.

**Forecasting workforce numbers and floor space**

Over many decades staff numbers have had some correlation to the wider growth within the district. This means that over the next 5 or 6 years, staff numbers growth of 13% to 15% could be anticipated. While this is a blunt indicator the ongoing additional workload around health and safety, central government and regulatory compliance historically tend to drive the need for additional staff.

Influenced by growth and central government mandate, there is the potential for a contraction of up to 30 people and/or the growth by 63%, being the growth of population to 2048. For forecasting purposes, the following table provides an upper and lower bound, with the upper bound seeing a growth equivalent to population growth, and the lower bound growing 1% per annum, plus a loss of 25 people with the mandate for Three Waters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table Two: Forecast staff numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Bound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Bound</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table Three: Lower Bound Forecast floor area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff (FTE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupancy density (m²/FTE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor area required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council chambers &amp; public space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (net)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (gross)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table Four: Upper Bound Forecast floor area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff (FTE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupancy density (m²/FTE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor area required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council chambers &amp; public space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (net)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (gross)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

30 in the main office, plus a further 20 from the Water Unit.
Potential accommodation for other agencies and groups

There is the potential for other agencies to want accommodation for their staff or activities in Rangiora. This could include Environment Canterbury, a future three waters and/or unitary authority or other government or non-government group. While there is no specific opportunity on the table, it is prudent to consider these possibilities, and allow for the flexibility to provide accommodation for these associated entities if appropriate.

A minimum of 290 staff is forecast needing office based accommodated by 2048, with the potential for this to be up to 391 staff.

This is a variance of 35% between the lower and upper bounds.
The Strategic Case – Making the Case for Change

This part of the Strategic Case finds that there is a compelling case for change to significantly improve the civic accommodation to better meet the present and future needs of the organisation.

Existing Arrangements and Business Needs

Major elements of the Rangiora Service Centre building are near the end of their useful life

Built in several stages the current fit-out is around 30 years old and building systems and services are now suffering from obsolescence and showing signs of wear and tear. This, together with the general dated fit-out design and condition means the office accommodation is no longer aligned with modern service provision and team requirements and are a high risk to the functionality and continued performance of the building.

In particular, the following key issues are

- **Electricity**: While currently meeting demand, the system is nearing capacity and with predicted growth this will eventually put the system at risk of failure. The boards and breakers are no longer manufactured (discontinued 12 years ago), spare parts are becoming harder to source and they cannot be retrofitted with any other manufacturer’s breakers. This means that the building is exposed to closure for three to four weeks if the main board fails.

- **Compliance requirements**: Work in the building after the earthquakes were exempted from a building permit, so a number of issues were not addressed. Exemptions are no longer permitted. The more recent works with full consents completed in 2018 addressed fire compliance and egress matters, however other access and safety upgrades will sooner or later need resolving.

- **Heating and ventilation**: The system is a very complex system, (e.g. 65 separate refrigerant units installed over 3 decades) with only part controlled by the Building Management System and so lack full integration. This means that the system is inefficient as a whole, difficult to control (not responsive) and compromised during peak loads when the system is likely to be ‘fighting itself’ at times. Although the system is not entirely ‘broken’, it performs poorly. Difficult or impossible to upgrade as ‘part’ of the building structure and to improve performance and efficiency, a total replacement is needed.

- **Carpets**: Throughout the building the carpets which are now over 20 years old are becoming threadbare and beyond reasonable repair or patching. The very partitioned nature of the existing layout means that replacement of carpets will be in relative terms quite expensive due to the large labour requirement. It would also result in any future alterations needing patch repairs where walls are removed.

- **Telecommunication**: The existing phone & telephony system (ShoreTel), is around 10 years old and no longer meets business requirements. Project Kōrero is
an IT initiative which looks to upgrade and potentially replace the current phone system with a solution that meets the council’s current needs and creates a platform for future growth and improvement. This provides an opportunity to develop an integrated system that maximises the effectiveness of people, space and technology.

- **Interior fit-out**: The existing interior fit-out features are dated and perform poorly. This has led to a maze or rabbit warren effect which fails to be a functional environment to work space. It is hard for people to navigate the building. Spatial allocation is inconsistent & some areas have little or no natural light. The lighting system is old and performs poorly by comparison with modern units. It also represents some risk in the event of an earthquake. This, combined with poor staff comfort and wellbeing, is likely to be compromising productivity and organisational performance.

- **Security**: Recommendations from the review following the Ashburton WINZ murders included alterations to customer service and office areas however these were deferred with the intent they were to be incorporated within the refurbishment project. These include features such as improvements to the customer service area, pathways to designated safe room areas, direction of doors, customer interview room design, surveillance and communications in an event.

- **Capacity**: The current occupancy of the building is already cramped in a number of areas and the ability to respond to changes in team size is highly problematic without breaking teams up. This is largely due to the number of semi-enclosed spaces as a result of structural walls and the historic fit-out.

---

*The Rangiora Service Centre Building is aging and struggles to provide a safe, compliant and comfortable environment leading to reduced productivity, less adaptable working spaces and higher operating costs.*
Existing facilities impede productivity and collaboration

The building provides for governance and the essential face-to-face customer service for the public through Rangiora and the greater Waimakariri District. It accommodates approximately 150 staff across a broad range of functions and teams. The main RSC building is part of a campus of three office buildings housing staff in Rangiora. The other two are the Ashley building (c35 staff) and the Farmers building (c55 staff).

Advanced corporate real estate management theory and good architectural practice has, for many years, identified that the work environment can act as an enabler or as a constraint to organisational performance.

The NZ Government National Property Strategy & Principles confirm that allowing staff to access the people, information and amenities they require to be productive, promoting open and receptive organisational behaviour both within and between departments, sharing collaborative spaces, supporting quiet, focused work areas, and allowing access to information will lead to better organisational performance.

Some of the outcomes of the current configuration include:

- The siloed and multilocation approach limits opportunities for interdepartmental collaboration.
- Departments and teams that need to interact are not always able to be situated in close proximity or provided with technological tools to engage.
- Higher costs are incurred in managing and maintaining facilities.
- The configuration and layout limits flexibility for change.
- The IT and telecommunications system are outdated, limiting opportunities for new approaches and tools for information management and communication.
- There is a wide range of accommodation standards across teams, leading to a sense of unfairness and inequity.
- Areas previously provided for storage in the building lofts have been converted as ‘make do’ accommodation for some years now waiting for a more permanent and practical ‘work friendlier’ environment.

The current split campus arrangements encourage siloed working leading to a lower quality of service and impeding greater levels of collaboration.
There is uncertainty in the future size of the organisation

There are a range of competing pressures that influence the future size and scope of council activities and means that there is some uncertainty in the forecast resourcing needs of the organisation, and hence the size of accommodation required.

- **Central government mandate**: The external context of central government reviews of funding and financial, scope of activities and particularly the provision of Three Water’s management may lead to changes in staffing in the council. This is coupled with the continued rapid growth of the district’s population and the demand for services that this will create.

- **Staff demographics and talent attraction**: Over the next 15 years, the council will lose 36% of employees due to retirement. An important question is how the council will attract talented and loyal employees. There is evidence that employees around the world and New Zealand are rejecting standard, bland offices and demanding something fundamentally different and so replacement of the retiring employees with high performing and talented staff is not certain.

- **Technology and ways of working**: According to data from Intel, the Internet of things (IoT) will be comprised of 200 billion ‘smart’ devices by the year 2020, equating to 26 ‘smart’ devices per person on the planet. Smart offices have the potential to help improve productivity and employee satisfaction, ultimately allowing employees and teams to focus less on the routine (or distractions) and more on driving results. Beyond introducing new efficiencies in the workplace, the IoT can also help spur innovation. Virtual reality and tech captured data will continue to improve the design process and deliver more intuitive office environments and other innovations are likely to drive new ways of working and collaboration. This could also mean that the scope and extent of the council’s functions could evolve also.

- **Staff growth**: Upper and lower bound forecasts outlined in the Strategic Context above suggests a long-term need for between 290-390 people to be accommodated in the main office space by 2048 – a variance of 35%.

---

There is uncertainty in the future size and scope of Council activities, leading to uncertainty how much to invest in civic accommodation right now.

This means that at least 35% of accommodation will need to be able to be staged, and cost-effectively expand and contract and be suitable for alternative uses.
The existing Rangiora building impedes town centre revitalisation

The Rangiora Service Centre (RSC) is a strategic asset for Waimakariri District Council (WDC). It is located on High Street and delivers a range of council functions to the public. It has two main entrances facing north and south with a large carpark and the public library beyond and locates a significant number of people working in the Rangiora town centre and sits within a precinct comprising of the library, a major carpark and Victoria Park, along with several shops and office spaces. Over the medium-term, there is a plan to expand the library to better meet the needs of the growing population.

However, the external urban form of the civic precinct is unclear and impedes connection through and around the building, the library and Victoria Park, with the following relevant points:

- The entrance from High Street is unclear with a long internal walk to the reception.
- The approach to the southern entrance is confusing, difficult to find and does not invite visitors into the building.
- The Civic offices, carpark, library and Victoria Park do not connect easily and is not easy for visitors to navigate.
- The building does not invite community members to access the public spaces and participate in council affairs.

The urban form of the Rangiora civic precinct (with Library and Victoria Park) is confusing, leading to lower public use of the precinct.
**Investment Objectives**

Based on the problem statements and business needs articulated above, the following investment objectives have been developed to address the problems.

**Table Five: Investment Objectives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>To provide office space for a minimum of 290, and up to 391 staff by 2048 at or below the average cost across the public sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>To provide flexible office space for all staff by 2029 that meets the design principles, government guidance and enables new technology to be incorporated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>A minimum of 35% of the office able to be adapted for alternative uses if the organisation size changes after 2029.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>To improve the pedestrian connectivity between High Street and Victoria Park by 2029.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table Six: Summary of the objectives, existing arrangements and business needs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment Objective One</th>
<th>To provide office space for a minimum of 290, and up to 391 staff by 2048 at or below the average cost across the public sector.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Arrangements</td>
<td>The main RSC building is part of a campus of three office buildings housing staff in Rangiora. The other two are the Ashley building and the Farmers building. Overflow is currently addressed with two portacom buildings on site where the new library expansion is proposed in the future. Together they accommodate 240 staff, however staff numbers are forecast to rise to between 290 and 391 by 2048.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Business Needs           | • Accommodation of the current and future staff necessary to deliver it’s functions to the level of service expected by the Community and set out in the Long term Plan  
• The council has clear affordability thresholds and must manage its finances within those constraints and exercise prudent financial management of public funds. As a benchmark, and of most relevance WDC, is the average Total Occupancy Cost reported by Colliers (2018) for ‘Rest of NZ’ is $5,424 per person p.a ($309/m2). |
| Potential Metrics        | Average Total Occupancy Cost |
| Investment Objective Two | To provide flexible office space for all staff by 2029 that meets the design principles, government guidance and enables new technology to be incorporated. |
| Existing Arrangements    | The Rangiora Service Centre Building is aging and struggles to provide a safe, compliant and comfortable environment leading to reduced productivity, less adaptable working spaces and higher operating costs. This is coupled with the spilt accommodation across multiple buildings which creates siloed working cultures. |
The office accommodation is no longer aligned with current building standards, government quality guidelines or meets the principles of Ta Matou Mauri and presents a risk to the functionality and continued performance of the organisation. Recommendations from the review following the Ashburton WINZ murders included alterations to customer service and office areas to improve security.

### Business Needs
- Safe, secure and comfortable accommodation to staff to both meet current building standards, government quality guidelines and meet the principles of Ta Matou Mauri.
- Adaptable and flexible provision of accommodation to allow technology and other ways of working to be implemented and productivity enhanced.

### Potential Metrics
- Security assessment
- Assessment against government guidance
- Staff accommodated in main building

### Investment Objective
**Three**
A minimum of 35% of the office able to be cost efficiently adapted for alternative uses if the organisation size changes after 2029.

### Existing Arrangements
There are a range of pressures that have the potential to affect staff numbers in the future, including:
- Mandate from central government, including the Three Waters Review
- Changes to technology and ways of working
- Forecast growth of district population
- Changing demographic of staff
- Need to continually attract new talent to the organisation.

39% of staff are stationed outside the in building in the Framers, Portacabins or Ashley Building (total 93 staff).

### Business Needs
- Forecast lower (290) and upper bound (391) staff numbers by 2048 indicate that there could be a 35% variation in demand for office space. Maintain flexibility in the scale and type of provision of accommodation with floor space able to be adapted for alternative uses at a low cost.
- A long term plan that ensures value for money investment in accommodation.

### Potential Metrics
- Average floor area per staff member
- Unused or inefficiently used space
- Area of medium- term expansion space available
Investment Objective Four
To improve the pedestrian connectivity between High Street and Victoria Park by 2029.

Existing Arrangements
The external layout around the civic precinct is unclear and impedes the connection through and around the building, the library and Victoria Park, leading to a decreased urban quality and reduced community use of the area.

Business Needs
• Use of any reconfiguration, relocation or expansion of the civic buildings improves the urban functioning and connectivity of the civic precinct.

Potential Metrics
Number of pedestrians visiting precinct

Potential Business Scope and Key Service Requirements

The potential range of business scope and key service requirements are identified in the table below.

Table Seven: Potential business scope and key service requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Requirements</th>
<th>Minimum Scope</th>
<th>Intermediate Scope</th>
<th>Maximum Scope</th>
<th>Out of Scope</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff accommodation</td>
<td>150 staff in current RSC building &amp; portacabin + all governance and customer service facilities</td>
<td>290 staff plus all governance and customer service facilities</td>
<td>391 staff plus all governance and customer service facilities</td>
<td>Outsourcing functions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building standards</td>
<td>Electrical, fire and security upgrades</td>
<td>Current building standards</td>
<td>Greenstar rating plus increased resilience to natural disasters</td>
<td>Possible changes to building standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productivity and collaboration</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>Enhance collaboration and productive opportunities</td>
<td>Meet all applicable NZ Government National Property Principles</td>
<td>Changing the way of working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellbeing and comfort standards</td>
<td>Improve HVAC performance and washroom facilities</td>
<td>Provide quality working spaces, systems, fixtures and fittings to current standards</td>
<td>As medium, with additional 25% workspace per staff member</td>
<td>Changing the way of working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban form</td>
<td>No change to current arrangements</td>
<td>Some improvements to urban form and connectivity</td>
<td>Reconfiguration of civic precinct</td>
<td>Redesign Victoria Park or outside site boundary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8 In decreasing order of relevance compared to the investment objectives.
Main Benefits

This Strategic Case has highlighted that the current Rangiora Service Centre is unlikely to be able to be refurbished to meet current building standards, accommodate all staff, provide modern comfort levels and support a highly productive organisation that is able to adapt to changing demands, new technologies and ways of working.

A well designed, fit for purpose civic accommodation is one of many enablers required to deliver high-quality service to the ratepayers of the district and to manage the significant public assets effectively and efficiently.

Tables Eight and Nine summarise the benefits to be gained from an improved civic accommodation that addresses the problems identified earlier. Some of benefits outlined therein are dependent on improvements in ways of working being made. However, it needs to be noted that considering changes to organisational culture and working approach is not in scope for this Indicative Business Case.

Table Eight: Analysis of potential benefits that can be expressed in monetary terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Benefits</th>
<th>Who Benefits?</th>
<th>Direct or Indirect?</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost efficient provision of accommodation</td>
<td>Council and ratepayers</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Total Cost of Occupancy per staff member - benchmarked nationally</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table Nine: Analysis of potential benefits that cannot be reliably expressed in monetary terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Benefits</th>
<th>Who Benefits?</th>
<th>Direct or Indirect?</th>
<th>Quantitative or Qualitative?</th>
<th>Description and Possible Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Better service for ratepayers from a more productive, loyal and talented workforce</td>
<td>Council, ratepayers and staff</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>• Staff engagement&lt;br&gt;• Talent attraction&lt;br&gt;• Staff satisfaction survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility in the provision of accommodation that can cost efficiently adapt to changes in size and/or ways of working</td>
<td>Council and ratepayers</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>• Unused or inefficiently used space&lt;br&gt;• Medium-term expansion space available&lt;br&gt;• Alternative use or liquidity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased foot traffic in precinct</td>
<td>Business and community</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>• Number of pedestrians visiting precinct</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Main Risks**

Risks result from uncertain events that either improve or undermine the achievement of benefits. The main risks that might create, enhance, prevent, degrade, accelerate or delay the achievement of the investment objectives are identified and analysed below.

**Table Ten: Initial risk analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Risks</th>
<th>Consequence (H/M/L)</th>
<th>Likelihood (H/M/L)</th>
<th>Comments and Risk Management Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foundation, hazardous materials, structural or other significant construction risks increase costs</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Provide allowance in forecast costs. Progress investigations early on high risk items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes in staffing requirements due to Three Waters Review and/or continued uncertainty</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Build flexibility to enable staging and alternative uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff disengagement due to change in working conditions</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Workstream on internal communications and consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to acquire land (if required)</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Secure option on sites subject to decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slow decision-making places pressure on current building and staff</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Secure options on decant and alternative space if required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inability to integrate planning with library development</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Progress master planning of whole precinct together (if required)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A risk register will be developed and progressively updated as more detailed analysis is undertaken.
**Key Constraints and Dependencies**

The proposal is subject to the following constraints and dependencies which will be carefully monitored during the project.

Table Eleven: Key constraints and dependencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constraints</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Budget provision has been identified in the Long-Term Plan and 30-year infrastructure strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service continuity</td>
<td>Ongoing staff accommodation and business continuity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependencies</th>
<th>Notes and Management Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library development</td>
<td>Consider integration of library development in overall site planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central government mandate</td>
<td>Continue to work with central government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora revitalisation</td>
<td>Successful revitalisation of Rangiora town centre may be dependent on retaining council employees in the town centre. The council is a major investor and stakeholder in this programme of works.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other centre revitalisation</td>
<td>The council also has programmes for revitalisation of the other centres, particularly Kaiapoi. The current model has multiple customer service locations and a decentralised library service.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Economic Case – Exploring the Preferred Way Forward

The purpose of the Economic Case is to identify the investment option that optimises value for money. Having determined the Strategic Context for the investment proposal and established a robust case for change, this part of the Economic Case:

- identifies critical success factors
- generates a wide range of longlist options
- undertakes an initial options assessment to identify a limited number of shortlisted options
- identifies a preferred way forward based on the shortlisted options.

**Critical Success Factors**

The following critical success factors have been developed

**Table Twelve: Critical Success Factors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Success Factors</th>
<th>Broad Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meets business needs of council</td>
<td>Meets agreed investment objectives and related business needs and service requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic fit</td>
<td>How well the option:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Integrates with other strategies, programmes and projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Enables alignment with possible future changes in central government mandate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Aligns with national standards and principles for civic accommodation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value for money</td>
<td>How well the option:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• optimises value for money (i.e. the optimal mix of potential benefits, costs and risks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Balances the cost of accommodation per employee balanced with other nonquantitative benefits, including quality of workplace and flexibility to address uncertain resourcing needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordability</td>
<td>How well the option:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• can be met from likely available funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• matches other funding constraint.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• avoids breaching debt levels and other financial constraints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• avoids displacing other council priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievability</td>
<td>How well the option is likely to be delivered:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• In the proposed timeframe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• With the current resources and support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Within the programme’s control and influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• With continuity of operation maintained during the construction period</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Longlist of Options

The five dimensions of choice

The purpose of this section is to identify and assess a wide as possible range of options that achieve the investment objectives and service requirements within the boundaries of the scope parameters and critical success factors identified above.

It is focussed towards answering the following five questions:

**Size and Scale**: What size of office space should be provided?

Bearing in mind the conflicting pressures on both growth and contraction of council staffing, what is the size of accommodation that is required? Is there the ability to expand and/or repurpose space for alternative use, including letting to third parties?

**Configuration**: How should the offices be configured?

The current campus style accommodation, where the organisation is spread across three different locations in Rangiora, with some location specific services in Kaiapoi and Oxford, provides flexibility to address changing demand but does present other challenges for the organisation to maximise productivity and manage costs.

**Location**: Where should the offices be located?

The current location may not be the optimum location for the civic offices. Kaiapoi and other locations in Rangiora are the principle alternative locations.

**Workspace Quality**: What quality of accommodation is optimum?

There is a choice between refurbishment of the existing building to minimum standards, or a greater standard of refurbishment or new build that is able to provide a higher quality of workspace that could improve productivity and organisational performance.

**Building Standard**: What is the optimum building standard?

There is a choice between maintaining the current level of resilience to adverse effects (such as earthquakes) and sustainability of the existing building, meeting current minimum standards (Importance Level 3 and Greenstar Rating 3) or providing an enhanced level of resilience and sustainability over the minimum in the Building Code (Importance Level 4 and Greenstar Rating 6).
**Longlist Options Assessment**

Decision-making relies on robust analysis of the trade-offs between scarce resources and the extent to which investment objectives and key service requirements of the investment proposal can be achieved.

A longlist of options has been developed against each dimension of choice that are explored in the previous section. These options have assessed as fully meeting, partially meeting, or not meeting each investment objective and critical success factor. Any option that fails to meet any of the critical success factors is automatically discounted and is not carried forward.

This analysis is summarised below and detailed in appendix B.

**Table Thirteen: Analysis of longlist options classified by the five dimensions of choice**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Options within each Dimension</th>
<th>Progress to short list?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size and Scale</td>
<td>What scale of accommodation should be provided?</td>
<td>• 150 staff (Current staff at RSC)</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 240 staff (Current full staff and 2028 lower bound)</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 290 staff (2028 upper bound, 2048 lower bound)</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 391 staff (2048 upper bound)</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Configuration</td>
<td>Single of multiple buildings/locations?</td>
<td>• Single building</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Campus accommodation in central Rangiora using existing buildings</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Where should the accommodation be located?</td>
<td>• Rangiora town centre (existing site)</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Rangiora town centre alternate site (e.g. Blake St carpark)</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Rangiora or Kaiapoi Mixed Use or business zones</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workspace Quality</td>
<td>What quality of work environment to be created?</td>
<td>• HVAC and washroom only</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Upgrade to meet modern workplace standards</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Create high-quality flexible workspace</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Standard</td>
<td>What level of sustainability and resilience should be incorporated?</td>
<td>• Existing standard(^\text{11})</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Upgrade to current building standards</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Maximum practical sustainability and resilience features</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{11}\) Where no upgrade required by the Building Code
Notes on options that were not progressed

The following options where either not included in the longlist or discarded and not progressed to the shortlist:

Not included in longlist

- Upgrading the existing building to high-performance office accommodation i.e. 6 Star or ILF resilience. This is not considered feasible.

- Moving to an existing building elsewhere in the district. There are no realistic opportunities for this option.

- Establishing a new facility outside Rangiora or Kaiapoi. This is considered politically and practically unrealistic due to the weight of population in these two towns.

- Outsourcing/alternative means of delivery of functions. This is out of scope.

- New facilities that involve multiple locations or buildings. This is considered not to be able to deliver the investment objectives for the project.

Not progressed to shortlist

- Limiting any new facilities to accommodate only the existing number of staff in the Rangiora Service Centre (147). The current configuration was assessed as not being fit for purpose and have a material effect on the objectives of supporting a high performing team and being adaptable to the future needs of the organisation.

- Establishing a new facility in either a Rangiora or Kaiapoi Mixed Use or business zones. This was assessed has having a significant detrimental effect on the council’s strategies for Kaiapoi or Rangiora town centre revitalisation and for these reasons was assessed as not achieving the strategic objectives of the council.

- A multi-office campus. – See below

- Upgrade of HVAC and washroom facilities only (for any refurbishment of the existing building) as it does not meet reasonable comfort standards or align with the wellbeing strategy of the organisation.

- Limiting building standard upgrades for any refurbishment of the existing building to essential fire, electrical and security elements only. This option was not considered to meet the objectives, support wellbeing or future-proof the accommodation.

- Undertaking a major refurbishment of the existing building and then later demolition or selling the building after constructing a new premises. This is considered illogical to spend considerable costs in refurbishment for approximately ten years only.
Discarding a multi-office decentralised approach

The analysis has discarded a multi-office or decentralised approach to office provision. While having the initial appearance of promoting flexibility, when assessed against the Investment Objectives and Critical Success Criteria it was found to undermine the overall investment proposition. This is further explained in the table below.

Table Fourteen: Assessment of multi-office decentralised dimension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment Objectives</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To provide office space for a minimum of 290, and up to 391 staff by 2048 at or below the average cost across the public sector.</td>
<td>Partially meeting</td>
<td>A multi or decentralised approach may provide initially lower capital cost accommodation however carries higher overhead costs and hence is a higher net present value.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To provide flexible office space for all staff by 2029 that meets the design principles, government guidance and enables new technology to be incorporated.</td>
<td>Not meeting</td>
<td>Decentralised or multi-office accommodation creates a division in an organisation. It supresses collaboration and common understanding and tends to create different cultures in each site. This also reduces the ability to be future-proofed, introduce new technologies and ways of working as the choice of accommodation is unlikely to be broad.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A minimum of 35% of the office able to be adapted for alternative uses if the organisation size changes after 2029.</td>
<td>Fully meeting</td>
<td>A multi-office or decentralised approach is able to provide flexibility, in that choices can be made more readily to expand or contract, particularly if there are short-term leases rather than ownership arrangements in place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To improve the pedestrian connectivity between High Street and Victoria Park by 2029.</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>The choice of this dimension does not influence this objective (refer location).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Success Factors</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meets business needs of council</td>
<td>Not meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic fit</td>
<td>Partially meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value for money</td>
<td>Fully meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordability</td>
<td>Fully meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievability</td>
<td>Fully meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Box 1: Queenstown Lakes District Council: Project Connect

For Queenstown Lakes District Council (QLDC), delivering better service for the community is a priority. Their offices are currently in four different corners of the town, with only two of the buildings community owned, the others are leased. They consider that locating the organisation in one place will create huge time efficiencies and an injection to council’s culture. They also consider the role it plays in the town centre revitalisation. The mandate for QLDC’s ‘Project Connect’ is to create a single office space in the town centre.
The Base Case

The Base Case option provides the benchmark for determining the relative marginal value for money added by the other shortlisted options under consideration.

The Base Case is not considered the ‘do nothing’ option, it is the ‘do minimum’ option. Doing nothing leaves the council open to compliance issues, with no allowance for failing services or current growth pressures. Nonetheless, there remain significant challenges with this option against the Investment Objectives and case for change set out in the Strategic Case.

The do minimum is to retain the status quo configuration with the Ashley, portacoms and Farmers buildings and refurbish the Rangiora Service Centre to meet current building safety standards. This involves upgrading the electrical, fire, HVAC, carpets, customer interface security and IT system.

As the organisation grows, additional space is leased. Additional minor refurbishments are required every ten years.

Expansion options

The analysis set out in the Strategic Case shows that there is some uncertainty in the future size of the organisation, and it is realistic to assume that both further growth and contraction pressure will occur during the life of any investment made in civic accommodation.

Therefore, it is critical to plan the development of accommodation in such a way that expansion and contraction is both simple and cost-effective. Any option that cannot provide that opportunity has been set aside. This can be achieved in a variety of ways:

- Staging any new build or extension to the existing buildings, with planned footprint identified and protected in an overall site master plan
- Designing and locating buildings to enable alternative uses for all or some of the floorspace (offsetting holding costs)
- Planning to lease overflow accommodation in other buildings (noting that this option has been discarded earlier, but included as part of the Base Case)

These approaches have been included in the relevant shortlist of options and all options are able to expand to meet the upper bound demand.
**Principle Shortlisted Options**

Table Fifteen below sets out the combinations of the dimensions of choice investigated above to provide a coherent set of options. The options differentiate between a refurbishment of the existing Rangiora building or a new building built in either one stage or over multiple stages.

Variations to each principal option to consider are:

- The location of the office building (existing or new location)
- The size of the building (and number of staff to be accommodated)
- The performance of the building, both in terms of providing higher levels of comfort as well as offering greater levels of sustainability and resilience from disasters.

The actual extent of these variations will depend on the preferred principal options. Each shortlisted option allows for expansion in stages to accommodate growth and/or adapt to the changing scope of the organisation.

In summary the principle shortlisted options and variations are:

**Table Fifteen: Shortlisted Options**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Variations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Base Case - Minimum refurbishment with leasing of additional space</td>
<td>ii.  nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| B      | Refurbishment of existing building with future expansion outside envelope | i. Building performance  
ii. Size of extension |
| C      | Staged development of new building                                  | i. Location  
ii. Building performance  
iii. Size of building |
| D      | Development of new building in single stage                         | i. Location  
ii. Building performance  
iii. Size of building |
### Assessment of Shortlisted Options

The following shortlist of options have been identified:

#### Table Sixteen: Advantages and Disadvantages of the shortlist of options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Net Present Value (4%)</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Base Case - Minimum refurbishment and leasing of other offices</td>
<td>Lower Bound: $32 m&lt;br&gt;Upper Bound: $41 m</td>
<td>The do minimum is to retain the status quo configuration with the Ashley, portacoms and Farmers buildings and refurbish the Rangiora Service Centre to meet current building safety standards. This involves upgrading the electrical, fire, HVAC, carpets, customer interface security and IT system. Future expansion involves leasing further office space elsewhere.</td>
<td>- Lowest cost initially</td>
<td>- No improvement in working conditions&lt;br&gt;- No ability to expand&lt;br&gt;- Higher operating costs&lt;br&gt;- No structural upgrade&lt;br&gt;- Poor levels of collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Refurbishment of existing building with future expansion outside footprint&lt;br&gt;Note: Future extension south into carpark in approx. 2029, possibly integrated with library</td>
<td>Lower Bound: $27 m&lt;br&gt;Upper Bound: $40 m</td>
<td>This option involves a substantial refurbishment of the existing building to improve customer service and public spaces and to accommodate staff until beyond 2028 and provide a modern quality working environment. This will mean the Ashley and Farmers offices are still required until any further expansion is progressed, but some teams may return to the main building to provide for a better work environment and growth, especially from the Ashley building. Building standard would be upgraded to normal modern standards to achieve best practice workplace environment with a range of informal breakout/meeting spaces.</td>
<td>- Accommodates up to 211 staff in stage one&lt;br&gt;- Customer service and public spaces, security, kitchen and washroom upgrades&lt;br&gt;- Some natural light improvement&lt;br&gt;- Structural upgrade, and removal of heavy dangerous roof&lt;br&gt;- Staged expansion as demand requires&lt;br&gt;- More affordable</td>
<td>- Carries higher construction risk&lt;br&gt;- Limited viable alternative uses for building&lt;br&gt;- Ashely accommodation continued to be used until 2029&lt;br&gt;- Financial constraints and contractual commitments to Farmers office constrains timing of further expansion until 2029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Net Present Value (4%)</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Advantages</td>
<td>Disadvantages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| C      | New building staged to accommodate expansion   | Lower Bound: $46 m  
Upper Bound: $60 m | This option involves building a new fit for purpose facility on a new site or the current Rangiora site to accommodate the forecast lower bound forecast staff in 2048, with the potential for further expansion in the future should the organisation grow faster. | • Fit for purpose build with longer life  
• Greater long-term flexibility  
• More alternative uses/flexibility to expand and contract  
• Increased productivity and talent attraction  
• Lower opex  
• Greater EQ resilience | • Loss of significant embedded carbon  
• Significantly more expensive  
• Financial constraints and contractual commitments to Farmers office constrains timing |
| D      | Develop new building in single stage   | Lower Bound: $47 m  
Upper Bound: $62 m | This option involves building a new fit for purpose facility on a new site or the current Rangiora site to accommodate upper bound forecast of staff in 2048. | | |

**Box 2: What difference does the site selection make to the lifecycle cost analysis?**

If **new site**: accounting for land acquisition, sale of RSC and Ashley Buildings: Net Present Value for a staged build ranges from $43 million (lower bound staffing forecast) to $57 million (upper bound).

If **existing site**, accounting for demolition of the RSC and sale of Ashley Building: Net Present Value for a staged build ranges from $46 million (lower bound staffing forecast) to $60 million (upper bound).

This means that there are $3 million difference in the net present value between building on the existing site (higher cost) or using a new site elsewhere in Rangiora town centre. Note that this relies upon being able to acquire new land and selling the Rangiora Service Centre and Ashley Building at the assumed valuations (refer appendix D).
The Preferred Way Forward

A detailed analysis is included in appendix C.

The analysis shows that the Base Case does not meet the investment objectives, delivers low levels of benefit and in particular, provides a declining level of quality accommodation for staff in a building with major elements nearing the end of their useful life. This option is more costly over the long term, does not cater to growth and would challenge the organisation’s desire for delivery of services to the community, a highly productive staff, and enabling the culture of Ta Matau Mauri.

The options (option C and D) which involve a new purpose-built facility would best meet the investment objectives, provide the greatest benefits and offer the greatest ability to adapt to changes in organisational size.

However, these options are approximately 63% more expensive than Option B (on a net present value basis) and would require the bringing forward of substantial budget from outside the current Long Term Plan period.

The variations to option C and D which involve demolishing the existing building and rebuilding a new purpose-built facility on the existing site would also cause the loss of embedded carbon in the building and challenge the government’s goals regarding carbon sustainability.

This additional cost of building a new building over refurbishing and extending the existing building appears to outweigh the advantages of a new purpose-built and flexible facility. On this basis, the option which make best use of the existing building through extensive refurbishment, and then staged extension to accommodate the organisation as it grows, offers the optimum balance between cost, flexibility and benefits.

Prudent decision-making will be necessary during the master planning and design stages to minimise sunk expenditure on elements of the building that would be lost in future extensions and ensuring there is flexibility for alternative uses.

If Council desires to reconfigure the entire precinct to improve the site lines, readability and pedestrian connections with Victoria Park, and integrate with future library expansion, it is recommended that sufficient master planning be undertaken prior to finalising the plans for the current refurbishment.

On the basis of the above assessment, the preferred way forward is Option B: Refurbishment of existing building & future expansion outside footprint.

Box 3: Variations to preferred principle option

The preferred way forward to refurbish and extend the existing building means that no decision needs to be made regarding an alternative location. The limitations of the scope of the refurbishment means that there is no decision is required regarding building performance and floor area until 2029, when the development of the extension is forecast. A suitable business case should be developed at that time to inform decision making.
Outlining the Commercial Case

The Commercial Case plans for the procurement arrangements needed to implement the preferred solution, prior to issuing requests for proposals. The IBC Commercial Case considerations are not intended to be as detailed as the Strategic or Economic Cases and include only a high-level analysis of the identified procurement approaches that are likely suitable for this project.

The procurement can be considered in two phases: master planning and delivery phase

Master Planning Phase

The next stage of the project is development of a master plan for the while Civic Precinct and an accompanying Detailed Business Case. This will provide:

- Concept design and functional brief for the Civic Offices and immediate external landscaping.
- An overall site plan for the Civic Precinct, incorporating the Library and Civic Offices.
- A staging plan for the next 20-40 years.
- A robust budget and delivery timeframe.
- Strategic and Economic Cases to optimise the components and support the master planning process.
- Detailed Commercial, Financial, Management cases.

On the basis that project management will be undertaken inhouse, to support the development of the Detailed Business Case it is recommended that the following professional services are engaged.

- Architectural design services,
- Structural and geotechnical engineer,
- Business case writer,
- Quantity surveyor,
- Statutory planning and any associated professional to support planning advice.

Due to the nature of these commissions, direct sourcing of expertise is recommended on standard terms of contract.

Most of the above roles are already in place with the current design team but the brief will need to be amended to account for the additional deliverables.
**Delivery Phases**

These phases encompasses the design, consent and construction of the project in stages. There are a range of viable options for each stage from a traditional design, tender build programme through to early contractor involvement.

Common to both is the need for a credible project director, architectural practice and construction company who have demonstrated experience and success in designing and delivering public building projects. The following table sets outs an initial assessment of the likely procurement methodologies that will be explored in the Detailed Business Case.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form of procurement</th>
<th>Potentially suitable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional design, tender, build</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design and build</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Package based</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct managed</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliance</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public private partnership</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early contractor involvement</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panel of suppliers</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The procurement methodology will be examined through the detailed business case analysis. The form of financing will also be a factor in this consideration.

**Owning and Financing the Project**

There are two predominant ownership forms that can be considered, with subsequent implications regarding the form of financing:

- Freehold (Fee Simple)
- Leasehold

Between these are hybrid options, such as retention of land ownership, fit out or building services, part ownership of a property-owning company and buy-back provisions. All of these commit council to a level of partnering with a commercial entity (Public Private Partnerships).

Hybrid options mitigate certain risks but result in a new level of complexity and interdependence with their own risk profiles. One hybrid option is for a Council Owned Organisation (COO) to own some or all of the development thereby retaining effective control and mitigating risks associated with leasehold tenure.

Transitional ownership mechanisms (e.g. BOOT’s – Build, Own, Occupy & Transfer), are designed to manage risk and taxation issues through the design and construction phases of a project. Ownership reverts to freehold, leasehold or a hybrid form of tenure, mentioned above.

All of the above leasehold or hybrid ownership structures vary considerably depending on the legal, tax and business circumstances of the non-council entity – until these are confirmed specific benefits or risks to council are difficult to assess. In generic terms leasehold tenure
spreads the capital cost over multiple generations, avoiding a spike in rates funded expenditure, but limits the level of control council has over its future service delivery options, operational costs and negates potential asset appreciation.

Freehold ownership by council provides more ability to respond to functional obsolescence, growth and other organisational changes with confidence and speed. It also utilises councils lower cost of capital, provides the most cost-effective provision of accommodation over time and provides an opportunity for the city to benefit from future property appreciation. Freehold ownership also supports the sense of community ownership that may be considered desirable.

With existing funding policy requirements, however, freehold ownership places a significant portion of the project cost on the current generation of ratepayers. By comparison leasehold tenure results in lower initial impact on rates but exposes council to more risks and higher cost over time. To mitigate these risks, hybrid ownership structures are an option whereby council retains some level of ownership or control. The most optimal of these is that of a Council Owned Organisation becoming the landlord, avoiding most identified risks and optimising ratepayer funds.

However, with the lease options there are limited buildings of the size required, and the council could become a ‘captured’ lease, with limited options should the facility be no longer the best option for the organisation.

Any of the ownership options, other than freehold, requires specialist legal advice before entering into any agreements due to the complexity of tax, contractual and LGA implications. As such, is recommended detailed consideration be given to ownership and financing approaches as part of the Detailed Business Case.
Outlining the Financial Case

The purpose of this section is to set out the indicative financial implications of the preferred way forward.

The detailed analysis of the Financial Case takes place at the Detailed Business Case stage. This part of the Financial Case provides assurance that the shortlisted options, with particular focus on the preferred way forward, are affordable to the organisation, taking into account all potential funding sources.

This section addresses three key questions

- What is the expected cost of providing civic accommodation out to 2048?
- Is there sufficient budget provided in the Long-Term Plan to deliver the project?
- What is the best method of financing the project?

Long-Term Plan Budgets for Civic Accommodation

The table below shows the allowances made in the Long-Term Plan (2018-2028) and 30 Year Infrastructure strategy for civic accommodation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table Eighteen: Long-Term Plan budgets ($2018)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Service Centre Alterations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Library Extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Service Centre Extension</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impact on the Financial Statements

Based on current estimates, the anticipated cash flows for the investment proposal until 2048 are set out in the table below. The assumptions made in determining these initial estimates are included as Appendix D, however these forecasts should not be used for accurate budgeting purposes.

The table shows that additional funding should be set aside over existing budgets in the LTP/Infrastructure Strategy:

- $2.7 million in FY 2020 for refurbishment

No other change to budgets is recommended with a Detailed Business Case to be done in future to size and develop suitable budget for extension in approximately 2029.
Table Nineteen: Forecast Cashflow 2020-2048

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preferred Way Forward</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2027</th>
<th>2028</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>6,700,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20,749,694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating</td>
<td>695,221</td>
<td>761,288</td>
<td>830,694</td>
<td>903,579</td>
<td>980,089</td>
<td>1,060,377</td>
<td>1,144,600</td>
<td>1,232,921</td>
<td>1,325,512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7,395,221</td>
<td>761,288</td>
<td>830,694</td>
<td>903,579</td>
<td>980,089</td>
<td>1,060,377</td>
<td>1,144,600</td>
<td>1,232,921</td>
<td>22,075,206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funded by:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Opex budget</td>
<td>806,880</td>
<td>831,086</td>
<td>856,019</td>
<td>881,700</td>
<td>908,151</td>
<td>935,395</td>
<td>963,457</td>
<td>992,361</td>
<td>1,022,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Capital</td>
<td>3,900,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra Capital</td>
<td>2,800,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-2,052,168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2029</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>2031</th>
<th>2032</th>
<th>2033</th>
<th>2034</th>
<th>2035</th>
<th>2036</th>
<th>2037</th>
<th>2038</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating</td>
<td>1,628,542</td>
<td>984,746</td>
<td>1,014,288</td>
<td>1,044,717</td>
<td>1,076,058</td>
<td>1,108,340</td>
<td>1,141,590</td>
<td>1,175,838</td>
<td>1,211,113</td>
<td>1,247,447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,628,542</td>
<td>984,746</td>
<td>1,014,288</td>
<td>1,044,717</td>
<td>1,076,058</td>
<td>1,108,340</td>
<td>1,141,590</td>
<td>1,175,838</td>
<td>1,211,113</td>
<td>1,247,447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funded by:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Opex budget</td>
<td>1,052,795</td>
<td>1,084,379</td>
<td>1,116,911</td>
<td>1,150,418</td>
<td>1,184,930</td>
<td>1,220,478</td>
<td>1,257,093</td>
<td>1,294,806</td>
<td>1,333,650</td>
<td>1,373,659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Capital</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra Capital</td>
<td>2,800,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2039</th>
<th>2040</th>
<th>2041</th>
<th>2042</th>
<th>2043</th>
<th>2044</th>
<th>2045</th>
<th>2046</th>
<th>2047</th>
<th>2048</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating</td>
<td>1,284,870</td>
<td>1,323,416</td>
<td>1,363,119</td>
<td>1,404,012</td>
<td>1,446,132</td>
<td>1,489,516</td>
<td>1,534,220</td>
<td>1,580,228</td>
<td>1,627,635</td>
<td>1,676,464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,284,870</td>
<td>1,323,416</td>
<td>1,363,119</td>
<td>1,404,012</td>
<td>1,446,132</td>
<td>1,489,516</td>
<td>1,534,220</td>
<td>1,580,228</td>
<td>1,627,635</td>
<td>1,676,464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funded by:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Opex budget</td>
<td>1,414,869</td>
<td>1,457,315</td>
<td>1,501,034</td>
<td>1,546,066</td>
<td>1,592,447</td>
<td>1,640,221</td>
<td>1,689,428</td>
<td>1,740,110</td>
<td>1,792,314</td>
<td>1,846,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Capital</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra Capital</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12 Budget in 30 yr Infrastructure strategy is $18 million in 2018 money, escalated $22.8 million due to inflation. Detailed Business Case to be done in future to size and develop suitable budget for extension. Rough order costs indicate that existing budget likely to be adequate.
Outlining the Management Case

The Management Case addresses the achievability of the proposal and planning arrangements required to both ensure successful delivery and to manage project risks. At this stage of the project life cycle, this sets out the project governance structure and broad milestones for delivery of the project, together with the risk and stakeholder management approaches to be followed.

Project Governance and Reporting

The following governance and reporting structure proposed for the project.

Outline Project Plan

The key aspects of the project plan are shown in the following table.

Table Twenty: Project milestones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed key milestones</th>
<th>Estimated timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masterplan and detailed business case</td>
<td>End 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed Design for Stage One</td>
<td>End 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Stage One</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Communications and Stakeholder Management

A detailed communications and engagement strategy will be prepared that will focus on staff, council, stakeholders and the wider community.

Risk Management and Project Assurance

The project manager shall hold the risk register and be supported by monthly all team formal risk identification meetings and weekly risk review. All mitigation measures will be included in the weekly action register.

This investment proposal has been assessed as medium risk using the State Services Commission (SSC) Gateway Risk Profile Assessment tool. On the basis of this risk assessment, it is recommended that a Formal Project Assurance process is put in place, including:

- Monthly rolling Interdependent Project Health reviews
- Annual formal Independent Quality Assurance reviews
Appendices
## Appendix A – Design Principles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Principle</th>
<th>Initiative &amp; Intention – rationale and desired outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DP1: Safe and secure work environment - which maintains comfort for wellbeing for all employees and visitors, including clients and contractors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- maintains accessibility: considering the needs of people with disabilities in the design, circulation and fit-out of the working environment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Security: Once security access has been granted the open-plan working environment provides easy access to most areas within the premises.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Bespoke design: Special provisions for specific tasks, as required, will optimise level of services and require, in certain instances, bespoke solutions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP2: A range of workplace settings - shared, collaborative, communal spaces with alternate quiet zones used for multiple purposes - alongside normal work settings – this permits choice.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Variety and choice: providing shared collaborative areas and quiet spaces to promote best performance and delivery of service.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Shared space: Staff groups (teams) no longer have ‘exclusive’ ownership of particular spaces because such facilities are now situated in a more communal space that is to be shared by multiple teams or organisations; this enables improved communications.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Creation of various communal and collaborative ‘hub’ spaces that can be used for multiple purposes &amp; unplanned staff interactions within the working environment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Staff use small non-bookable spaces that are available, if required, to work for concentrated periods of time, meet with their boss or other staff for one-on-one conversations and to make private or lengthy phone calls so not to distract other staff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DP3: An adaptable open-plan working environment
- **An open plan layout** which allows for the diversity and identity of individuals and teams to be retained.

- **Efficient space utilisation** promoting mobility and accessibility, flexibility of use and adaptability for **team agility**, ease in reconfiguring for team needs.

- Reduce areas of confined space, unnecessary walls or enclosed offices to minimise staff becoming unintentionally isolated.

- Provide communal activity areas adjacent to team neighbourhoods reflecting the value of diversity and distinct team identities.

- Teams blend together with less physical separation, such as screens or walls. Instead, specific work requirements dictate the delineation of space, so there are specific spaces for high-concentration work and obvious collaborative ‘hub’ spaces where staff can interact and socialise with ease.

- Check proximity to alternate options available for high concentration work, minimising office distraction.

- Where appropriate managers and team leaders are encouraged to move into open plan with their teams. This improves efficiency of space utilisation and reinforces principles of open egalitarian management culture.

DP4: Consistent & Fair Design – increase of familiarity and equality of workspace.
- more navigable office space.

- Teams should be formed around the requirements of projects and activities, not pods of desks or confined space.

- A consistent, generic workplace design enables staff to adjust and move to a different space more quickly and reduces the cost and time involved in the shift.

- In general, when staff need to move the furniture will stay in place.

- Spatial allowances for staff and environmental conditions will be consistent where possible and where it is appropriate for the type of work undertaken.

- There is need for layouts to be relatively consistent to maximise the efficiency of a floor plan while considering and allowing for the other design guidelines referred to here.
DP5: Effective utilisation of technology – to augment and enable effective workspaces through use of modern, mobile technologies.

- Staff need the right tools in order to do their jobs effectively. The use of new technologies should be encouraged wherever practical and achievable.

- This may include training staff in the effective use of new technologies, and organisations will need to provide budget and time for staff to be adequately trained in the use of any appropriate new technologies.

- E.g. the building inspectorate able to work remotely and reduce travel time between sites and RSC base.

DP6: Efficient and effective space utilisation

- Space-less growth reducing unnecessary outlay or additional costs, the ability to effect business more wisely with what one already has.

- Flexibility of design with simplified layouts permit organisations to expand/contract more effortlessly to reduce unnecessary costs associated with relocations, leases, down-time shifting.

- Acquisition of modular office furniture provides efficiencies reconfiguring team workplace requirements.
Appendix B – Analysis of Longlisted Dimensions
APPENDIX B.1 – Analysis of size and scale dimension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIZE AND SCALE</th>
<th>Option</th>
<th>150 staff</th>
<th>240 staff</th>
<th>290 staff</th>
<th>390 staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investment Objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not meeting</td>
<td>Not meeting</td>
<td>Partially meeting</td>
<td>Fully meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To provide office space for a minimum of 290, and up to 391 staff by 2048 at or below the average cost across the public sector.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not meeting</td>
<td>Not meeting</td>
<td>Partially meeting</td>
<td>Fully meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To provide flexible office space for all staff by 2029 that meets the design principles, government guidance and enables new technology to be incorporated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not meeting</td>
<td>Partially meeting</td>
<td>Fully meeting</td>
<td>Fully meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A minimum of 35% of the office able to be adapted for alternative uses if the organisation size changes after 2029.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not able to be assessed against this dimension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To improve the pedestrian connectivity between High Street and Victoria Park by 2029.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not able to be assessed against this dimension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Critical Success Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Meets business needs of council</th>
<th>Strategic fit</th>
<th>Value for money</th>
<th>Affordability</th>
<th>Achievability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not meeting</td>
<td>Not meeting</td>
<td>Fully meeting</td>
<td>Fully meeting</td>
<td>Fully meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not meeting</td>
<td>Not meeting</td>
<td>Fully meeting</td>
<td>Fully meeting</td>
<td>Fully meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not meeting</td>
<td>Not meeting</td>
<td>Fully meeting</td>
<td>Fully meeting</td>
<td>Fully meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fully meeting</td>
<td>Fully meeting</td>
<td>Fully meeting</td>
<td>Fully meeting</td>
<td>Fully meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fully meeting</td>
<td>Fully meeting</td>
<td>Fully meeting</td>
<td>Fully meeting</td>
<td>Fully meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Progress through to shortlist | NO | NO | YES | YES |
## APPENDIX B.2 – Analysis of configuration dimension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONFIGURATION</th>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Single building</th>
<th>Multiple buildings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investment Objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To provide office space for a minimum of 290, and up to 391 staff by 2048 at or below the average cost across the public sector.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fully meeting</td>
<td>Partially meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To provide flexible office space for all staff by 2029 that meets the design principles, government guidance and enables new technology to be incorporated.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fully meeting</td>
<td>Not meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A minimum of 35% of the office able to be adapted for alternative uses if the organisation size changes after 2029.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fully meeting</td>
<td>Fully meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To improve the pedestrian connectivity between High Street and Victoria Park by 2029.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not able to be assessed against this dimension</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Success Factors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets business needs of council</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fully meeting</td>
<td>Not meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic fit</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fully meeting</td>
<td>Partially meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value for money</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fully meeting</td>
<td>Fully meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordability</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fully meeting</td>
<td>Fully meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievability</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fully meeting</td>
<td>Fully meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress through to shortlist</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B.3 – Analysis of location dimension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Current Site</th>
<th>Rangiora CBD</th>
<th>Rangiora or Kaiapoi Mixed Use or business zones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investment Objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To provide office space for a minimum of 290, and up to 391 staff by 2048 at or below the average cost across the public sector.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fully meeting</td>
<td>Partially meeting</td>
<td>Fully meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To provide flexible office space for all staff by 2029 that meets the design principles, government guidance and enables new technology to be incorporated.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fully meeting</td>
<td>Fully meeting</td>
<td>Fully meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A minimum of 35% of the office able to be adapted for alternative uses if the organisation size changes after 2029.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fully meeting</td>
<td>Fully meeting</td>
<td>Fully meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To improve the pedestrian connectivity between High Street and Victoria Park by 2029.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fully meeting</td>
<td>Partially meeting</td>
<td>Partially meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Success Factors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets business needs of council</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fully meeting</td>
<td>Fully meeting</td>
<td>Partially meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic fit</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fully meeting</td>
<td>Fully meeting</td>
<td>Not meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value for money</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fully meeting</td>
<td>Fully meeting</td>
<td>Fully meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordability</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fully meeting</td>
<td>Fully meeting</td>
<td>Fully meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievability</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fully meeting</td>
<td>Fully meeting</td>
<td>Fully meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress through to shortlist</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# APPENDIX B.4 – Analysis of workspace quality dimension

## WORKSPACE QUALITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>HVAC and washroom only</th>
<th>Upgrade to modern workplace standards</th>
<th>Increase space + tech and quality upgrade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Investment Objectives

- **To provide office space for a minimum of 290, and up to 391 staff by 2048 at or below the average cost across the public sector.**
  - Not meeting
  - Fully meeting
  - Partially meeting

- **To provide flexible office space for all staff by 2029 that meets the design principles, government guidance and enables new technology to be incorporated.**
  - Not meeting
  - Partially meeting
  - Fully meeting

- **A minimum of 35% of the office able to be adapted for alternative uses if the organisation size changes after 2029.**
  - Not meeting
  - Partially meeting
  - Fully meeting

- **To improve the pedestrian connectivity between High Street and Victoria Park by 2029.**
  - Not able to be assessed against this dimension

### Critical Success Factors

- **Meets business needs of council**
  - Not meeting
  - Fully meeting
  - Fully meeting

- **Strategic fit**
  - Not meeting
  - Fully meeting
  - Partially meeting

- **Value for money**
  - Not meeting
  - Fully meeting
  - Partially meeting

- **Affordability**
  - Aligned
  - Fully meeting
  - Partially meeting

- **Achievability**
  - Aligned
  - Fully meeting
  - Partially meeting

### Progress through to shortlist

| NO | YES | YES |
## APPENDIX B.5 – Analysis of building standards dimension

### BUILDING STANDARDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Fire, electrical and security upgrades</th>
<th>Current building standards</th>
<th>Sustainability and resilience optimised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Investment Objectives</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To provide office space for a minimum of 290, and up to 391 staff by 2048 at or below the average cost across the public sector.</td>
<td>Not able to be assessed against this dimension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To provide flexible office space for all staff by 2029 that meets the design principles, government guidance and enables new technology to be incorporated.</td>
<td>Not meeting</td>
<td>Fully meeting</td>
<td>Fully meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A minimum of 35% of the office able to be adapted for alternative uses if the organisation size changes after 2029.</td>
<td>Not meeting</td>
<td>Partially meeting</td>
<td>Fully meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To improve the pedestrian connectivity between High Street and Victoria Park by 2029.</td>
<td>Not able to be assessed against this dimension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Critical Success Factors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets business needs of council</td>
<td>Not meeting</td>
<td>Fully meeting</td>
<td>Fully meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic fit</td>
<td>Not meeting</td>
<td>Fully meeting</td>
<td>Fully meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value for money</td>
<td>Aligned</td>
<td>Fully meeting</td>
<td>Fully meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordability</td>
<td>Fully meeting</td>
<td>Fully meeting</td>
<td>Partially meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievability</td>
<td>Fully meeting</td>
<td>Fully meeting</td>
<td>Fully meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Progress through to shortlist</strong></td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix C – Analysis of Shortlisted Options

## Response options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment Objectives</th>
<th>Option A</th>
<th>Option B</th>
<th>Option C</th>
<th>Option D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base Case - Minimum refurbishment and leasing of other offices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refurbishment of existing building with future expansion outside footprint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New building staged to accommodate expansion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop new building in single stage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To provide office space for a minimum of 290, and up to 391 staff by 2048 at or below the average cost across the public sector.</td>
<td>Does not meet</td>
<td>Fully meets</td>
<td>Does not meet</td>
<td>Does not meet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To provide flexible office space for all staff by 2029 that meets the design principles, government guidance and enables new technology to be incorporated.</td>
<td>Does not meet</td>
<td>Partially meets</td>
<td>Fully meets</td>
<td>Fully meets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A minimum of 35% of the office able to be adapted for alternative uses if the organisation size changes after 2029.</td>
<td>Fully meets</td>
<td>Fully meets</td>
<td>Fully meets</td>
<td>Fully meets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To improve the pedestrian connectivity between High Street and Victoria Park by 2029.</td>
<td>Does not meet</td>
<td>Partially meets</td>
<td>Fully meets</td>
<td>Fully meets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Critical Success Factors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets business needs of Council</td>
<td>Does not meet</td>
<td>Partially meets</td>
<td>Partially meets</td>
<td>Partially meets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic fit</td>
<td>Does not meet</td>
<td>Fully meets</td>
<td>Fully meets</td>
<td>Fully meets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value for money</td>
<td>Does not meet</td>
<td>Fully meets</td>
<td>Does not meet</td>
<td>Does not meet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordability</td>
<td>Does not meet</td>
<td>Fully meets</td>
<td>Partially meets</td>
<td>Does not meet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievability</td>
<td>Does not meet</td>
<td>Fully meets</td>
<td>Fully meets</td>
<td>Fully meets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Continued next page*
### Benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Option A</th>
<th>Option B</th>
<th>Option C</th>
<th>Option D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Base Case - Minimum refurbishment and leasing of other offices</strong></td>
<td>42.0%</td>
<td>88.0%</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Refurbishment of existing building with future expansion outside footprint</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New building staged to accommodate expansion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Develop new building in single stage</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Percentage of full benefit to be delivered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Option A</th>
<th>Option B</th>
<th>Option C</th>
<th>Option D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benefit 1</strong></td>
<td>Cost efficient provision of accommodation</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benefit 2</strong></td>
<td>Better service for ratepayers from a more productive, loyal and talented workforce</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benefit 3</strong></td>
<td>Flexibility in the provision of accommodation that can cost efficiently adapt to changes in size and/or ways of working</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benefit 4</strong></td>
<td>Increased foot traffic in precinct</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Risk and uncertainty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk 1</th>
<th>Med - Not finding additional suitable accommodation</th>
<th>Med - construction cost risk</th>
<th>Low - construction cost risk</th>
<th>Low - construction cost risk L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Risk 2</td>
<td>High - loss of staff to substandard workplace</td>
<td>Low - Challenge to loss of parking</td>
<td>Med - Challenge to loss of parking (if ex site) or acquisition of land (if new site)</td>
<td>Med - Challenge to loss of parking (if ex site) or acquisition of land (if new site)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk 3</td>
<td>Med - failure of building systems</td>
<td>Med - Challenge to additional spending</td>
<td>Med - Realise sale of building or opposition to demolition of existing due to carbon loss</td>
<td>High - Challenge to additional spending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Disbenefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disbenefit 1</th>
<th>High - Lost productivity</th>
<th>Low - Inflexibility in use of asset</th>
<th>Med - Loss of carbon and impact in town centre</th>
<th>Med - Loss of carbon and impact in town centre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disbenefit 2</td>
<td>Med - Inflexibility in use of asset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Interdependencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interdependency 1</th>
<th>Continuity of service</th>
<th>Library development</th>
<th>Library development</th>
<th>Library development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interdependency 2</td>
<td>Continuity of service</td>
<td>Continuity of service</td>
<td>Continuity of service</td>
<td>Continuity of service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Lower - Upper Bound</th>
<th>Lower - Upper Bound</th>
<th>Lower - Upper Bound</th>
<th>Lower - Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net Present Value (Lower - Upper Bound)</td>
<td>$32-$41 million</td>
<td>$27-$40 million</td>
<td>$46-$60 million</td>
<td>$47-$62 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Occupancy (4% NPV/average staff / 28 yrs)</td>
<td>$5,456/staff/annum</td>
<td>$3,762/staff/annum</td>
<td>$6,337/staff/annum</td>
<td>$6,518/staff/annum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Time for first stage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Range)</th>
<th>1-2 yrs</th>
<th>1-2 yrs</th>
<th>2-3 yrs</th>
<th>2-3 yrs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Ranking

| Ranking | 1-7 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
## Appendix D: Financial Model Assumptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Costs</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Build rate - standard</td>
<td>$6,500.00&lt;sup&gt;13&lt;/sup&gt; $/m&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build rate - high</td>
<td>$7,500.00 $/m&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Floor Areas</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average space per person – existing offices</td>
<td>16 m&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average space per person – new/refurb offices</td>
<td>14 m&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council chambers and public entrance</td>
<td>250 m&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor gross to net floor area</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing RSC (gross) – c147 people</td>
<td>2,800 m&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley (gross) – c 30 people</td>
<td>650 m&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers (gross) – c 55 people</td>
<td>1000 m&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operational Costs</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opex RSC - existing</td>
<td>200 $/m&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opex New Build and refurbished - standard</td>
<td>150 $/m&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opex New Build – high performance</td>
<td>120 $/m&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opex incl lease satellite offices</td>
<td>400 $/m&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capital values</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demolition of RSC</td>
<td>$1,000,000&lt;sup&gt;14&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale of ex RSC building</td>
<td>$5,130,000&lt;sup&gt;15&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale of Ashley building</td>
<td>$1,130,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land acquisition/Land value Blake St</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Miscellaneous</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction Cost Index and inflation on Opex</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opex budget ($2021)</td>
<td>$806,880</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>13</sup> Rawlinsons  
<sup>14</sup> Estimate  
<sup>15</sup> Based on NLA of 2,500m<sup>2</sup> @$175/m<sup>2</sup> and Cap Rate of 8%. Land value is $3.02 million
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vision
• A workplace environment which is safe, secure and maintains comfort for staff well-being

• A range of workplace settings i.e. shared, collaborative, communal spaces with alternate quiet zones used for multiple purposes - alongside normal work settings

• An adaptable open-plan working environment and distinct team identities while remaining agile to changing needs

• Consistent & fair design, that increases the familiarity and equality of workspace - more navigable

• Effective utilisation of technology to augment & enable effective workspaces through use of modern, mobile technologies

• effective space utilisation, space-less growth reducing unnecessary outlay or additional costs, the ability to effect business more wisely with what one already has
concept
Wider context

Waimakariri District Council serves a wide platform of community stretching from the sea to the Southern Alps, and attends to a diverse mix of rural and urban residents. Since its establishment as a district in 1989, it has seen significant growth partly as a result of residential shift into regions surrounding Christchurch city after the 2010-2011 Canterbury earthquake sequence.

Centrally sited on the High Street, the Rangiora Services Centre acts as the seat for the Waimakariri District Council. Adjacent to this is the Rangiora Library, which sits to the South East, completes the civic hub of the township.
SITE & CONTEXT
EXISTING SITE PLAN

Scale 1:700 at A3

EXISTING SITE PLAN:
- Trees
- Existing library
- Rangiora Service Centre
- Pedestrian connection / lane
- Entrance
- High quality landscape edges
- Lesser quality built edges and open space
- Portacom units

Legend:
- Trees
- Existing library
- Rangiora Service Centre
- Pedestrian connection / lane
- Entrance
- High quality landscape edges
- Lesser quality built edges and open space
- Portacom units

High Street
Victoria Park
Library
Portacom units
**FUTURE EXTENSION**

**SITE PLAN**

- Scale 1:700 at A3
- Summer sun
- Winter sun

- **Trees**
- **Existing library**
- **Future library & service centre extension**
- **Rangiora Service Centre**
- **Connection between existing buildings and future extension**
- **Pedestrian connection / lane**
- **Visual connections**
- **High quality landscape edges**
- **Lesser quality built edges and**

---

**HIGH STREET**

- **VICTORIA PARK**

- **dreen open space L significant trees**

- **Existing library**

- **Future library & service centre extension**

- **Rangiora Service Centre**

- **Connection between existing buildings and future extension**

- **Pedestrian connection / lane**

- **Visual connections**

- **High quality landscape edges**

- **Lesser quality built edges and**
EXISTING PLAN
GROUND FLOOR

existing customer service & entrances
- uninviting
- confusing public interface with staff
- no accessible counter
- two entrances are disconnected
- lack of way finding
- lack of space planning, too many wasted spaces

Existing capacity
- Open plan: 67
- Enclosed: 11
- Total: 78

Meetings / collaboration
- Enclosed meeting: 7
- Open collaboration: 0
- Flexible workbench: 0

Scale 1:200 at A3
EXISTING PLAN
FIRST FLOOR

Scale 1:200 at A3

Existing capacity
- Open plan: 56
- Enclosed: 13
- Total: 69

Meetings / collaboration
- Enclosed meeting: 1
- Open collaboration: 0
- Flexible workbench: 0

existing workplace
- very limited access to day light
- cluttered & space not organised
- unnecessary circulation spaces & corridors
- poor air quality
- hard to navigate
- no space for staff and teams to collaborate or socialise
PROPOSED LAYOUT
GROUND FLOOR

Scale 1:200 at A3

PROPOSED CAPACITY
Workstation Size: 1800x800
- Open plan: 74
- Enclosed: 10
- Hot desk: 8
Total: 92

Meetings / collaboration
- Enclosed meeting: 8
- Open collaboration: 10
- Flexible workbench: 2
PROPOSED PLAN
FIRST FLOOR

Scale 1:200 at A3

- Primary Horizontal Circulation
- Secondary Horizontal Circulation
- Vertical Circulation - Lifts
- Vertical Circulation - Stairs

Workplace
Meeting/Collaboration
WC
Utility & Amenity
Kitchen
Customer Services

Future Extension
**PROPOSED LAYOUT**

**FIRST FLOOR**

- **open plan workspace**
- **hot desk / flexible work bench**
- **open collaboration**
- **meeting / collaboration**
- **print / resource**
- **social / kitchen**
- **booth collaboration**

### PROPOSED CAPACITY

**Workstation Size: 1900x800**

- Open plan: 94
- Enclosed: 8
- Hot desk: 16

**Total: 118**

**Meetings / collaboration**

- Enclosed meeting: 4
- Open collaboration: 12
- Flexible workbench: 2 (10-12 people)

**Scale 1:200 at A3**
WORKSPACE
MEETING / INDIVIDUAL SPACES

Booth
Collaborations / meetings / small group presentations / group video conference
- Capacity: 7-8 people
- Furniture: built in booth seating, table, ottomans
- Technology: power + data, screen, video conference devices

Small / Medium sized meeting
Formal / informal meetings / group video conference
- Capacity: 3-4 people
- Furniture: Table + Chairs
- Technology: power + data, screen, video conference devices

Video conference / screen focused group work
Group video conference / collaboration work with screen focused / informal presentation
- Capacity: 4-6 people
- Furniture: Table + chair
- Technology: power + data, screen, video conference devices

Focus
Focus / quiet concentration work / individual zoom
- Capacity: 1 person
- Furniture: Table + chair
- Technology: power + data, small screen or laptop

Semi Focus
Focus work with some connection to the main workspace
- Capacity: 2 people
- Furniture: Table or leaner, chair or stool, removable acoustic screen
- Technology: power + data

Breakout / phone calls
Informal catchups / space for phone calls, breakout space / rest
- Capacity: 1-2 people
- Furniture: Table + soft chair
- Technology: power + data
INITIAL PROPOSAL
SECTIONS

Scale 1:200 at A3
INITIAL PROPOSAL
SECTIONS

Scale 1:200 at A3

1 : 100 @ A1 - Half Scale @A3

Existing Sections

A3.0.00

Rangiora SC
215 High Street,
Rangiora

A3.1.00-

natural light

workplace

natural light

walkway

meet
courtesy

proposed long section B

existing long section B

Forcourt

Scale 1:200 at A3
base build
BASE BUILD:
GROUND FLOOR

101 workstations including 7 enclosed hot desks
1110m²
Scale 1:200 at A3
OPTIONS
SCOPE SUMMARY

CONCEPT:
CIRCA $6.7 MILLION

- new roof cladding
- structural upgrade
- areas
- refurbishment to entire ground and
- refurbishment of toilet and staffroom amenities
- refurbishment to foyer
- relocation of chambers, meeting and

BASE BUILD:
CIRCA $5.3 MILLION

- new roof cladding
- structural upgrade
- roof areas
- partial refurbishment to ground
1. SUMMARY

1.1 This report seeks an increase to the ANZAC Day Services Operational Costs of the Governance Budget.

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 190516069154.

(b) Approves the increased allocation of $12,000 to GL10.135.343.2465 (from $5,500 to $17,500) of the ANZAC Day Services Operational Budget.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1 The ANZAC Day Services budget covers funding for advertising of services, wreaths, RSA service sheets and some acoustics equipment hire for ANZAC Day services throughout the district. The budget also funds wreaths laid at other memorial services such as Passchendaele Battle in October and the Merchant Seamen Commemoration. The ANZAC Services sees the Council and Community Boards lay over 25 wreaths across the district on behalf of the citizens of the district and two wreaths on behalf of the people of Belgium. The hired sound equipment is organised directly through the organising RSA, who pass the account through to the Council for payment. This has been a long-standing arrangement.

3.2 Unfortunately it was only after the budget assessments internal work and the draft Annual Plan document had been released to public consultation, it was discovered that the Roading Unit were also using the ANZAC budget for expenses related to Traffic Management Plans for ANZAC Day services. It was mutually agreed between the department managers that the TMP work specifically remain with the Governance/ANZAC budget rather than a roading unit budget.

4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

4.1 The Roading Unit undertake the Traffic Management Plans (TMP), on behalf of the RSA’s for the Kaiapoi, Rangiora and Cust ANZAC Day services. The TMP cost associated for the 2019 ANZAC Day Services was $12,000.
4.2. The current ANZAC (Commemorative) Day budget is adequate for aspects outlined in para 3.1, however no budget has been allocated for the TMP work. The Roading Unit does not hold a budget to cover the TMP work for the commemorative services.

4.3. Staff seek an increase in the budget of $12,000 (from $5,500 to $17,500) of the ANZAC Day Services Operational Budget, to adequately cover associates TMP costs.

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

5. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

5.1. **Groups and Organisations**

The commemorative services, such as the Returned Services Association (RSA) work with the Council to ensure successful events, which are accessible to the community. The RSA do not have funding available for costs associated with Traffic Management Plans.

5.2. **Wider Community**

There is an expectation from the community that commemorative services such as ANZAC are held in the District. The community likely consider it part of the Council’s civic duty that ANZAC Day is respected and honoured in the District.

The Council work with the local RSA representatives to ensure a safe and accessible event.

6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**

There is no budget to cover costs associated with Traffic Management Plan for commemorative events within the District. The rate impact of the proposed budget increase is 0.02%.

6.2. **Community Implications**

As outlined in para 5.

6.3. **Risk Management**

It is imperative that Traffic Management Plans are certified by the authorised personnel and must occur before any event that requires road closures and modifications. Events such as ANZAC Day parades cannot occur unless appropriate TMP’s are assessed and authorised by the Council.

6.4. **Health and Safety**

As above. Failure to authorised TMP’s will result in commemorative parades not occurring or place the safety of the public at risk.

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

There is a safe environment for all.
The community’s cultures, arts and heritage are conserved and celebrated.

7.4. Delegations

The Council has the delegation to set the budgets.

Sarah Nichols
Governance Manager
1. **SUMMARY**

This report contains a list of projects and capital works which have either not commenced or will not be completed this financial year. Approval is required to include these projects into the 2019-20 Annual Plan. The cost of completing the projects listed will be met either by credit balances carried forward, reserve fund transfers or by loan funding.

It is intended that the budget carryovers be approved as part of the 2019-20 Annual Plan process, but the actual carryover will be made after the 30 June 2019 accounts have been completed and the actual expenditure situation for each project is known.

**Attachments:**

i. Schedule of Proposed Carryovers from 2018-19 to 2019-20 (190513067281)

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 190513067283.

(b) **Adopts** the carryovers as listed (190513067281) for inclusion in the 2019-20 Annual Plan.

(c) **Notes** the rate effect of the carryovers is 0.13% between years. This is adjusted by effectively “smoothing” the rate effect between these years.

3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1 Not applicable

4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1. This report identifies the projects included in the 2018-19 budget which will not be completed by 30 June 2019.

Remarks have been provided for each project explaining the reason why the carryover has been requested.

4.2. Rates may be affected in outer years to a minor extent, due to the expenditure relating to loan repayments. The cost of completing the projects listed will be met either by credit balances carried forward, reserve fund transfers or by loan funding.
4.3. A project is normally capitalised when it is fully completed. Therefore in most cases the full budget needs to be carried over. Projects that will be partially capitalised as at 30 June 2019 will only have unspent portion carried over. If a project is overspent but still continues into the next financial year, only the Council approved budget will be carried over. Capital projects that have already been included/re-budgeted in the 2019-20 Annual Plan will not be included on the carry over list.

4.4. Operational expenditure will only be carried over if there is sufficient operational expenditure surplus in the account. If there is not, a separate report is required to be approved by Council. The carry over requirements for operational budgets this year are $332,670 in total. $45,000 is from Rangiora, Kaiapoi and Woodend Waters for Backflow maintenance, $3,070 is from the Community Boards Discretionary Grants, $58,825 is from Recreation for the Asbestos Investigations, $18,000 is from Information Services for the GIS Operations and $207,770 is from District Development for Development Planning Unit Operations.

4.5. Council’s projected spend on capital (excluding projects carried over from last year) as at 30 June 2019 is expected to be over $49.0m.

4.6. Additional carryovers requested (capital projects) for the current year are summarised below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Budget for Projects to carryover $mill</th>
<th>Anticipated expenditure to 30 June 2019 $mill</th>
<th>Anticipated capitalised portion $mill</th>
<th>Unspent portion $mill</th>
<th>Amount to be carried over $mill</th>
<th>Number of Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roading</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earthquake</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.7. All of the Roading carryovers are either sub-divisional or growth related projects which do not effect rates.

4.8. The Draft Annual Plan already contained $20.2m worth of carryovers.

- Water - $1.5m
- Wastewater - $1.0m
- Drainage - $1.7m
- Roading - $3.3m
- Recreation - $6.0m
- Earthquake - $4.3m
- Others - $2.3m
• Total - $20.2m

4.9. Therefore, the $20.2m worth of carryovers plus the additional $9.9m of carryovers less the $2.3m of carryovers reduced/double counted provides a combined total of carryovers from 2018-19 into 2019-20 worth $27.8m.

4.10. The unspent portion of the combined total of carryovers from 2018-19 into 2019-20 is $18.6m.

4.11. Significant carryovers of each category are summarised below:

Capital budget

4.11.1. Water

Kaiapoi – Darnley & Peraki St Reservoir Strengthening & Sealing - **Budget $0.4m**  
**Anticipated Expenditure $0.2m**
Construction planned from May to October 2019. Forecast under-spend of budget due to price being less than engineer’s estimate, and contractor starting slightly later than originally anticipated.

Garrymere New Source - **Budget $0.3m**  
**Anticipated Expenditure $0.0m**
Preliminary design and consultation has been carried out. More work is required with advisory groups to confirm strategy for completing project before detailed design can commence. Currently waiting on outcome of Annual Plan consultation on funding options. $100k into 2019/20, $200k into 2020/21.

4.11.2. Wastewater

Kaiapoi - Upgrade Charles Street Rising Main - **Budget $0.9m**  
**Anticipated Expenditure $0.1m**
Tendering in May. Construction scheduled to start in October 2019.

4.11.3. Drainage

Rangiora - Land Purchase Pond 5, Culverts, Swales - **Budget $2.3m**  
**Anticipated Expenditure $1.4m**
Delayed as Developer led and they haven’t progressed as far as expected - $565k for land, and $290k for reticulation in next stage, rest to be capitalised.

Kaiapoi – Parnhams Drain PS Upgrade & Access - **Budget $0.6m**  
**Anticipated Expenditure $0.1m**
Delays due to complexity related to construction. Works will be tendered before end of FY.

4.11.4. Roading

West Kaiapoi Silverstream New Arterial Rd - **Budget $1.3m**  
**Anticipated Expenditure $0.3m**
Final fencing work, landscaping and actions from Safety Audit to be completed.

West Rangiora Outline Development Plan - **Budget $0.5m**  
**Anticipated Expenditure $0.0m**
Received price from City Care to include within existing contract. Rates received too high to proceed, will need to go to open tender.

Southbrook Outline Development Plan - **Budget $0.4m**  
**Anticipated Expenditure $0.4m**
Flaxton Road Upgrade including walking and cycling linkages. Progress delayed due to resourcing.

4.11.5. Recreation
Court Facilities - *Budget $4.5m Anticipated Expenditure $1.9m*

Rangiora Tennis Centre Carpark - *Budget $0.3m Anticipated Expenditure $0.0m*
Budget has been reallocated for Tennis Centre Grant in 2019/20.

4.11.6. Earthquake
Kaiapoi Town Centre Renewal - *Budget $1.5m Anticipated Expenditure $0.1m*
Allowance made post-earthquake. Most planned projects have been completed. However, carry-over the remainder for future works (not yet specified).

Rangiora Car Park Building – *Budget $1.6m Anticipated Expenditure $0.1m*
Purchase for the last parcel of land is awaiting final negotiations around access rights.

Redzone Sports Field Kaiapoi East – *Budget $1.7m Anticipated Expenditure $2.0m*
Design underway and ongoing. Bulk earthworks and Sports turf establishment are well underway. Turf establishment current risk with contamination – possible large project delay.

4.11.7. Property
Upgrade of Rangiora Service Centre - *Budget $2.3m Anticipated Expenditure $0.1m*
Construction to begin February 2020.

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

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS
5.1. Groups and Organisations
Not applicable

5.2. Wider Community
All projects were included in the 2018-28 Long Term Plan which was consulted with the community

6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS
6.1. Financial Implications
The Annual Plan for 2019-20 will be adjusted to include the approved carryovers.

The loan adjustments to previous carryovers in the Draft Annual Plan plus the additional carryovers requested will have the effect of decreasing the rates by 0.13% in 2019/20.

Risks arise with the delay or non-completion of projects with the two main consequences being:

- Necessary work not being completed could result in not achieving the level of service.
- Escalation of prices due to the current economic environment.
6.1.1. For each project the Council may approve that the project is carried over to the 2019-20 Annual Plan.

OR

6.1.2. The Council may amend the work.

OR

6.1.3. The Council may decide not to proceed with the particular project.

Rates may be affected in outer years to a minor extent, due to the expenditure relating to loan repayments. The cost of completing the projects listed will be met either by credit balances carried forward, reserve fund transfers or by loan funding.

6.2. **Community Implications**

Not applicable

6.3. **Risk Management**

Risk is associated with the delay of projects with the main consequences being:

- Necessary work not being completed could result in not achieving levels of service.
- Price fluctuations due to the current economic environment.
- Earthquake recovery – availability and amount of government funding and insurance recoveries for some assets.
- Further costs which may be incurred in future earthquakes e.g. Council self-insures bridges in conjunction with NZTA funding.

6.4. **Health and Safety**

For all projects with physical works, the Council’s Health and Safety policies must be followed.

7. **CONTEXT**

7.1. **Policy**

This matter is a matter of significance in terms of the Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy as the cost of some projects, or in total, exceed $1m, however the original approval was done in conjunction to a special consultative procedure and is requested for approval due to the timing of the projects. The expected completion dates (if known) are provided on the schedule attached.

7.2. **Legislation**


7.3. **Community Outcomes**

The Annual Plan process contributes to the following community outcomes:

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

- The Council makes information about its plans and activities readily available.
- The Council takes account of the views across the community including mana whenua.”
7.4. **Delegations**

The Council must adopt its Annual Plan by 30 June 2019.
## Carry-over schedule 2019/20

Capital work requested to be carried over from 2018/2019 to 2019/20 (capital projects that had been re-budgeted in 2019/2020 will not be listed on this carry over report)

### Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Category (Current Year or Multi-Year or Developer Driven)</th>
<th>Full year revised budget</th>
<th>Anticipated Expenditure to date as at 31 Mar 19</th>
<th>Anticipated Capitalisation</th>
<th>Projected Completion Date (FY20)</th>
<th>Unspent</th>
<th>Amount to be carried over</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ROARING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSG replacement</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>258,396</td>
<td>190,010</td>
<td>90,400</td>
<td>67,806</td>
<td>258,396</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting replacement</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>410,123</td>
<td>64,162</td>
<td>216,040</td>
<td>149,058</td>
<td>194,063</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNDERPOLISHED</strong></td>
<td>Land Purchases - Improved LSG</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>Not a project. Budget to be allocated to projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reading District Development</strong></td>
<td>West Kaipori Silverstream New Arterial Rd - Multi</td>
<td>681,500</td>
<td>207,489</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>431,500</td>
<td>431,500</td>
<td>Final fencing work, landscaping &amp; actions from Safety Audit to be completed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking and Cycling Programme 2018</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>66,586</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>Preliminary investigation only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kangaro Park &amp; Ride</td>
<td>Multi</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>4,625</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>Preliminary investigation only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Board Complete Funded Projects</td>
<td>Multi</td>
<td>644,000</td>
<td>290,349</td>
<td>353,600</td>
<td>353,600</td>
<td>290,400</td>
<td>290,400</td>
<td>Final fencing work, landscaping &amp; actions from Safety Audit to be completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WATER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WASTEWATER</strong></td>
<td>Kaiapoi Wastewater Scheme - Multi</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>54,610</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>Performance analysis completed. Assessment of upgrade options in progress. Project completion 05/05/19.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi Capacity Upgrade - LoS</td>
<td>Multi</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>10,776</td>
<td>15,723</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>34,277</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>Performance analysis completed. Assessment of upgrade options in progress. Project completion 05/05/19.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cridland St Sewer Repairs</td>
<td>Multi</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>22,442</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>Preliminary investigation only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RECREATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Drainage Scheme</td>
<td>Land Purchases - Flood, Swales</td>
<td>2,283,000</td>
<td>1,084,879</td>
<td>1,429,719</td>
<td>1,425,000</td>
<td>850,282</td>
<td>1,084,879</td>
<td>Relate to Developer led and they haven't progressed as far as expected - $550K for land, and $200K for indications in next stage, need to be capitalised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Drainage Scheme</td>
<td>Multi</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>25,777</td>
<td>25,777</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>Project designed, construction already budgeted for next year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohoka Drainage Scheme</td>
<td>Mill &amp; Street</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>36,903</td>
<td>37,745</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>312,254</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>Relate to detailed planning, investigations to determine land area required for Stormwater Management Area. Budget in for land purchase. Land purchase this financial year not achievable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RESERVES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camping Grounds - Multi</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>Further negotiations underway but demolition likely in off season.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camping Grounds - Multi</td>
<td>230,000</td>
<td>230,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>230,000</td>
<td>230,000</td>
<td>Further negotiations required to receive asset ownership. If above ground assets retained work likely to proceed in off season</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camping Grounds Subtotal</td>
<td>245,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>255,254</td>
<td>255,254</td>
<td>Further negotiations required to receive asset ownership. If above ground assets retained work likely to proceed in off season.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Landsaping</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Ashley General Landscape Development - Multi</td>
<td>28,201</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28,201</td>
<td>28,201</td>
<td>Projects are determined by the board. These projects are approved at various times of year.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi Tushaus General Landscape Development - Multi</td>
<td>46,420</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>46,420</td>
<td>46,420</td>
<td>Projects are determined by the board. These projects are approved at various times of year.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Carry-over schedule 2019/20

Capital work requested to be carried over from 2018/2019 to 2019/2020 (capital projects that had been re-budgeted in 2019/2020 will not be listed on this carry over report)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Category (Current or Multi-Year or Developer Driven)</th>
<th>Full year revised budget</th>
<th>Actual Expenditure to date as at 31 Mar 19</th>
<th>Anticipated Expenditure to 30 June 2019</th>
<th>Anticipated Capitalisation</th>
<th>Projected Completion Date (if any)</th>
<th>Actual Expenditure to date as at 31 Mar 19</th>
<th>Unspent Amount to be carried over</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Town Centre Development</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>Scope of this project not yet identified. Strategy is currently being completed and will guide priority for erosion enhancements. Staff are working with the Kaiapoi Signage Working Group to design the interpretive signage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation Signs</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Onkla General Landscape Development</td>
<td>Multi</td>
<td>1,060</td>
<td>1,008</td>
<td>938</td>
<td>Venues</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1,008</td>
<td>Projects are determined by the board. These projects are approved at various times of year.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weedon Seton General Landscape Development</td>
<td>Multi</td>
<td>2,502</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Venues</td>
<td>2,502</td>
<td>2,502</td>
<td>Projects are determined by the board. These projects are approved at various times of year.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woolshed Beach Sign</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>8,280</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,300</td>
<td>4,300</td>
<td>Design options have been completed and presented to the community. Consultation being collated currently.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Landscaping Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>124,562</td>
<td>1,060</td>
<td>11,316</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>121,816</td>
<td>12,746</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal &amp; Native Conservation</td>
<td></td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>Budget covers purchase and installation of signage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal &amp; Native Conservation Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOLD WASTE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Disposal Pit Upgrade &amp; road realignment Multi</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Consultancy work; feasibility; preliminary design upgrade at SRRP/Transfer station. Contract awarded to T+T, on target to complete options assessment and progress preliminary design by 30 June.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource &amp; Recovery Area Uplifts Multi</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Consultancy work; feasibility; preliminary design upgrade at SRRP/Transfer station. Contract awarded to T+T, on target to complete options assessment and progress preliminary design by 30 June.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste Subtotal</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Projects are determined by the board. These projects are approved at various times of year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROPERTY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Refurbishment Program</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>128,000</td>
<td>5,489</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>Bathroom refurbishment and one unit refurbishment to be completed by end of the FY.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>128,000</td>
<td>5,489</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>Projects are determined by the board. These projects are approved at various times of year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VEHICLES RENEWAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor vehicle purchases</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>1,158,159</td>
<td>381,896</td>
<td>820,000</td>
<td>820,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>306,159</td>
<td>306,159</td>
<td>Vehicles sold purchased per replacement programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles Renewal Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,158,159</td>
<td>381,896</td>
<td>820,000</td>
<td>820,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>306,159</td>
<td>306,159</td>
<td>Projects are determined by the board. These projects are approved at various times of year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMPUTER SERVICES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects</td>
<td>Multi</td>
<td>1,644,983</td>
<td>972,766</td>
<td>1,305,980</td>
<td>1,305,980</td>
<td>Venues</td>
<td>196,913</td>
<td>196,913</td>
<td>Projects sub-projects with various completion dates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Services Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,644,983</td>
<td>972,766</td>
<td>1,305,980</td>
<td>1,305,980</td>
<td>Venues</td>
<td>196,913</td>
<td>196,913</td>
<td>Projects are determined by the board. These projects are approved at various times of year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GENERAL EARTHQUAKE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi Town Centre Renewal</td>
<td>Multi</td>
<td>1,478,000</td>
<td>47,899</td>
<td>47,899</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NYD</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,478,000</td>
<td>Projects are determined by the board. These plans have been completed. However carry over the remainder for future works (not yet identified).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangers Town Centre Redevelopment</td>
<td>Multi</td>
<td>374,420</td>
<td>10,375</td>
<td>10,375</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>364,045</td>
<td>374,420</td>
<td>Projects are determined by the board. These projects are approved at various times of year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Earthquake Subtotal</td>
<td>1,852,420</td>
<td>58,274</td>
<td>58,274</td>
<td>58,274</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,796,146</td>
<td>1,796,146</td>
<td>Projects are determined by the board. These projects are approved at various times of year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DRAINAGE EARTHQUAKE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Centre Linear, Kaye &amp; Evelyn Multi</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>Replacement solution now sought - Works start soon uncertain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones St Pitworks (part of Project 43) Current</td>
<td>875,000</td>
<td>95,497</td>
<td>414,000</td>
<td>414,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>461,000</td>
<td>675,000</td>
<td>Projects are determined by the board. These projects are approved at various times of year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pines Beach Stormwater Improvements Current</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>Projects are determined by the board. These projects are approved at various times of year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage Upgrade Subtotal</td>
<td>955,999</td>
<td>95,497</td>
<td>564,375</td>
<td>564,375</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>391,621</td>
<td>391,621</td>
<td>Projects are determined by the board. These projects are approved at various times of year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ROADING EARTHQUAKE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones St Round-a-bout sandy</td>
<td>Multi</td>
<td>580,000</td>
<td>75,545</td>
<td>620,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Sep 19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>560,000</td>
<td>Projects are determined by the board. These projects are approved at various times of year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roading Earthquake Subtotal</td>
<td>580,000</td>
<td>75,545</td>
<td>620,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Sep 19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>560,000</td>
<td>560,000</td>
<td>Projects are determined by the board. These projects are approved at various times of year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RED ZONE REGENERATION EARTHQUAKE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redzone Rec &amp; Eco Linkages Multi</td>
<td>254,000</td>
<td>16,723</td>
<td>207,400</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>204,000</td>
<td>204,000</td>
<td>Projects are determined by the board. These projects are approved at various times of year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redzone Rural &amp; Private Lease Plan</td>
<td>Multi</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>6,050</td>
<td>7,050</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>94,342</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>Projects are determined by the board. These projects are approved at various times of year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Zone Regeneration Earthquake Subtotal</td>
<td>404,000</td>
<td>22,773</td>
<td>214,450</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>398,342</td>
<td>304,000</td>
<td>Projects are determined by the board. These projects are approved at various times of year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Earthquake Recovery Subtotal</td>
<td>5,278,300</td>
<td>10,319</td>
<td>1,535,980</td>
<td>1,535,980</td>
<td>Venues</td>
<td>196,913</td>
<td>196,913</td>
<td>Projects are determined by the board. These projects are approved at various times of year.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL CAPITAL TO CARRY OVER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>14,886,119</td>
<td>4,023,042</td>
<td>7,149,651</td>
<td>7,149,651</td>
<td>Venues</td>
<td>5,012,096</td>
<td>5,012,096</td>
<td>Projects are determined by the board. These projects are approved at various times of year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Carry-over schedule 2019-20

Operational budget to be carried over from 2018/2019 to 2019/2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GL</th>
<th>GL description</th>
<th>Full year revised budget</th>
<th>Actual Expenditure to date as at 31 March 19</th>
<th>Anticipated Expenditure to 30 June 2019</th>
<th>Unspent</th>
<th>Amount to be carried over</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.300.684.2586</td>
<td>Maintenance - Backflow (Rangiora)</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>31,309</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>Behind schedule this FY, complete next FY.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.309.684.2586</td>
<td>Maintenance - Backflow (Kaeo)</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>10,338</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>Behind schedule this FY, complete next FY.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.302.684.2586</td>
<td>Maintenance - Backflow (Woodend)</td>
<td>25,940</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>15,940</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>Behind schedule this FY, complete next FY.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water Subtotal (Operational Budget)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>113,940</td>
<td>48,645</td>
<td>70,940</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Governance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Grants - Community Boards</td>
<td>34,400</td>
<td>23,495</td>
<td>31,326.67</td>
<td>3,070</td>
<td>3,070</td>
<td>Discretionary Grants for Community Boards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development Planning Unit</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recreation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.500.100.2519</td>
<td>Asbestos Investigations</td>
<td>117,650</td>
<td>30,554</td>
<td>58,825</td>
<td>58,830</td>
<td>58,830</td>
<td>Behind schedule this FY, complete next FY.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.118.283.2360</td>
<td>GIS Operations</td>
<td>113,340</td>
<td>24,065</td>
<td>95,340</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>To be used to fund additional resource, not able to start until July 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Earthquake</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.243.100.2570</td>
<td>Investigation into KTC mixed use business areas (MUBA)</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>This budget provides for expert advice to Council on activation strategies for the Mixed Use Business Regeneration Areas in Kaapiti. This is relatively specialist area of work, and the consultants required to support this work were not immediately available. Work is now starting in June/July.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Operational Budgets to Carry Over**

1,014,570 549,435 606,906 407,670 407,670