MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF THE OXFORD-OHOKA COMMUNITY BOARD HELD IN THE WEST EYRETON HALL, 3 EARLYS ROAD, WEST EYRETON ON THURSDAY 5 JULY 2018 AT 7.00PM.

PRESENT
D Nicholl (Chair), M Brown, W Doody, J Ensor, S Farrell, K Felstead, J Lynn and T Robson.

IN ATTENDANCE
E Cordwell (Governance Adviser), S Markham (Manager Strategy & Engagement), T Ellis (Development Planning Manager), J McBride (Roading and Transport Manager), B Rice (Senior Transport Engineer) and E Stubbs (Minute Secretary).

Thirty members of the public were present in the gallery for Item 5.1. The meeting adjourned for a short break from 7.53pm to 7.55pm to allow the public to leave.

1 APOLOGIES
Nil.

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
James Ensor advised that he was a member of the Mandeville Residents Association – Item 5.1

3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES
3.1 Minutes of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board – 7 June 2018
Moved S Farrell seconded M Brown
THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:
   (a) Amends the minutes of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board 7 June 2018, the last paragraph of Item 8.4 should read ‘S Farrell commented that all the Council community buildings that had wooden floors were well booked up and the Oxford A&P building was being used as a community building by OxBox and Yoga at present. It needed maintenance on it to meet Health & Safety standards.’
   (b) Confirms the circulated minutes of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board meeting, held 7 June 2018, as a true and accurate record.

4 MATTERS ARISING
Nil.

5 DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS
5.1 Rosina Rouse and T McBrearty Mandeville Residents’ Association (MRA) and Eyre District Environmental Association Inc. (EDEAI) spoke in relation to the Canterbury Landscape Supplies (CLS) activity at Diversion/ South Eyre Roads, Eyreton. R Rouse and T McBrearty introduced themselves and their relationship to a number of community groups in the area. T McBrearty advised that he was the also a local Water Committee Representative for Ohoka, Mandeville and Oxford. They noted the large public gallery supporting their deputation who were also affected by the CLS operation and advised that
they believed that around 300 people were actually affected. They spoke to a tabled presentation (Trim 180706075233).

R Rouse and T McBrearty appreciated the opportunity to speak to matters of concern to the residents including potential impact on ground water, lack of firefighting facilities, unresolved issues and operation of the site.

It was noted that there were three separate Resource Consents for the proposed composting activity. Two to Environment Canterbury (ECan) CRC175344 and CRC175345 for ‘discharge to land and air, with a separate consent application to Waimakariri District Council (WDC) regarding ‘land use’ including stockpiling.

These applications are being processed and addressed separately with the application to ECan being refused by two independent Hearing Commissioners on 26 June 2018. It was acknowledged that the Community Board formally submitted in opposition to the CLS operation.

These same Commissioners have been engaged by WDC, to ensure consistency and to determine whether the consent application to WDC should or should not be publicly notified in accordance with the strict criteria of the Resource Management Act (RMA). This is the first stage of the RMA consenting process and is not subject to interpretation.

The MRA were of the understanding that this decision had already been made and that the WDC consent was to be ‘non-notified and had prepared their material for the Board on that basis.

Staff and Deputy Mayor Felstead confirmed that this was not the case and that no decision had been made and that this is still before the independent Commissioners to determine. K Felstead also advising later in the meeting that the Commissioners’ decision was subject to a 15 day time frame for CLS to appeal and that this had not yet expired. Any such appeal would be heard by the Environment Court and would automatically place the WDC consent on hold pending any Court outcome.

(Post meeting note - this appeal was lodged on 18 July 2018).

R Rouse advised that the MRA believed that the matters were not minor and that the application to WDC must be publicly notified. They were not against compost production or business and agreed with the findings of the Hearing Commissioners to refuse the ECan consent.

R Rouse expressed a number of concerns regarding communication of the consents to local residents. Many residents were distressed, angry and frustrated. She commented that the community had fully and respectfully engaged in the entire process because they believed it was the right thing to do out of concern for the environment, for its future protection and necessary remediation. R Rouse commented that they placed trust that the governing authorities: Waimakariri District Council and Environment Canterbury would do the right thing.

R Rouse noted that WDC provided representation at the Mediation meeting through its lawyer Andrew Schultze of Cavell Leitch but that neither staff nor Councillors had attended any of the four days of the ECan Hearing. The Oxford-Ohoka Community Board (Doug Nicholl and John Lynn) had presented their submission.

K Felstead and staff advised that it was imperative that both WDC staff and Councillors maintained scrupulous independence from the ECan process to ensure that the WDC consenting process could withstand any potential challenge or Judicial Review as regards pre-determination or other impropriety.

R Rouse spoke to the issue of water noting local residents relied on their shallow wells to provide safe, good-quality drinking water. Many were located
on a red nutrient water zone where nitrate levels are already high and they
could not afford further nitrates to seep into the ground water. R Rouse
outlined results of various local supplies. Currently her own supply was just
below the Maximum Allowable Value (MAV) for nitrates and she had installed
a reverse osmosis filter at a cost of $900 with additional ongoing costs. She
asked in the case of nitrate levels increasing above MAV who would fund and
supply safe water; it was not fair to expect residents to pay. She had been
advised that it could be done but would be very expensive. Residents did not
want a repeat of the Havelock North situation.

R Rouse requested a WDC report into the feasibility, timeframe required and
cost of providing a safe supply of potable water to the potentially affected
residents of the district. She also requested that the drinking water from her
reverse osmosis filter system be tested so that other residents may have
certainty about the success of this means of dealing with nitrates.

R Rouse spoke to the issues of stormwater and leachate. She commented
that she believed that the site was unsuitable and was located in a sensitive
environment. There was uncertainty regarding what was in the compost
material including pathogens, ponding of water and still no collection of
stormwater and leachates. The material had been on bare ground for over
two years. R Rouse outlined what she believed the requirements needed to
be for the site, including impermeable barriers, permanent bunding, engineer's
report, safe collection of all polluted water, lining of pad and collection ponds
and assessment of materials.

R Rouse spoke to the issue of fire. She believed that the site Fire Plan needed
to be updated. Water was currently supplied by a neighbour which had initially
been only a short term agreement. There was no well on site yet and no
application for one had been made. Based on pipe diameter R Rouse
suggested that the applicant's assertion of 15L/s may be overinflated and that
the 25,000L tank was insufficient to fight fires. There were flight restrictions
due to overhead cables so aerial firefighting was not an option. They believed
24/7 monitoring of composting temperatures was required and R Rouse
highlighted what she felt was the poor track record of the applicant with regard
to fires. Residents were also concerned about the speed of progress of fire,
ability to halt a fire in very strong winds, detection, how residents would be
advised of danger and believed there was an unacceptable risk to residents,
property, stock, livelihoods and the Waimakariri River. R Rouse noted there
were a number of unresolved issues including flies and midges, the smell and
transport of hazardous materials and spillages.

T McBrearty commented that in his view the applicant had a long history of
compost production but appeared to have issues with compliance. Changes
to composting operating procedures were post-complaints and in a reactive
rather than proactive way. T McBrearty commented that residents had a lack
of trust in the applicant's ability to successfully establish and manage the
operation.

In conclusion T McBrearty advised that the Mandeville Residents' Association
believed that the WDC Resource Consent sought by Canterbury Landscape
Supplies Ltd should be refused. They believed the application for this consent
should be publicly notified.

In addition the Mandeville Residents Association wanted to ensure that this
kind of situation did not happen in the future, suggesting that there could be a
Bylaw that would prevent retrospective consents on any new rural operation.

The Board were advised that the applicant did seem to be removing large
amounts of material from the site in accordance with an ECAn notification.
R Rouse requested that after the removal of material that the land be tested so it was known what condition it was in and there was reassurance it would be reinstated and was safe. This would be a matter to be raised with ECan.

R Rouse referred to photographs on the handout which showed the site after rain events in 2018. Water was ponding and running off.

S Markham noted the appeal period expired in a few days.

S Markham provided an overview of various scenarios depending on whether or not the applicants lodged an appeal to the Environment Court. He also advised of the various types of notifications: non-notified, publicly notified or limited notification.

K Felstead asked staff if the applicant did not appeal would the land use consent application be withdrawn. T Ellis replied that this was likely as WDC could not give effect to a land use consent if there was no discharge consent.

S Markham acknowledged the significance of the community’s concerns. He highlighted that when, or if the land use consent was considered, it would be by the same Commissioners who had considered the discharge consents so they were familiar with the background and had been involved throughout the process.

S Farrell raised concerns about residents not having a platform to be heard in relation to the land use consent (WDC) if it was not notified. T McBrearty replied that he would be disappointed if this were to be the case as the Council had an excellent track record of community engagement but he acknowledged that this was a decision under the RMA, rather than a Council decision, as to notification. R Rouse commented that residents were not experienced in these types of RMA processes and had found it to be lengthy and difficult. However, they had not taken what they had been presented with at face value and had done their research, which included visiting a number of other composting operations including that of Timaru District Council. As a result of their research they felt they understood what best practice at a composting site was – and that this was not happening at the CLS operation. T McBrearty believed the withdrawal of support for CLS from Silver Fern Farms at the hearing when they learnt that CLS was operating without consent, was of note.

J Lynn asked for clarification regarding compost removal and R Rouse advised it was being removed under ECan direction. It was understood that CLS had until the end of the week to supply a plan on how it was to be removed. The removal was expected to go past the deadline.

J Ensor asked what the residents would like to see regarding monitoring water and ensuring safe drinking water. R Rouse advised they would like the reverse osmosis water filtration method to be tested to provide clarity around whether the system worked. If nitrate levels continued to increase there were likely to be other residents who would require a solution. They understood that there other contributing factors in increasing nitrates, but they could not afford any more going into the drinking water. They would like a report to look at the possibility of a potable water supply to protect residents in the future.

*The meeting adjourned from 7.53pm to 7.55pm to allow members of the public to leave.*

5.2 Joanne McBride (Roading and Transport Manager) spoke to the previously circulated memo (Trim 180703073912) providing an update on roading priorities for 2018-2019. To determine conditions of kerb and channels and footpaths a condition rating is carried out every three years. There was also
coordination with 3Waters and Greenspace. J McBride advised that she was happy to take feedback on the priorities at the meeting or following via phone or email.

J Lynn, as Chair of the Ohoka Residents’ Association, noted that the proposed new footpath in Ohoka, was planned for 2022 which was another four years out, and it had already been raised for the last 10 years. He expressed disappointment at the delay and noted it was for the safety of children walking to Ohoka School. K Felstead asked if the path needed to be sealed or would crusher dust be sufficient. J Lynn replied that in the absence of seal it would suffice. J McBride advised that there was separate funding for walking and cycling projects and that a list of projects would be going to the Utilities and Roading Committee for approval.

M Brown asked with regard to Tram Road (at Woodfields Road) improvements did that include consultation to which J McBride confirmed it did.

M Brown asked whether ‘Roadside Hazard Removal’ projects included roadside drains. J McBride advised it included removing obstacles such as concrete tombstone ends that were close to the road. M Brown asked where roadside drains fell in terms of roading as some blocked culverts under roads that were not being addressed. J McBride replied that it came under roadside maintenance issues, and she was happy to discuss specific sites.

M Brown asked about funding for cattle underpasses as it was his understanding that the farmer paid. J McBride advised that this was usually the case but on occasion, where an underpass was necessary in terms of safety outcomes, the Council would consider assisting but they were heavily subsidised by the NZTA and the farmer.

S Farrell raised a concern regarding shingle spreading onto South Eyre Road from Diversion Road and Browns Road which was causing problems. J McBride advised that over recent years Council had been re-sealing side roads back to the boundary as part of resealing improvements however there were others that did need to be looked at for sealing back.

D Nicholl asked with regards to Browns Road could residents assist with costs. J McBride noted there would be a report to the Utilities and Roading Committee soon regarding the upcoming seal process.

J Ensor noted that following the recent work completed at North Eyre Road it was not sealed back to the boundary which created issues with the Mandeville Sports Club carpark. J McBride advised she would follow up on this. J Ensor also noted problems at Mill Road and was happy to discuss further with J McBride.

M Brown asked if seal back at intersections came under maintenance or capital works. J McBride advised that if a reseal was being completed there would be seal back to the boundary on either side, however if more sealing was required it would be put into the programme to bring to Community Boards.

K Felstead commented that it was good to see the new Oxford footpaths. He noted that a number of years ago Harewood Road was at the top of list for a footpath however residents had requested that drainage issues be fixed first. The drainage works had now been completed and he asked for an update on when the footpath work would be completed. J McBride agreed to follow up on this.

K Felstead noted the Board’s submission to the Long Term Plan regarding German Road, Browns Rock Road and Cust Road being in a rough condition and asked if those road repairs had been programmed. J McBride would follow up on the matter.

T Robson queried the Ashley Gorge Road guard rail project. B Rice advised that it was at the end of the straight heading toward Oxford. T Robson asked
if the Ashley Gorge route assessment would include an assessment of cycling usage as it was a very popular route and cyclists could present a safety risk. J McBride advised that this was a joint project with NZTA and ACC looking at roadside hazards.

W Doody noted that she was pleased to see the guardrails included. She also noted that there were gum trees on the south side of Tram Road that were now affecting the road and creating a ridge.

J Lynn provided feedback from local residents in Ohoka who were concerned that a commercial entity on Mill Road had created a turning bay on the grass verge. They questioned why they had been allowed to do so while farmers had to increase the size of culverts for milk tankers to enter and exit farm driveways. J McBride would follow up and to ascertain if formal permission had been sought for the widening.

S Farrell asked for an update on the hand rail in Meyer Place. J McBride would follow up.

5.3 Trevor Ellis (Development Planning Manager) provided an update regarding the District Development Strategy (DDS) and tabled the finalised Waimakariri 2048 District Development Strategy. S Markham noted it was the lead-in document to the upcoming District Plan review and provided direction. T Ellis also tabled a spatial overview of residential section sizes and growth. Oxford Township was not experiencing rapid growth and zoning within the Oxford Township would be looked at as part of the District Plan Review.

T Ellis advised there was appetite for rural residential development to continue including in Mandeville / Ohoka. There was potential for larger rural residential lots to intensify. The tabled map provided analysis of lot sizes by certificate of titles. It showed there was preference for four hectare subdivision in the eastern part of the district. The review would consider whether the current four hectare minimum rule was sustainable. There were regional provisions to protect and manage primary production land and rural character. There had been an initial briefing to Councillors regarding the potential for up to twelve different ‘character areas’.

S Farrell referred to the planner’s report (Agenda Item 8) which highlighted that there was not much industrial land available in Waimakariri, for example for composting. T Ellis noted there was approximately 60-70 hectares of industrial land in Southbrook that was vacant however it was held by a handful of landowners who could choose when or if they wanted to make it available. Council would continue to monitor the situation. Staff were considering a number of different zoning options and areas as part of the review.

J Ensor referred to subdivisions such as Ohoka Meadows and Mandeville Park which he felt did not have sufficient infrastructure to cope with heavy rain events. He asked why adequate infrastructure was not installed at the time of development rather than needing to fix down the track. T Ellis could not comment on specific examples. Decisions were based on what was known at the time. S Markham advised there was now a proposal for transition from a more reactive approach that was led by private plan changes, to more proactive provisions. There was a parallel stream of work about a more planned approach. Private plan changes created an incremental cumulative effect rather than proactive zoning by the Council. It would be more costly to the Council in the short term as historically the private plan change process relied on the applicant doing a lot of the work.

J Lynn referred to the growth in Woodend and Pegasus and the deferment of the Bypass, asking if there needed to be consideration around the impact of this. S Markham commented there was a paradox, as development would potentially bring the bypass timeframes forward. There was active work ongoing with NZTA. It was a difficult situation that required clarity.
T Ellis noted there was a sum of money for Greater Christchurch to be allocated for mass transit.

D Nicholl expressed concern at the splitting of farmland into small blocks highlighted by the comparative images from the 1980’s to early 2000’s. There had been a significant change to the District over the life of the current District Plan. T Ellis commented that there was a lot of crystal ball gazing going on at the moment around rural futures and what it meant for future land use.

6 ADJOURNED BUSINESS

Nil,

7 REPORTS

7.1 Oxford Area School Pick Up / Drop Off Area on Bay Road– B Rice (Senior Transport Engineer)

B Rice spoke to the report noting that it was in response to a request from the Oxford Area School for a drop-off zone outside the school on Bay Road. Like many schools around New Zealand there were issues with picking up and dropping off children safely at the beginning and end of the school day. The effectiveness of the proposed area would be greater in the morning and limited in the afternoon and would be largely dependent on monitoring and enforcement. Enforcement by Police or Council parking staff was likely to be limited. While the drop-off zone would not totally mitigate the issues, school staff supported it, had agreed to assist with monitoring it and speaking with parents.

S Farrell asked if B Rice believed it would cause more parents to do U turns to get to the drop-off point and suggested it may create confusion for cars getting into the drop-off zone. There was still the ability to park on the west side. B Rice agreed that this could be an outcome but that it was preferential to have parents do U turns than for children to cross the road. It would of course be better if drivers went around the block, but that was driver behaviour and could only be encouraged.

S Farrell asked if it were possible to include a 40km/hr school zone at the same time. B Rice advised that was something that could be considered. K Felstead asked if that had been discussed with the School Board. W Doody asked what K Graham the Road Safety Coordinator thought of the zone. B Rice advised that K Graham had offered to work with the school regarding reducing the number of cars ‘dropping off’ and other measures to assist with the situation.

Moved T Robson seconded M Brown

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) Receives report No 180614066438.

(b) Adopts the attached Amended Second Schedule – Parking Restrictions to the Parking Bylaw 2007 (Trim No 180621069253).

(c) Notes that enforcement of the drop off zone by Police or Council parking staff is likely to be limited.

(d) Notes that the Oxford Area School has indicated a willingness to provide staff to monitor the drop off zone.

CARRIED
7.2 Oxford-Ohoka Community Board’s Discretionary Grant Fund 2018/2019 and General Landscaping Fund 2018/2019 – E Cordwell (Governance Adviser)

E Cordwell spoke briefly to the report noting the Board’s General Landscaping Budget allocated by the Council for 2018/19 was $12,160 and the Board’s Discretionary Grant Funding allocated by the Council for 2018/2019 was $6,520. The noted corrections to the Application and Accountability Forms were in hand.

Moved S Farrell  seconded J Lynn

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 180619067874.
(b) Notes that the Board’s General Landscaping Budget allocated by the Council for 2018/19 is $12,160.
(c) Notes that the Board’s Discretionary Grant Funding allocated by the Council for 2018/2019 is $6,520.
(d) Approves the Board’s 2018/2019 Discretionary Grant Fund Application Criteria and Application Form (Trim No.180621068982).
(e) Approves the Board’s 2018/2019 Discretionary Grant Accountability Form (Trim No. 180621068877).
(f) Approves that Discretionary Grant Fund applications will continue to be considered at each meeting for the 2018/2019 financial year (July 2018 to June 2019).

CARRIED

7.3 Application to the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board’s Discretionary Grant Fund 2018/2019 – E Cordwell (Governance Adviser)

E Cordwell spoke briefly to the report noting that the Club had received $3,500 from a Pub Charity Grant toward the full cost of the new uniforms.

Moved K Felstead seconded S Farrell

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 180621068915.
(b) Approves a grant of $500 to Ohoka Netball Club towards the cost of new uniforms.

CARRIED

7.4 Approval of the updated Oxford-Ohoka Community Board Plan 2018/19 – E Cordwell (Governance Adviser)

E Cordwell noted a further draft had been circulated, and that there was the provision for the Chair to sign off the Plan on the Board’s behalf subject to minor edits. There was still a placeholder for a photo and E Cordwell suggested the new Oxford Library and Service Centre.

A number of minor edits were noted.

Moved M Brown  seconded S Farrell

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 180618067171.
(b) Approves the final draft of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board Plan
CARRIED

8 CORRESPONDENCE

E Cordwell noted the tabled response to the Draft Stormwater Bylaw (Trim 180619067653).

The memo regarding the CLS operation provided an update on progress including various reports and the Commissioners’ findings for the ECan consent refusal.

S Farrell requested that the Board formally express their concern that residents affected by the CLS did not have a platform to be heard by WDC if the Commissioners determined that the land use consent to WDC be ‘non notified’. K Felstead opposed this proposal given that the decision to notify or otherwise had not been made and so the Board should not yet express views.

J Lynn expressed a number of concerns. He believed that there should have been a formal report to the Community Board seeking recommendations to the Council as to whether the CLS application should or should not be notified. He was disappointed with the inability to engage with the decision process as regards notification.

It was noted that at the previous month’s meeting, in the workshop S Nichols (Governance Manager) had covered a number of matters including the RMA process for notification.

E Cordwell explained that the Community Boards were not part of the RMA planning assessment. Under the Resource Management Act (RMA), whether an application was notified or non-notified followed very specific legislative rules, and that process did not include directly either the Council or the Community Board.

K Felstead reiterated that this was a highly legal process. In addition this specific CLS application was being assessed by independent Commissioners to ensure scrupulous adherence to the RMA and prevent any subsequent challenge from the applicants or any other party.

M Brown acknowledged it was a legal process. He believed the general feeling of the Board members was that they needed to take every opportunity to advocate for change in the RMA legislation and associated processes, including through the District Plan Review. Whilst they could not affect the current application, members of the Board wished to make it clear to residents that they were listening to them and that they did not like the current process and would advocate for change to that process.

T Robson agreed with J Lynn and felt uninformed and frustrated. The confusion it created for residents was the main concern.

J Lynn was disgusted with the RMA process, noting the number of concerned residents who had supported the deputation and were living daily with the issue. There was a strong concern regarding water and the Council needed to be acting faster.

S Farrell expressed her own concerns and disappointment with the RMA process. She also asked if WDC staff and the planning consultant had been to the CLS site. S Farrell stated people were suffering adverse effects including to their mental and physical health.

S Markham noted that the planning consultant’s report regarding notification should not be confused with a report on the detail of the application. The current report, looked at the threshold for notification against strict criteria in
the District Plan and the RMA. Multiple reports and technical assessments would be produced relating to the consent itself and presented in due course to the Commissioners that would take into account a range of issues pertaining to the proposed site and operation. This was a later stage of the process.

However, if the applicant appealed the ECan discharge consent then the situation would alter. S Markham acknowledged it was a convoluted process that was far from clear cut. If there was no appeal by the 18 July then the matter was over, however this may not be the case.

K Felstead believed staff had summed up matters well. The elected members did not get to decide if the application was notified or non-notified. K Felstead also referred to Page 65 of the agenda where it was noted there was a site visit on 25 April 2018.

M Brown reiterated that the Board needed to advocate for change through local and central government so the situation did not happen again. It was of concern that CLS could set up an operation before a resource consent was granted. S Markham advised that there was a test in the RMA around notification. It was possible that changing the provisions of the District Plan from an effects base to an activities based plan could assist. The plan could specify certain activities that needed to be publicly notified. Initiating change to the RMA itself was more challenging, as that was a parliamentary process.

Moved M Brown seconded J Ensor

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) Receives the memo regarding Canterbury Landscape Supplies Operation in Eyreton (Trim 180625070336).

CARRIED

Moved M Brown seconded J Lynn

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(b) Notes that, if it had been the case that the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board were material to the decision for notification, the Board would have strongly advocated that the Canterbury Landscapes Supplies application be publicly notified.

CARRIED

9 CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT

9.1 Chairperson’s Report for June 2018

Moved T Robson seconded J Ensor

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) Receives report No 180621068953.

CARRIED

10 MATTERS FOR INFORMATION

10.1 Rangiore-Ashley Community Board meeting minutes – 13 June 2018
(Trim No. 180606062470.)

10.2 Kaiapoi Tuahiwi Community Board meeting minutes – 21 May 2018
(Trim No. 180518054887).
10.3 Woodend-Sefton Community Board meeting minutes – 14 May 2018 (Trim No. 180510051232).

10.4 Woodend-Sefton Community Board meeting minutes – 11 June 2018 (Trim No. 180606062391).

10.5 Youth Council meeting minutes – 29 May 2018


10.7 Draft Business Zones 1 & 2 Public Spaces Policy report to Council 5 June 2018 (Trim No. 180507049501).


Moved M Brown    seconded J Lynn

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board receives the information in items 10.1-10.8

CARRIED

11 MEMBERS' INFORMATION EXCHANGE

J Ensor

- Attended Waimakariri Health Advisory Group meeting. A Terms of Reference for the group was introduced (Trim 180706075244). Noted the helicopter pad funding was proceeding.
- Noted upcoming Civil Defence Welfare Exercise Friday 27 July.
- Attended Mandeville Sports Centre meeting – main item was Health and Safety.
- Mandeville Village and Main Road open – LED lights not as effective as could be due to colour choice. Care needed to be taken with decisions regarding that intersection.

J Lynn

- Gatekeepers Lodge – Council agreed to fund to tie down the building foundation.
- Noted mess outside Ohoka Domain carpark.

T Robson

- Attended Ashley Gorge Advisory Group meeting where work on removing the Lombardy Poplars was viewed, as well as the heritage building – good progress.
- Oxford Promotions Association (OPAC) – Oxford Lights Festival successful with a good turnout.
- Upcoming Oxford Garage Sale Sunday 5 August.

S Farrell

- Assisted with Oxford Lights Festival.

M Brown

- Judging at local pony club events – clubs were in good heart.
- Attended Oxford Rural Drainage Committee meeting, discussed joining with Cust Rural Drainage – answer was no. Reasons for ‘no’ included Cust had a zero balance while Oxford had $70,000 available.
- Attended Mandeville Sports Club Board meeting - Canterbury Sports Trust had been engaged to assist with a Strategic Plan.

K Felstead

Noted Council reports:
- Oxford Museum and Jaycee Room strengthening – not strengthen as not high use. Approved new entranceway from carpark $125,000.
• Public consultation of Draft Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan in August.
• Set up project management group for Multi Use Sports Facility.
• CWMS Annual Report.
• Mayor to champion Sustainability Strategy.
• Solid waste transfer station – tender.
• Approved request for additional funding for Kaiapoi well head security.
• Submission to Mainpower Trust.
• Final Greenspace Activity Management Plan.
• Submission on ECan Representation Review.

W Doody

Tabled her Councillor’s Report (Trim No 180706075224). Points noted were:
• Ken Stevenson retirement.
• Kerbside collection – what service and bin size.
• Public consultation for ‘Alcohol in our District’.
• Oxford Rural No2 in operation.
• Oxford Rural No1 – consent decision in favour.
• Progress on Ashley Gorge Heritage building was moving fast.
• Oxford Museum – work starting soon.
• Oxford Festival of Lights – an incredible event.

12 CONSULTATION PROJECTS

Business Zones 1 &2 Public Spaces Policy

Consultation closes Monday 30 July 2018.


13 BOARD FUNDING UPDATE

13.1 Board Discretionary Grant

Balance as at 5 July 2018: $6,520.

13.2 General Landscaping Fund

Balance as at 5 July 2018 – 12,160.

14 MEDIA ITEMS

Nil.

15 QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS

Nil.

16 URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDERS

Nil.
NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board is scheduled for Thursday 9 August 2018 commencing at 7.00pm, in the Ohoka Hall.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE MEETING WAS CLOSED AT 9.54pm.

CONFIRMED

________________________
Chairperson

________________________
Date