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KAIAPOI-TUAHIWI COMMUNITY BOARD

AGENDA FOR THE MEETING OF THE KAIAPOI-TUAHIWI COMMUNITY BOARD TO BE HELD IN MEETING ROOM 1 (UPSTAIRS), RUATANIWHA KAIAPOI CIVIC CENTRE, 176 WILLIAMS STREET, KAIAPOI ON MONDAY 20 MAY 2019 AT 4PM.

RECOMMENDATIONS IN REPORTS ARE NOT TO BE CONSTRUED AS COUNCIL POLICY UNTIL ADOPTED BY THE COUNCIL

BUSINESS

1 APOLOGIES

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

3.1 Minutes of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board – 15 April 2019

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:

(a) Confirms the circulated minutes of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board meeting, held 15 April 2019, as a true and accurate record.

4 MATTERS ARISING

5 DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

5.1 Joy Mehlhopt will speak to the Board about Environment Canterbury’s Bus Review.

6 ADJOURNED BUSINESS
7 REPORTS

7.1 Service Requests Six Monthly Results – Maree Harris (Customer Services Manager)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:
(a) Receives report No. 190501062291

7.2 Report back on NZ Community Boards’ Conference 2019 – Kay Rabe (Governance Advisor)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:
(a) Receives report No. 190423058748

7.3 Ratification of the Board’s Comments on the Reviewed District Plan ‘What’s the Plan’ – Kay Rabe (Governance Advisor)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:
(a) Receives report No. 190509066112
(b) Retrospectively ratifies the Board’s Comments on the Waimakariri District Council Reviewed District Plan (Trim Ref: 190508065617)

8 CORRESPONDENCE

9 CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT

9.1 Chair’s Diary for May 2019

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:
(a) Receives report No. 190506063835.

10 MATTERS REFERRED FOR INFORMATION

10.1 Oxford-Ohoka Community Board meeting minutes – 3 April 2019 (Trim No. 190404049937)

10.2 Woodend-Sefton Community Board Meeting minutes – 8 April 2019 (Trim No. 190404049992)

10.3 Rangiora-Ashley Community Board meeting minutes 10 April 2019 (Trim No. 190404050002)

10.4 Youth Council meeting minutes – February 26 2019

10.5 Youth Council meeting minutes – March 26 2019
RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board receives the information in items 10.1-10.05.

Note: Items were circulated to Board members separately.

11 MEMBERS’ INFORMATION EXCHANGE

The purpose of this exchange is to provide a short update to other members in relation to activities/meetings that have been attended or to provide general Board related information.

12 CONSULTATION PROJECTS

13 REGENERATION PROJECTS

13.1 Town Centre, Kaiapoi

Updates on the Kaiapoi Town Centre projects are emailed regularly to Board members. These updates can be accessed using the link below:


13.2 Kaiapoi Regeneration Steering Group

The next meeting of the Kaiapoi Regeneration Steering Group will be held in Meeting Room 1, Ruataniwha Kaiapoi Civic Centre, 4pm on Monday 10 June 2019. This meeting is open to the public.

14 BOARD FUNDING UPDATE

14.1 Board Discretionary Grant

Balance as at 15 May 2019: $2,878.

14.2 General Landscaping Budget

Balance as at 15 May 2019: $46,420.

15 MEDIA ITEMS

16 QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS

Board member M Pinkham submitted the following questions on Friday 10 May for response as per Standing Orders section 20.4.

Kaiapoi Car Parking Financial Contributions

Question 1:

Rule 34.2.7 of the Waimakariri District Plan, repeated below, details how financial contributions shall be required in lieu of providing on-site car parking. Can you please advise which council officers have delegated authority to waive the payment of such financial contributions?
Response:

Financial contributions are applied as a condition of a resource consent as a possible mitigation measure to offset an environmental effect. RMA Section 108 provides for conditions to be placed on resource consents and specifically 108 (2) specifies that financial contributions may be sought. Council staff who have the delegation to impose, or not, a condition on a consent are the:
Manager Regulation
Planning Manager
Team leader – Resource Consents
Senior Planner

Question 2:

Financial contributions in lieu of providing on-site parking were waived for RC175272 at 184 Williams Street, Kaiapoi. Can you please provide a copy of the approval of that waiver, or empowering documentation?

Response:

The planning officer for this consent recommended that financial contributions for parking should be waived. The relevant extract from that report (180111001872) is:

9.8 Financial contributions

As the application site contains three ‘Principal Shopping Street Frontages’ (Williams Street, Charles Street, and the Kaiapoi River Frontage), the District Plan requires that a financial contribution is required in lieu of on-site car parking provision. However, as part of the application, the applicant has requested that no financial contribution be paid.

The application has included reference to the Kaiapoi Town Centre Parking Study (2017) prepared by Abley Transportation Consultants Limited which demonstrates that there is a high level of parking availability in the vicinity of the application site. The parking study shows that, during the peak parking period (1:30pm – 2:00pm), the streets adjoining the application site have a low average parking occupancy, 0 – 40%. Similarly, the streets in the wider area have a relatively high level of parking availability with the exception of Charles Street and Ravens Quay northwest of Williams Street (both of which have an occupancy rate of above 80%).

Given the above assessment, it is considered that the additional parking demand generated by the proposed development can be effectively accommodated in the surrounding area without displacing the existing parking demand. As such, it is considered that the establishment of additional parking facilities is unnecessary and the requirement to provide a financial contribution should be waived.

The approval of the waiver is provided in the decision for RC175272 (TRIM 180115002432) extract as follows:

Reasons for the decision

Pursuant to Section 113 of the Act the Council was satisfied that:

• All person who have been deemed to be adversely affected by the proposal have provided their written approval.
• The environmental effects will be no more than minor.
• The proposal is not contrary to the objectives and policies of the District Plan.
• Potentially contaminated soils will be appropriately managed.
• The development has been designed to a high standard taking into account the amenity and design features set out in the Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan 2011.

• The additional parking demand generated by the development can be effectively accommodated in the surrounding area without displacing the existing parking demand. As such, the requirement to provide a financial contribution is waived.

• The development can be adequately serviced, and will contribute positively to the Kaiapoi Town Centre.

Question 3:

Financial contributions in lieu of providing on-site parking were waived for RC195066 at 137 Williams Street, Kaiapoi. Can you please provide a copy of the approval of that waiver, or empowering documentation?

Response:

The planning officer for this consent recommended that financial contributions for parking should be waived. The relevant extract from that report (190418057998) is:

Traffic, Access and Car Parking

9.7 The applicant has provided the Kaiapoi Town Centre Parking Study 2017 completed by Abley Transportation Consultants that reviews the car parking demand, traffic generation, loading and access arrangements of the Kaiapoi Town Centre, which includes the subject site. Council’s Development Engineer, Alister O’Callaghan in conjunction with Council’s Transport Engineer, Bill Rice, and myself, have reviewed the application including the Kaiapoi Town Centre Parking Study 2017. The following comments were provided and shall be adopted for the purpose of this report:

“The key findings found the average parking occupancy over the entire study area is 36%. The optimum is between 80 and 85%, hence it is concluded there are adequate on street parks available to service the additional parking needs of the new development.”

The Abley Report also concluded that in terms of on-street parking, highest average and peak occupancies were recorded in Williams Street between Hilton Street and Raven Quay, Raven Quay and Charles Street west of Williams Street. Although this is the area in which the proposed development is to be sited the highest averages and peak occupancies were 58% and 64% for average parking occupancy. I do note that the Abley report is dated prior to the construction of the Port and Eagle development however taking into consideration the shortfall from that development and the shortfall of the proposed development the occupancy levels will still be below the maximum thresholds of 80%. Therefore, it is considered that the additional parking demand generated by the proposed development can be effectively accommodated in the surrounding area without displacing the existing parking demand. As such, it is considered that the establishment of additional parking facilities is unnecessary.

9.8 The application proposes to rely on existing car parking within the Kaiapoi Town Centre generating a shortfall of 11 car park spaces, 2 loading spaces, 2 short term casual cycle parks and 2 long term secure cycle parks. When Council sold this portion of land through expressions of interest it was not a desired requirement to provide car parking due to the proximity to Charles Street pedestrian crossing and the roundabout. The Kaiapoi Town Centre Parking Study 2017 and weekly survey graphs of available carparks indicates that parking occupancy is on average 36%. Due to the neighboring building on Charles Street (Lot 6 DP 919) having air conditioning units and concrete pads intruding into the access easement, service vehicles cannot use the easement to service the building. The carriageway currently accommodates parking on the proposed development side of Williams Street which is sign-posted to be restricted parking of 15 minutes. Although no cycle parking is proposed with the application there are existing cycle stands on the corners bordering the round-a-bout.
Figure 7: Aerial photo showing the existing cycle parking facilities located on the corners of the roundabout of Williams Street and Charles Street.

9.9 The parking demand for the development and for the existing church located on the neighboring site are different in that the Church has a number of people going to and from the site at specific times for worship. The proposed development will have a variety of tenants which will generate different movements of people at different times and varying needs of parking.

9.10 The surrounding immediate area is made up of Trousselot Park to the north-east which occupies a large area of land and also has a skate park, playground and basketball court. Along the street frontage of Charles Street on both sides of the road is restricted 120 parking as well as unrestricted parking further down the road. With large open space provided around the subject site there is not the density created with retail activities providing the opportunity to utilise the parking in Charles Street to access the proposed development. The close proximity to the town centre between Raven Quay and Hilton Street encourages pedestrian movement and people to walk to the development from the town centre area.

9.11 The District Plan envisions and promotes the use of business 1 land for retail activities. The narrow site does not allow for a variety of options in terms of providing parking on site. The proposed development is the greatest utilisation of space without compromising design and function of the site. It is also noted that the previous buildings, prior to the Christchurch earthquakes, on the site did not provide for parking on site.

9.12 Mr. O’Callaghan and Mr. Rice has assessed the amount of car parking and considered the shortfall results in effects that are considered less than minor, and can be accommodated in the existing on street car parking of the surrounding area. It is also noted that Council will undertake a Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan review which will consider the parking across the town centre, in particular, the parking will be addressed in this specific area. This review will also consider initiatives such as restricted parking and off street car parking options as part of this review process and will be implement any changes required. I have not relied on the review to consider the effects from the shortfall of car parking spaces. I am satisfied any adverse effects associated with car parking will be less than minor.

Financial Contributions

9.42 Financial contributions will not be required as a part of this proposal. Waimakariri District Council’s Roading and Transport Manager, Joanne McBride, has confirmed that financial contributions will not be necessary due to the Kaiapoi town centre providing capacity within the public network for the car parking required as part of this proposal. Gerard Cleary, Council’s Manager of Utilities and Roading also confirmed that financial contributions would not be considered necessary with this proposal. I note also that the conclusions in sections 9.7 – 9.12 regarding the scale of potential adverse effects of the proposal do not support the need to impose financial contributions to mitigate car parking effects.

The approval of the waiver is provided in the decision for RC195066 (190501061909) extract as follows

Reasons for the decision

Pursuant to Section 113 of the Act the Council was satisfied that:

• The environmental effects will be less than minor as the character and amenity associated with the Business 1 Zone will be maintained, and the town centre retail focus enhanced by this proposal.

• Car parking for the activity can be absorbed within the existing car parking capacity in the town centre area.

• The proposal will not affect the safe and efficient functioning of the adjoining road network.
NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board is scheduled for 4pm, Monday 17 June 2019 at the Ruataniwha Kaiapoi Civic Centre.

Workshop

- Cycleway Connections – Joanne McBride (Roading and Transport Manager)
- Members Forum
MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF THE KAIAPOI-TUAHIWI COMMUNITY BOARD TO BE HELD IN MEETING ROOM 1 (UPSTAIRS), RUATANIWHA KAIAPOI CIVIC CENTRE, 176 WILLIAMS STREET, KAIAPOI ON MONDAY 15 APRIL 2019 AT 4PM.

PRESENT
J Watson (Chairperson), N Atkinson, R Blair, C Greengrass, M Pinkham, P Redmond and S Stewart.

IN ATTENDANCE
D Ayers (The Mayor), J Palmer (Chief Executive), J McBride (Roading and Transport Manager), M Flanagan (Landscape Planner – District Regeneration), Cameron Wood (Senior Policy Planner), K Rabe (Governance Adviser) and C Fowler-Jenkins (Governance Support Officer).

1 APOLOGIES
Moved J Watson seconded C Greengrass
An apology for lateness was received and accepted from Neville Atkinson who arrived at 4.34pm and was absent for clauses 1 – 7.3.

CARRIED

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
There were no conflicts of interest.

3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES
3.1 Minutes of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board – 18 March 2019
Moved J Watson seconded P Redmond

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:

(a) Confirms the circulated minutes of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board meeting, held 18 March 2019, as a true and accurate record subject to the following changes:

- Item 7.2 that the following be added “P Redmond stated that he had reservations and concerns regarding permanent structures as indicated in the third option and that the river should be a public reserve and should not be in private ownership.”

- Item 11 under P Redmond the following be added - Attended community BBQ at Moorcroft Reserve – disappointing turn out and requested “staff to investigate the possibility of formalising the ‘informal’ path to link with the existing path already there”.

- “Attended the Food Forest Wellbeing Day
- Attended the ENC function at Rangiora RSA
- Attended Port photo exhibition at Ruataniwha and commented on how blue the water of the Kaiapoi River was in the 1990’s.”

- Item 11 under C Greengrass the following be added – “Attended the opening of the Port and Eagle.”
4 MATTERS ARISING

- Deputation by the Local Police – this matter had been postponed due to the terror attack of 15 March 2019. K Rabe gave an update regarding the postponement. Members would have an opportunity to meet Police at the June All Boards Briefing.

- S Stewart mentioned that concerns had been again raised by residents of The Pines Beach and Kairaki areas regarding burglary, vandalism and other anti-social behaviors. C Greengrass agreed to discuss this matter at the next Pines Beach and Kairaki Residents Group meeting. J Palmer noted that security cameras were installed in town centers but not in rural settlements.

5 DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

There were no deputations or presentations.

6 ADJOURNED BUSINESS

There was no adjourned business.

7 REPORTS

7.1 Report for Town Centre feature Lighting and Decorations Terms of Reference and Working Group Membership Joanne McBride (Roading and Transport Manager) and Gerard Cleary (Manager, Utilities and Roading)

P Redmond asked if this working group would deal with Christmas decorations and was assured that it was all decorations/adornments.

J Watson suggested that P Redmond and C Greengrass would be good representatives as they had a particular interest in this matter. Both P Redmond and C Greengrass agreed that they would accept nomination to the working group.

Moved J Watson seconded C Greengrass

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 190403049853.

(b) Appoints two elected members to the Town Centre Feature Lighting and Decorations Working Group. The elected members shall be as follows:

P Redmond and C Greengrass.

Moved J Watson seconded P Redmond

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board recommends:

THAT the Council:

(c) Receives report No. 190403049853;

(d) Approves the Terms of Reference for the working group;

(e) Approves the formation of the Working Group and membership as recommended by the Board.
7.2 **Kaiapoi Interpretive Signage – Michelle Flanagan (Landscape Planner – District regeneration)**

M Flanagan spoke to her report giving a precise for the Board’s information. The Board had agreed to use $20,000 of its General Landscape Budget to purchase four or five signs to start the project depending on the final costings of the signs.

P Redmond asked about how the sites would be prioritised and was told that the working group had identified the first five sites as McAllister Square and the Old Library and Fire Station, Williams Street Bridge (including Baxters Hut and Kaikai-a-waru), Hansens Mall, Old Post Office, BNZ Building, Rialto Theatre, Old Courthouse and Jail, Trousselot Park (including Mandeville Bridge, War Memorial Hall and Clock, Kaiapoi Kindergarten, Band Rotunda, Trousselot Monument).

S Stewart raised concerns regarding the practice of using weathering steel frame. She felt that as the steel aged it became very hard to read and wanted assurance this would not be the case with these signs.

R Blair agreed that S Stewart’s comments were relevant and had merit and that this matter should be discussed in more detail at the next meeting of the working group.

M Pinkham also suggested that the vertical lettering was difficult for some to read and had health and safety concerns regarding the design of the marker post. The working group assured the Board all these matters would be taken into account at its next meeting and thanked the members for their input.

J Watson congratulated M Flanagan for her excellent work she had done with the regeneration group as well as the signage group. C Greengrass and R Blair added their congratulations and thanks for her leadership on this project.

**CARRIED**

Moves J Watson seconded C Greengrass

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

(a) **Receives** report No. 190404049990.

(b) **Approves** the concept design for the interpretive signage (included as Attachment ii)

(c) **Notes** staff will be engaging Larsen's Art 'n' sign Studio Ltd for the design, construction and installation of the interpretive signage up to a value of $5,000 per interpretive panel.

(d) **Notes** that should the estimated cost for the design, construction and installation of each interpretive panel exceed $5,000 a report to the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board will be required.

(e) **Notes** that a list of potential important sites for interpretive signage has been developed as a working document (included as Attachment i).

(f) **Notes** that there is $20,000 allocated from the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board General Landscaping Budget for the interpretive signage.
7.3 **Kaiapoi Structure Plan – Heike Downie (Principal Planning Analyst) and Cameron Wood (Senior Policy Planner)**

C Wood spoke to his report.

M Pinkham reminded staff that a similar process was done in the 1990s and good work was done at that time and he hoped that this would be referred to when implementing this plan.

There was general discussion regarding current constraints including natural hazards, Christchurch International Airport's review of current plan contours and controlled airspace.

J Watson asked if there was any indication if the contour would increase or decrease and was told that there was speculation about it being broader and shorter but no decision had yet been made known. R Blair commented that on a recent flight the plane came down the centre of the South Island and can nowhere near Kaiapoi.

Moved J Watson seconded M Pinkham

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

(a) **Receives** report No. 190328045496

(b) **Notes** the key project timeline and milestones set out in paragraph 4.4 of this report.

CARRIED

**N Atkinson arrived at 4.34pm.**

7.4 **Application to the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board's Discretionary Grant 2018/2019 – Kay Rabe (Governance Advisor)**

K Rabe spoke to this report.

P Redmond queried, in regard to the Clarkville Playcentre report, the discrepancies of the dates for when the application arrived and the date the report came to the Board. K Rabe explained that the Playcentre had applied to Oxford-Ohoka Community Board earlier in the year. As was policy no new application could be processed until the accountability for the first grant had been received resulting in a delay before this application was processed.

R Blair requested clarification regarding the Board’s informal policy in regards to funding schools/projects that were funded by the Ministry of Education. Members agreed that Playcentres did not fall into this category.

C Greengrass requested clarification that the application to Oxford-Ohoka Community Board was for different equipment and was informed that the funding from Oxford-Ohoka Community Board was for puzzles.
Moved P Redmond seconded M Pinkham

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 190308029066.

(b) Approves a grant of $420 to Clarkville Play Centre towards the replacement of a double seated tricycle and the purchase of three balance bikes.

CARRIED

K Rabe spoke to the funding application for Presbyterian Support noting that the grant, if successful, would be retrospective as the event was scheduled for 11 April 2019. This was due to the timing of the Board’s meeting schedule and that because the application had been received in March it missed the deadline for the March meeting. She also clarified that the Rangiora-Ashley Board had funded this event, Woodend-Sefton Board had declined the application and no application had been received for the Oxford-Ohoka Board.

A Blackie commented that Presbyterian Support were a huge operation with income in the millions. He believed the discretionary grant funds were for groups such as sports club or community groups who had little funding.

P Redmond commented that seeing as the event had already happened he was against funding it retrospectively.

Moved P Redmond seconded C Greengrass

(c) Declines the application from Presbyterian Support.

CARRIED

7.5 ANZAC Day Services 2019 – Kay Rabe (Governance Advisor)

Moved J Watson seconded P Redmond

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 190315034862.

(b) Appoints Board member M Pinkham to attend the Kaiapoi Cenotaph Dawn Service at 6.30am on Thursday 25 April 2019.

(c) Appoints Board members R Blair, J Watson and P Redmond to lay a wreath on behalf of the Board at the Kaiapoi Cenotaph (Trousselot Park) Service at 10.00am on Thursday 25 April 2019.

(d) Appoints Board members C Greengrass and P Redmond to lay a wreath on behalf of the Board at Tuahiwi (Urupa) ANZAC Day Service at 2.00pm on Thursday 25 April 2019.

CARRIED
7.6 **Ratification of the Board’s Submission to the Waimakariri District Council’s Draft Rural Residential Development Strategy – Kay Rabe (Governance Advisor)**

Moved J Watson seconded M Pinkham

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

(a) **Receives** report No. 190402048283.

(b) **Retrospectively ratifies** the Board’s submission to the Waimakariri District Council’s Draft Rural Residential Development Strategy (Trim No. 190402047670).

CARRIED

Note: N Atkinson and S Stewart abstained from voting

---

7.7 **Ratification of the Board’s Submission to the Waimakariri District Council’s Draft Annual Plan 2019-2020 – Kay Rabe (Governance Advisor)**

Moved C Greengrass seconded R Blair

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

(a) **Receives** report No. 190402048085.

(b) **Retrospectively ratifies** the Board’s submission to the Waimakariri District Council’s Draft Annual Plan 2019-2020 (Trim No. 190402047675).

CARRIED

Note: N Atkinson and S Stewart abstained from voting.

---

8 **CORRESPONDENCE**

There was no correspondence.

---

9 **CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT**

There was no Chairperson’s report.

---

10 **MATTERS REFERRED FOR INFORMATION**

10.1 **Oxford-Ohoka Community Board meeting minutes – 7 March 2019** (Trim No. 190226022558).

10.2 **Woodend Sefton Community Board meeting minutes – 11 March 2019** (Trim No 190306026937).

10.3 **Rangiora-Ashley Community Board meeting minutes – 13 March 2019** (Trim No 190306026941)

10.4 **Youth Council meeting minutes – January 2019** (Trim No 1902120155950)


10.7 Enterprise North Canterbury half year report to December 2018, promotion of the Waimakariri District Business Plan report to December 2018 – report to Audit and Risk Committee (Trim No 190225021990).

10.8 Library Update March 2019 – report to Community and Recreation Committee 26 March 2019 (Trim No 190315034754).

10.9 Aquatic Facilities Update – Community and Recreation Committee 26 March 2019 (Trim No 190227023702).


10.13 Report to Council ANZAC Day services and attendance April 2019 (Trim No 190218018037)

M Pinkham raised the matter of a report that should have been circulated to the Board that was omitted in error to the above list. Board members requested that reports being circulated from Council, Committees or other Boards be circulated at the time of the meeting rather than being kept and sent with the agenda.

Moved J Watson seconded N Atkinson

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board receives the information in items 10.1-10.13.

CARRIED

11 MEMBERS’ INFORMATION EXCHANGE

The purpose of this exchange is to provide a short update to other members in relation to activities/meetings that have been attended or to provide general Board related information.

S Stewart
- First Schedule consultation on the Waimakariri plan change to the Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan which opened on 15 April and runs to 15 May.
- Environment Canterbury’s response to the intrusion of salt in the Kaiapoi River – report to the Utilities and Roading Committee.
- Traces of arsenic found in water from private bores. Public to be encouraged to test their water more regularly.
- Work with Drainage groups in the area to unify charges and services
- Working with staff to redesign the rhododendron garden in Fairweather Crescent
- Attended Silverstream public meeting on floor levels and other issues.

P Redmond
- 23 March attended the Annual Plan Drop-in session outside the library – not many people
- 25 March attended Social Services Youth Forum
- 27 March attended Silverstream public meeting
- 28 March attended Rural Residential Development Strategy Drop in Session in Rangiora – well supported
• 1 April attended Annual Plan and Rural Residential Development workshop
• 2 April attended Waimakariri Youth meeting – petition for after hours medical service in the district
• 9 April attended Council Briefing at Rangiora – Environment Canterbury’s changes to the bus service, do’s and don’ts when electioneering and update on remuneration

M Pinkham
• 19 March attended Rural Residential Development Strategy at Ohoka – good attendance
• 1 April attended Annual Plan and Rural Residential Development workshop
• 9 April attended Council Briefing at Rangiora – Environment Canterbury’s changes to the bus service, do’s and don’ts when electioneering and update on remuneration.

J Meyer
• Commented that the Board should do all in their power to protect the Kaiapoi River from becoming a saltwater estuary
• Footpath replacement south side of Williams Street
• Working on Review of District Plan and Hearings for Annual Plan.

A Blackie
• Update on request for houseboats on the Kaiapoi River – planners now under pressure to push through processes.
• Update on Tenders
• Silverstream Reserve – volunteers safety concerns

C Greengrass
• Attended Annual Plan Drop-in session outside library
• Pines Residents & Kairaki meeting next week
• Attended Silverstream public meeting on floor levels
• Missed Access meeting
• Attended Museum meeting – issue with bulbs blowing continually
• 6 May Red Cross will be celebrating its 80th Anniversary in Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board

R Blair
• Gave an overview of the recent Community Board Conference and thanked the Board for supporting his attendance
• Super Seniors grant information
• Remuneration observation

N Atkinson
• Six weeks of Greater Christchurch Hearings – interesting process
• District Plan review

12 CONSULTATION PROJECTS

About District Plan Review

Consultation closes Monday 6 May

About Vehicle crossings

Consultation closes Friday 1 May
https://www.waimakariri.govt.nz/have-a-say/lets-talk/consultations/about-vehicle-crossings

13 REGENERATION PROJECTS

13.1 Town Centre, Kaiapoi

Updates on the Kaiapoi Town Centre projects are emailed regularly to Board members. These updates can be accessed using the link below:

13.2 Kaiapoi Regeneration Steering Group

The next meeting of the Kaiapoi Regeneration Steering Group will be held in Meeting Room 1, Ruataniwha Kaiapoi Civic Centre, 4pm on Monday 6 May 2019. This meeting is open to the public.

14 BOARD FUNDING UPDATE

14.1 Board Discretionary Grant

Balance as at 9 April 2019: $3,298.

14.2 General Landscaping Budget

Balance as at 9 April 2019: $46,420 – note that this money is targeted for the interpretive signage.

15 MEDIA ITEMS

No media items.

16 QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS

No questions under standing orders

17 URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDERS

No urgent business

NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board is scheduled for 4pm, Monday 20 May 2019 at the Ruataniwha Kaiapoi Civic Centre.
THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE MEETING WAS CLOSED AT 5.24pm

CONFIRMED

___________________________
Chairperson

___________________________
Date
1. SUMMARY

1.1 This report presents the six monthly service request statistics to the Board for the quarters ending 31 December 2018 and 31 March 2019.

1.2 Items raised by the Boards at the previous round of discussions on service requests are answered in Section 4 Issues and Options. Matters raised at each of the previous meetings are covered.

Attachments:

i. Graph showing service requests by activity group for the Board area for the quarter ending 31 December 2018

ii. Graph showing service requests by activity group for the Board area for the quarter ending 31 March 2019

iii. Graph showing service requests completed within target for the whole District by activity group showing completed and in progress requests for the 6 months ending 31 March 2019

iv. Graph showing service requests completed within target for the whole District by activity group showing completed and in progress requests for the 6 months ending 31 March 2018

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 190501062291

3. BACKGROUND

3.1 The first round of service request reports were presented to the Community Boards at the end of 2018.

3.2 Graphs showing service request activity in the Board area for the quarters ending 31 December 2018 and 31 March 2019 are attached. Separate graphs show activity across the whole District for these two three month periods ending March 2019 with a comparison for the same period in 2018. These display requests completed within and outside target.

3.3 In future the graphs will be circulated to the Board for information at the end of each quarter.
4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1. It was noted that it would be helpful to know what issues were involved when a comparison with the previous year showed a significant change in the number of service requests received in a particular group.

4.2. A request was made for a geographical display of service request locations as the Board boundaries often include several communities of interest.

At the moment data is not gathered when the request is entered that would allow accurate plotting of requests on a map. The exception is where the request relates to a particular property and is linked to that property eg a leaking water toby. The majority of requests are not linked to a property. This topic is on the radar of the GIS team and is identified as a future system improvement.

4.3. There was concern that Snap Send Solve requests were not monitored after hours and that urgent issues could go unattended. Just prior to Christmas a message was included on the SSS app advising that if the incident is urgent please contact the Council on the phone number provided.

This year a “call recommended” feature has been introduced that tags categories that may be urgent with a message to phone the Council. This is being considered but the category itself does not create the urgency, it is more situational which does not justify assigning “call recommended” to a whole category.

There are benefits in urgent requests being phoned in. The customer knows their request has been responded to, the operator can ask questions, clarify or seek more details. Emails can be delayed due to network or outside issues.

Consideration is being given to asking the after hours phone provider to monitor the SSS emails. At the moment most SSS requests are not urgent and do not require an immediate response.

Additional advertising has been arranged in the community page regarding the availability of SSS and reminding people to send the email from the location of the issue, and not to use SSS for urgent requests. Further opportunities will be found to reinforce these messages.

The lack of staff response customers making SSS requests was raised. Staff are now entering a Call Back tick on all SSS requests entered.

4.4. A request was received to see the number of service requests completed within target for each of the activity groups. Separate graphs are included showing this result District wide for two comparable periods in 2018 and 2019. Overall the Council receives around 14,000 service requests a year and around 80% are completed within targeted timeframes. Requests can take longer to resolve for a variety of reasons including the need for inspections and consultation with other parties, and wait times for contractors for non-urgent work. A recent focus on improving timeframes has shown good results trending in recent months up to 90%.

4.5. Interest was expressed in a further breakdown of some of the request types where significant activity occurred eg Animal Control or Roading. Providing detail to category level involves a lot more detail than would be useful. A breakdown of specific groups can be provided on request.
4.6. Staff responsiveness in reporting service request outcomes to customers was raised. Most work groups advised that they are providing feedback to customers, although gaps have been identified. This is a topic being discussed by a cross-organisation group working on improving service request performance.

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

5. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

5.1. Community Views have not been sought.

6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications** NA

6.2. **Community Implications** NA

6.3. **Risk Management** NA

6.4. **Health and Safety** NA

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**

To make Waimakariri a great place to be, in partnership with our Communities guided by our outcomes, through our role as a service provider.

7.4 **Delegations** NA

Maree Harris
Customer Services Manager
Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi 2018/2019 Quarter 2

Service Requests Received

- **Same Quarter Last Year**
- **Selected Quarter**

![Bar Chart showing service requests received for different categories like Reading, Parks & Greenpace, Animal Control, Noise, Water, Recycling, Drainage, Health/Environmental Services, Sewer, Parking, Building, District Regeneration, Planning/Administration, Council Property, Rural Fire, Complaint about Council, Compliment, Refuse/Rubbish, Administration/Enquiries, Business and Centres.](image_url)
### Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi 2018/2019 Quarter 3

#### Service Requests Received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Category</th>
<th>Selected Quarter</th>
<th>Same Quarter Last Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parks &amp; GreenSpace</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roading</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Control</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Services</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Property</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Administration</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Regeneration</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refuse / Rubbish</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaints</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaint about Council</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Fire</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Defence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and Centres</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dust</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaints</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT FOR INFORMATION

FILE NO and TRIM NO: GOV-26-08-06 /190423058748
REPORT TO: Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board
DATE OF MEETING: 20 May 2019
FROM: Kay Rabe, Governance Adviser
SUBJECT: Report back on NZ Community Boards’ Conference 2019
SIGNED BY: (for Reports to Council, Committees or Boards)

1. SUMMARY

1.1 This report provides information to the Board from the member who attended the NZ Community Boards’ Conference in New Plymouth from 11 to 13 April 2019.

Attachments:

i. Copy of the Conference Itinerary (Trim No. 190417057777)
ii. R Blair’s comments regarding the New Zealand Community Boards’ Conference 2019. (Trim No: 190423058794).

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 190423058748.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1 Roger Blair attended the conference together with Chris Prickett from the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board, John Archer from the Woodend-Sefton Community Board and James Ensor, Shirley Farrell and Thomas Robson from the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board.

3.2 The theme of the conference was Community Boards in a Time of Change and hosted by New Plymouth District Council in partnership with LGNZ.

4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

4.1. All members travelled by air and were not accompanied by any staff members.

4.2. All members stayed in the same accommodation and socialised which enabled an opportunity for members to gain a greater understanding of each other and to share experiences from their individual board community areas.

4.3. Due to unforeseen circumstances neither J Gerard (Rangiora-Ashley Community Board) nor J Watson (Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board) were able to attend the conference.
4.4. The conference had approximately 150 delegates from across New Zealand. The majority of attendees were community board members, however there were several Councillors, Mayor and Council staff in attendance.

4.5. The conference commenced with registration on 11 April and the formal programme on 12 April. Neil Holdom, Mayor of New Plymouth opened the Conference on Day 1.

4.6. Sessions covered:
  - Looking forward, encouraging youth and talent
  - Engaging with the Maori community
  - Taranaki Mounga project
  - The important role of Youth Voice Groups locally and regionally
  - LGNZ Localism

4.8. Concurrent Workshops included:
  - Building strong Te Au Maori relationships
  - Age Friendly Movement: getting there community by community
  - Community Emergency Planning
  - Towards Predator Free Taranaki

4.9. The Conference Dinner was held on the evening of 12 April and a number of Best Practice Awards made. Ten Community Boards entered the Best Practice Awards with the categories being as follows; Leadership, Enhancing Communities, Engaging Communities, People’s Choice (voted by the delegates on the night) and Supreme Winner (selected from the category winners by the judges). The winners were:
  - Cambridge Community Board for the Enhancing Communities category and the Supreme Winner
  - Whanganui Rural Community Board for the Leadership category
  - Waipuna/Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton for the Engagement Communities category
  - Bay of Islands Community Board for the People’s Choice

4.10. As well as the Board awards there were three Outstanding Service Award presented. These went to Elizabeth Cowan of Otorohanga Community Board, Hamish Gilpin of Methven Community Board and Peter Kay of Hastings Rural Community Board.

4.11. Day 2 commenced with presentations from the Chair of NZ Community Boards – Mick Lester and an update on LGNZ activities from the President - Dave Cull.

4.12. The Honourable Nanaia Mahuta, Minister for Local Government also addressed the delegates.


4.14. Workshops encompassed:
  - Are we People Friendly Enough?
  - How to activate, develop and empower your local youth voice
  - Rural Connectivity

4.15. Members attended a range of workshops.
4.16. Of the six members attending the conference, four returned on Saturday afternoon with a further two staying on for the post conference BBQ returning on Sunday 14 April.

4.17. The Management Team have reviewed this report.

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. Groups and Organisations
Board members attend a range of groups and activities always seeking views and to share best practice.

5.2. Wider Community
The Conference enabled all members to gain further insight and awareness of issues pertaining to communities across New Zealand.

6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1. Financial Implications
The Board had a training/seminar budget of $9,540 from the 2018/19 financial year. This has not been utilised for any other training opportunities outside the organisation. At the Board’s February meeting it was resolved that two members, J Watson and R Blair would attend the conference at an indicative cost of $1,995 each. J Watson withdrew from attending the conference.

Summary of actual conference costs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Airfares x 2</td>
<td>$888.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation x 1</td>
<td>$366.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference fees x 2</td>
<td>$1,510.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extras (meals) x 1</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,814.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2. The training budget for the rest of the financial year is $6,726.

6.3. Community Implications
Not applicable.

6.4. Risk Management
Not applicable.

6.5. 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
Not applicable.
7.3. **Community Outcomes**

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

People are friendly and caring, creating a strong sense of community in our District.

7.4. **Delegations**

Not applicable.

Kay Rabe
Governance Adviser
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Venue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 11 April</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00pm</td>
<td><strong>Registration</strong> open</td>
<td>Venue: Foyer Lounge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.45pm</td>
<td>Coaches depart The Devon to Len Lye</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00pm</td>
<td><strong>Welcome function</strong></td>
<td>Venue: Len Lye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.45pm</td>
<td>Coaches return from Len Lye to The Devon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Free evening</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 12 April</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.00am</td>
<td><strong>Registration</strong> open</td>
<td>Venue: Foyer Lounge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.30am</td>
<td>Mihi Whakatau</td>
<td>Venue: Hobson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.00am</td>
<td>Conference Opening</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neil Holdom (New Plymouth Mayor)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Chair: Glen Bennett</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.15am</td>
<td>Plenary: Looking forward, encouraging youth and talent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Darren Pratley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Chair: Alexandra Davids</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td>Plenary: Engaging with the Maori community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Puna Wano-Bryant and Wharehoka Wano</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Chair: Tania Tapsell</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.45am</td>
<td><strong>Morning tea</strong></td>
<td>Venue: Foyer Lounge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.15am</td>
<td>Plenary: Taranaki Mounga Project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sean Zelitjes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Chair: Allan Sole</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.00pm</td>
<td>Plenary: The important role of Youth Voice Groups locally and regionally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sarah Colcord</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Chair: Gerard Linstrom</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.45pm</td>
<td><strong>Lunch</strong></td>
<td>Venue: Foyer Lounge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.45pm</td>
<td>LGNZ Localism Project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CEO of LGNZ, Malcolm Alexander</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Chair: Don Cameron</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.30pm</td>
<td>Award participants (snap shot) presentations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Chair: Mike Reid</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.15pm</td>
<td><strong>Afternoon tea</strong></td>
<td>Venue: Foyer Lounge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.45pm</td>
<td>FOUR Concurrent workshops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building strong Te Ao Maori relationships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Puna Wano-Bryant &amp; Wharehoka Wano</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Chair: Bronwyn Bauer-Hunt</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Venue: Courtenay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age friendly Movement: getting there community by community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diane Turner &amp; Julia Tinga</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Chair: Ryan Jones</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Venue: Hobson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.15pm</td>
<td><strong>Close</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7pm-11pm</td>
<td><strong>Conference dinner and Best Practice Awards</strong></td>
<td>Venue: Hobson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Chair(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.00am</td>
<td>Registration open</td>
<td>Venue: Foyer Lounge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.30am</td>
<td>NZCBC Update  Chair of NZ Community Boards, Mick Lester  <strong>Chair: Glen Bennett</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.45am</td>
<td>LGNZ Update  President of LGNZ, Dave Cull  <strong>Chair: Mick Lester</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.15am</td>
<td>Plenary: Local Government update  Hon Peeni Henare  <strong>Chair: Mick Lester / Ryan Jones</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.45am</td>
<td>Plenary: Setting the foundations for community development  Shay Wright  <strong>Chair: Bronwyn Bauer-Hunt</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.30am</td>
<td>Morning tea</td>
<td>Venue: Foyer Lounge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00am</td>
<td>THREE Concurrent workshops  Are we People Friendly enough?  <strong>Lance Girling Butcher</strong>  <strong>Chair: Jayne Beer</strong>  <strong>Venue: Hobson</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How to activate, develop and empower your local youth voice  <strong>Shay Wright and Sarah Colcord</strong>  <strong>Chair: Tania Tapsell</strong>  <strong>Venue: Watson</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural Connectivity Group – RB12 and Mobile Black Spots Programme  <strong>Caitlin Metz</strong>  <strong>Chair: Doug Hislop</strong>  <strong>Venue: Courtenay</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.30pm</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>Venue: Foyer Lounge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.30pm</td>
<td>Plenary: The implications of our ageing population  <strong>Natalie Jackson</strong>  <strong>Chair: Christine Papps</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15pm</td>
<td>Plenary: Engaging the next generation  <strong>Noa Woolloff</strong>  <strong>Chair: Allan Sole</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00pm</td>
<td>Conference wind up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.30pm</td>
<td>Post conference BBQ</td>
<td>Venue: Sculpture Garden</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The theme of the 2019 Community Boards’ Conference was ‘Community Boards in a Time of Change’. The conference was held between the 11-13 April at the Devon Hotel, New Plymouth.

After a greeting from the local Taranaki iwi the conference was opened by the mayor of new Plymouth, Neil Holdom.

Topics covered during Friday 12 April
- Looking forward, encouraging youth and talent.
- Engaging with the Maori Community
- Taranaki Mounga Project
- The important role of youth voice groups locally and regionally
- LGNZ Localism project
- Award participants presentation

Concurrent Workshops
- The age friendly movement – getting there community by community
- Community emergency planning
- Building strong Te Reo Maori relations
- Towards predator free Taranaki

Conference dinner and best practice awards.

Topics Covered Saturday 13 April
- Update from the HZCBE Chair
- Update from the HGNZ President
- Local Government Update
- Setting the foundations for community development.

Concurrent Workshops
- Are we people friendly enough
- How to activate, develop and empower your local youth voice
- Rural connectivity group RB12 and mobile black spots Programme
- The implication of our aging population
- Engaging the next generation
- Post conference function – barbeque

Notes on conference speakers

Glen Bennett – Mixes in many diverse communities around Taranaki and New Zealand.
Darren Pratley – Again and again, in a career spanning over two decades, Darren has taken leadership roles in organizations facing up to the need for change.
Puna Wano Bryant – Is currently iwi environmental Manager Te Kahui O Taranaki Iwi and also holds another of other positions with local iwi.

Wharehoka Loano – is currently CEO Te Kahui O Taranaki. He is heavily involved in the community and supports and participates on Marae, community, cultural activities, events, festivals and sports.

Sean Zeiltjes – as project manager of the Taranaki Mounga project, Sean is making sure we are on target to secure the Mounga from predators and weed’s, and then restore species to it, revitalizing the ecology across the landscape.

Malcolm Alexander – is the CEO of Local Government New Zealand and brings with him a combination of legal background and commercial experience.

Dave Cull – In July 2017 Dave became he president of HGNZ – the representative body that interacts with and advocates to central government on behalf of the diverse councils and territorial authorities of New Zealand.

Shay Wright – Is a Maori social entrepreneur for his work as co-founder of two social enterprises – Te Whare Hukahuka and Nuku ltd.

Dr. Natalie Jackson – Is involved in the study of demographics. Today her focus is on regional population aging and maintaining those differentials.

Noa Woolloff – (Aged 20) gained significant national and international attention when he became head boy of his school during the same year became a father.

Other speakers included –

Toby Shanley – conservation

Julia Tinga – Age Friendly movement

Elaine Reilly – blend of people and business skills

Ben Ingram – CDEM lead for New Plymouth District Council

Sarah Colcord – Elected to the Manurewa Local Board at 20 years of age

Lance Girling – Butcher – a long serving taranaki journalist.

Over 150 people attended the conference. Award winners included the Wanganui Rural Community Board and the Waipuna/Halswell Hornby Riccarton Community Board. Overall a really good experience and an enjoyable two days.

Roger Blair

Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board Member

April 2019
1. **SUMMARY**

1.1 The purpose of this report is to retrospectively ratify the Board's comments made in relation to the Waimakariri District Council Reviewed District Plan – ‘What’s the Plan’.

1.2 Attachments:
   i. The Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board Comments on the Waimakariri District Council Reviewed District Plan (Trim Ref: 190508065617)

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:

(a) **Receives** report No. 190509066112.

(b) **Retrospectively ratifies** the Board's Comments on the Waimakariri District Council Reviewed District Plan (Trim Ref: 190508065617).

3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1 The District Plan review has a number of distinct phases leading to the creation of a formally approved Draft Reviewed District Plan which will be subjected to Public Notification, Submissions and a comprehensive Hearing process in 2020.

3.2 A number of consultations and engagements have already taken place during 2017 and 2018 to assist staff in the preparation of the reviewed plan and to identify the critical issues that the community believe should be taken into account going forward.

3.3 The plan is a complex document requiring specialist and meticulous work but is also critically important as it affects the way in which the District will develop over the next 20 to 30 years, how this will be 'managed' and what restrictions may or may not apply.

3.4 A further consultation opportunity has been undertaken entitled ‘What's The Plan – Shaping the Content of the Reviewed District Plan’. This engagement sought further comments on 13 topic areas and suggested over 50 possible questions for the community to consider. Given the importance of the plan and to enable the Community Boards to have
a further input at this formative stage, WDC Planning staff undertook extensive (two hour) focussed workshops with each of the boards to answer any queries as well as to seek feedback on these key areas. The workshops were facilitated by the specialist staff and targeted to concentrate on those aspects of the plan that members wished to offer comments.

3.5 These workshops were held in early May and covered an immense amount of detail and discussion. Recognising that members have contributed previously and will be offered further opportunities as part of the formal consultation in 2020 it was agreed that staff would collate a summary of comments rather than prepare a lengthy and complex document.

3.6 Members were also encouraged to take every opportunity to feed any additional comments to staff as part of the main public consultation process.

3.7 Public consultation took place from 8 April to 6 May 2019, with the specific workshops for the Boards taking place to meet both member and specialist staff availability.

3.8 The Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi workshop was held on Tuesday 7 May 2019.

3.9 The summary comments were circulated for information on 9 May 2019 and a final document agreed with the Chair on 10 May 2019.

4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1. The Board is now asked to retrospectively ratify the attached Comments.

4.2. The Management Team have reviewed this report.

5. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

5.1. **Groups and Organisations**

A major publicity campaign was put in place by the Council including Drop In sessions which board members have also attended.

5.2. **Wider Community**

As for 5.1.

6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**

Not applicable.

6.2. **Community Implications**

The Reviewed District Plan will be subject to a formal consultative process in 2020.

6.3. **Risk Management**

Not applicable.

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**
Not applicable.

7.3. **Community Outcomes**

- Opportunities for people to contribute to decision making.
- People have wide ranging opportunities for being informed.
- Public spaces and facilities are plentiful, accessible and high quality.

7.4. **Delegations**
Not applicable.

Kay Rabe
Governance Adviser
### Question: How much protection, more or less, do we need for our historic heritage?

- We think that the current process for identifying heritage is fit for purpose and needs very little change. However, we would like to see more information about what character setting means and how this might impact on landowners.
- We also would like to see the Council develop a fund to support the retention of heritage buildings and sites, as often the costs of maintaining and restoring these important heritage sites is beyond the means of the landowner. As a community we need to acknowledge that some land owners are bearing the brunt of retaining these heritage sites that have a general benefit to the whole community.
- Need better understanding on criteria for heritage – is it defined by date or other aspects.

### Question: What level of protected tree pruning by landowners is acceptable?

- We acknowledge that the retention of protected trees is of considerable benefit to the community and therefore we would like to see the council provide free advice to landowners of protected trees to ensure that any pruning is carried out to appropriate standards.

### Question: What should be avoided within the drip line of a protected tree

- We do not support the inclusion of rules around what should be avoided within the drip line of protected trees this is getting far too specific for a District Plan. Use common sense re earthworks near tree roots.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Do you know of any trees that you think may be worthy of protection?   | • Protected tree list should be updated regularly and not left for the District Plan Review (significant oak trees along Rangiora/Woodend Road felled which should have been avoided)  
|                                                                        | • Trees that line Mill Road                                                                                                                                                                                |
| **Open space and Recreation zones**                                     |                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| Do you have any comments on what we are thinking?                      | • The proposed three Open Space and Recreation zones proposed seem to make a lot of sense and on the face of it would make it straightforward to administer. We concur with the proposal that these zones are only for public land. |
| **Noise**                                                              |                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| Do you agree or disagree with any of these changes to the noise rules, why? | • We do not agree with the concept of making the daytime and night-time hours the same for all zones. We see that the hours for industrial zones could be quite different to that for residential zones. We take the view that the noise generated from new activities should be measured at the boundary of the zone in which the noise is generated and reflect the impact of the nature on the adjoining zone.  
<p>|                                                                        | • We do not support the concept of having controls on various activities within a zone as this will never capture potential noise generation. It is our view that it should be the measure of noise at the adjoining boundary which should take precedent. In some cases, there may be a cumulative effect of new noise generation activities and this may lead to new noise generating activities not being able to proceed if the cumulative effect at the zone boundary is sufficiently adverse. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you agree there should be specific treatment for noise from quarry</td>
<td>• We do not support this concept it will be extremely difficult to define a noise level from some of these very specialised activities. While it would be very nice to approve activities based on their expected noise levels it is our view that it is the actual noise at the boundary of the noise generating property which should be the principal consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blasting, firewood processing, dog boarding kennel, gun clubs,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shooting ranges, motor vehicle racing, function venues, and military</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>training?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any parks and reserves where you think noise levels should</td>
<td>• We support the concept of some parks and reserves being able to hold activities that generate higher than normal levels of noise, for the likes of holding events, but there does need to be some rules around this including the total number of days when these activities can occur, and on what days these activities can occur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be more permissive?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Earthworks**

<p>| Should we change the thresholds for earthwork activities from a ratio   | • We do not support this concept as we do need to acknowledge the potential impact of earthworks on a large site will be a lot smaller than for a smaller site given the same volume of earthworks. |
| approach to a volume that can be undertaken annually on a site?         |                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| Should we introduce limits on stockpile heights and setbacks?         | • We support the concept of limits on stockpile heights and setbacks, but they would need to vary from zone to zone                                                                                     |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How should stormwater channels be protected?</td>
<td>• Overflow paths should be protected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any activities that you think should require special treatment?</td>
<td>• We are not aware of any such activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quarrying</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What control do you think there should be for Quarrying?</td>
<td>• We support the concept of there being controls on noise, dust control, traffic generation, and vibration from quarry activities to minimise impact on amenities of the areas involved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should we introduce setbacks for quarrying from houses and other sensitive activities?</td>
<td>• We support the concept of setbacks from houses, but it should be based on appropriate New Zealand or internationally recognised standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you think the setback should be where should they be measured from, should they be the same for all types of quarrying activity?</td>
<td>• We support the concept of setbacks been from roads, waterways, and adjoining properties based on the potential for noise and dust impacting on the adjacent property</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| To what extent should resource consents be required for quarry as an activity and different zones? | • Some of the Board supported the concept of quarry zones with an associated set of rules, and in these circumstances most quarrying activities should be Permitted Activities  
  • In other zones a resource consent should be required. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural Environment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indigenous Biodiversity and Riparian Areas</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you think offering development bonuses to protect and enhance SNA or ecological corridor priority areas would be an appropriate incentive to improve our District’s biodiversity values?</td>
<td>• We support this concept and recommend that a fund be established to recompense landowners where land use changes have an adverse impact on their properties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any biodiversity values or locations that should be included or not included within the reviewed district plan provisions?</td>
<td>• We are not aware of any such areas at this stage but are interested in what research has been done by the Council regarding such areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outstanding natural landscapes and features</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are your views on the amount of acceptable development in the outstanding landscapes area e.g. wind farms, cell phone towers?</td>
<td>• We would like to see some controls on the installation of cell phone towers as these are often located to provide important safety services for our local communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• We would not support a total ban on wind farms but would expect to see the DP include criteria for assessing wind farm development proposals, and that they be designed to protect the amenity value of the landscape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question</strong></td>
<td><strong>Commentary</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any other natural features or landscapes in our district that should be protected?</td>
<td>• We would like to see the Kaiapoi River, and its banks included.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **What are your views on the revised extent of outstanding natural landscape (foothills) and newly identified outstanding natural features (Waimakariri River and the Ashley-Rakahuri / Saltwater Creek estuary)?** | • We would not support the inclusion of the Waimakariri River as an outstanding natural feature as it is already highly modified and is a valuable resource of aggregates. Including it as an outstanding natural feature would be very complicated. In addition, there could be considerable cross boundary issues with Christchurch City and Selwyn District if they do not have similar provisions their district plans. • We do not support the inclusion of the Ashley-Rakahuri as an outstanding natural landscape is it too is highly modified and an important source of aggregate. • However, we would support the concept of the Ashley-Rakahuri / Saltwater Creek estuary to be added as an outstanding natural landscape |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Coastal environment</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What activities in the coastal environment should be managed by the reviewed district plan?</td>
<td>• We would not like to see the district plan have additional controls as the current regional plan and national environmental standard already provide enough guidance as to what activities can be carried out in the coastal environment. • We are concerned that additional controls in relation to forestry activity in the coastal area could considerably impact on the council’s own forestry assets and potential forestry asset contained within the Te Kohaka coastal environment. • Rising sea levels should be taken into account when building close to the coast and development limited in the coastal zone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What level of activity is acceptable?</td>
<td>• There is no need for additional activities to be included in the district plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Temporary activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any other temporary activities you think require treatment?</td>
<td>• We cannot think of any</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How should electronic sound amplification and associated with events be managed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What hours do you consider appropriate for noisy events?</td>
<td>• Our view is that it is not inappropriate for noisy events to continue until 10 p.m. on weeknights, and up to 12 midnight on Friday and Saturday nights.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often and for what duration should temporary events and other temporary activities occur on each site?</td>
<td>• We think that it would be very difficult to have a set of general rules in relation to establishing the duration and frequency of noisy events. We support the concept of specific sites, for example Woodford Glen, the town centres, and other event locations, to have specific rules regarding duration and frequency that need to be tested in the notified district plan. This will provide certainty for both the event locations and for neighbouring property owners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any locations that should be afforded leniency for temporary event noise levels?</td>
<td>• As noted in the answer above we think that some locations should have specific rules regarding duration and frequency of events and that the approach should be consistent across the district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transport</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Do you have any comments on the road width and layout provided and recent greenfield developments | • We do not have any comments on this matter but note that on street parking is very difficult in some of the higher density areas such as west Silverstream and The Oaks. In these locations it is not so much the road layout but the lack of on road parking that needs to be addressed.  
  • We support the provision of additional parking where roads are narrow.                                                                                                                   |
<p>| Should major new developments be required to provide an integrated transport assessment part of their resource consent application? | • This concept as this suggests that the council has no strategy dealing with growth in the district. The council's District Development Strategy should identify the growth areas and the associated Transport Infrastructure that is required to support those areas as they develop. |
| Do you have any other comments on the technical standards that control road and access design?                                         | • We have no comments on this matter                                                                                                                                                                       |
| <strong>Residential</strong>                                                        |                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
| How should we be more flexible in allowing for different types of housing?                                                | • We would like to see greater flexibility in the sizes of properties within a particular zone. The current strategy of having zones with one density is that they tend to become very boring, and do not provide options for people living within a particular zone. For example, the lack of small lots within the Sovereign Palms development means that there are some people who would like to live in this area but cannot as they cannot afford to buy the larger section, and the large house as required the developer's covenants. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there any accommodation types that should be restricted, why?</td>
<td>• We have no comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should we restrict the number of storeys for housing in medium density zones, if so what's the maximum number of stories be in the zone, why?</td>
<td>• We would not like to see housing more than four stories high in the medium residential zone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you think about the four proposed zones</td>
<td>• We tend to agree that the four zones make a lot of sense.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• We would like to see a mixture of lot sizes within each of the new zones, based on average lot sizes overall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• We would like to see rules for each of these zones identify a minimum lot size and an average lot size that would provide a lot more flexibility for developers and house purchasers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Restrictions on the number of properties that can be built on any parcel of land (to prevent several tiny houses on one lot).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should we keep the same minimum section size for existing residential zone land, or be more flexible by allowing for smaller lot sizes?</td>
<td>• We would like to see a mixture of lot sizes within each of the existing zones provided infill and redevelopment can utilise the existing infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rural</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you support the protection of rural production (farming)?</td>
<td>• We do support stronger protection of rural production.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you agree that maintaining rural character is important is it more important in some areas than in others if so why?</td>
<td>• We do not understand exactly what is meant by rural character but would support the new district plan listing permitted activities that support rural production as the primary focus of rural areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on character, land-use, and the potential for future production, should the rural zone be split into more than one zone. At present there is a one zone (4ha minimum) approach across the rural area of the district?</td>
<td>• We support a variation in rural lot sizes based on potential production. For example, we would support a lower lot size for high quality soils that would be ideally suited to horticulture and other intensive land uses. Similarly, in areas with poor soils where pastoral farming would be the predominant activity we would like to see a much higher lot size.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What combination of zoning options would work best for the district? where?</td>
<td>• As noted above we do see that rural zoning lot sizes and other controls should be reflective of the production potential for that zone.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Effluent spreading and intensive farming**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you support removing current rules requiring separation between liquid effluent spreading and houses</td>
<td>• Yes – no duplication of work that other authorities oversee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you support continuing to manage separation between intensive farms and houses</td>
<td>• We do support separation between intensive farms and houses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you agree industrial area should remain primarily for industrial activities and not for standalone offices or high street retailing?</td>
<td>• While we support the concept of industrial areas primarily being for industrial activities, we think it is important that all industrial areas have a wide range of services and retail outlets to support each industrial area. It makes no sense for workers in an industrial area having to travel to town centres for their day to day needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are your thoughts on allowing Trade based and Yard based retailing in industrial zones?</td>
<td>• We need to be realistic that in the Waimakariri District industrial activity is generally of the light industrial type and Trade based and Yard based activities are a good fit. It is also beneficial for the workers in an industrial zone to have access to Trade based and Yard based services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you agree with increasing the height limit in the Rangiora and Kaiapoi town centres?</td>
<td>• We would support the height limit increasing to 4 stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you agree with introducing minimum residential amenity requirements for residential activities and commercial zones</td>
<td>• We would support the introduction of minimum residential amenity requirements for residential activities in commercial zones. However, these would need to be quite different to the amenity requirements in residential zones as people living in commercial zones are looking for quite a different lifestyle to that of residents in residential zones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you have any other comments on what we are thinking</td>
<td>• We are unsure of the definition of mixed-use business as proposed for the Kaiapoi regeneration area. The new district plan is the appropriate place for this to be defined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• We oppose the proposal for a 2 m deep landscape strip between industrial buildings and the road as a 2m zone is completely inadequate to establish a meaningful landscape environment. However, we would support wider landscape strips on arterial and collector roads in Industrial areas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Business activities in rural and residential zones**

| What businesses should be permitted in residential zones and rural zones? | • We think it is important that there is a relatively wide range of businesses established in residential zones and rural zones.                                                                                       |
|                                                                         | • In residential zones we would prefer to see a wide range of retail and service activities permitted in neighbourhood shopping areas to service each distinct residential community.                                      |
|                                                                         | • In rural areas it is our view that businesses associated with the rural sector should be permitted provided they do not result in adverse noise and traffic generation and there is sufficient parking to support that activity. |

<p>| What businesses should not operate in a rural residential zone why?       | • It is our view that rural and residential zones should not have businesses that create excessive noise or traffic generation or impact visual amenity.                                                        |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Other comments | • We are extremely disappointed that this consultation document does not provide the opportunity to provide feedback on those topics listed on page 21 of the consultation document. Many of these topics are of intense interest to the Kaiapoi Tuahiwi Community Board and we would have liked to have seen the councils thinking on how some of these matters can be addressed.  
• We're disappointed to see that the question of natural hazards has not been included in this document.  
• The Kaiapoi Tuahiwi Community Board would also like to be involved in the development of the district plan in relation to activities on the surface of water. This is particularly important for the Kaiapoi community and this consultation document would have been a good starting point for discussions on this matter. In particular that no permanent structures are erected on river bed – house boats should float and be able to be moved to other areas of the river from time to time. |
1. **SUMMARY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 29</td>
<td>Pines Beach Kairaki residents Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 3</td>
<td>Inspiring Women with Nikki Kay at Urban Revival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 6</td>
<td>Regeneration Steering Group meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 7</td>
<td>Workshop on Annual Plan submission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kaiapoi’s Waitangi Day Celebration opening speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 8</td>
<td>Hui at Tuahiwi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 9</td>
<td>Signage meeting with Roger Blair, Chris Greengrass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual Plan submission presented to WDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 10</td>
<td>Meet with UC Political Science students with Chris Greengrass and David Ayers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 15</td>
<td>Forestry Harvest PCG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 16</td>
<td>Drainage get together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 17</td>
<td>KTCB workshop Metro bus review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

(a) **Receives** report No. 190506063835.

Jackie Watson  
Chair  
Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board