

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL HELD IN THE  
KAIKANUI MEETING ROOM, RUATANIWHA KAIAPOI CIVIC CENTRE, 176 WILLIAMS  
STREET, KAIAPOI ON TUESDAY 5 OCTOBER 2021, COMMENCING AT 1PM**

**PRESENT**

Mayor D Gordon (Chairperson), Deputy Mayor N Atkinson, Councillors A Blackie, W Doody, N Mealings, P Redmond, S Stewart (until 5.02pm), J Ward and P Williams.

**IN ATTENDANCE**

J Harland (Chief Executive), G Cleary (Manager Utilities and Roothing), S Markham (Manager - Strategic Projects), D Young (Senior Engineering Adviser), G MacLeod (Community Greenspace Manager), S Hart (Business and Centres Manager), C Roxburgh (Water Asset Manager), S Nichols (Governance Manager), K LaValley (Project Development Manager), S Collin (Infrastructure Strategy Manager 3 Waters), R Hawthorne (Property Manager) V Thompson (Business and Centres Advisor), C Roxburgh (Water Asset Manager), K Simpson (3waters Manager), A Mace-Cochrane (Graduate Engineer), L Beckingsale (Policy Analyst), T Kunkel (Governance Team Leader), and A Smith (Governance Coordinator).

1. **APOLOGIES**

Moved: Councillor Ward

Seconded: Councillor Blackie

**THAT** apologies for absence be received and sustained from Councillors K Barnett and R Brine.

**CARRIED**

2. **CONFLICTS OF INTEREST**

Item 8.1 – Councillor Atkinson declared a conflict of interest as he had a business relationship with the owner of the property.

3. **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

Nil.

4. **CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES**

4.1 **Minutes of meetings of the Waimakariri District Council held on  
7 September 2021 and 28 September 2021**

Moved: Councillor Atkinson

Seconded: Councillor Ward

**THAT** the Council:

- (a) **Confirms**, as a true and correct record, the circulated Minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on 7 September 2021.
- (b) **Confirms**, as a true and correct record, the circulated Minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on 28 September 2021.

**CARRIED**

**MATTERS ARISING**

Nil.

4.2 **Minutes of the public excluded meetings of the Waimakariri District Council held on 7 September 2021**

*(Refer to public excluded minutes)*

5. **DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS**

5.1. **Heather Woods – 108 Butchers Road**

H Woods provided a brief history of her discussions and agreement with the Council on the possible provision of an esplanade strip adjacent to 108 Butchers Road. She noted that the Council's reason for requiring the esplanade strip to enable public recreational use no longer applies as there was already a walking track on the property's eastern boundary. H Woods advised that the rural amenity for their farm, which was zoned Rural Lifestyle, would be challenging to maintain if there was to be public access on three sides of their property. The increased public access to their property, due to the walking trail, had already led to an increase in property theft and vandalism.

H Woods explained that the Resource Management Act, 1991 (RMA) was clear regarding the rights of property owners when establishing esplanade reserves. In her opinion, the Council would be infringing on their rights, as it would not be able to guarantee their property's safety with the unbridled public access on three sides of their property. The Council would also be changing the use of the property and would therefore have to consider rezoning the area. They had always allowed the Council access to this area and had maintained it to the Council's satisfaction. She, therefore, noted her concern that the Council was imposing the esplanade reserve without appropriate consultation with the effected property owners.

In conclusion, H Wood emphasised that the Council's reasons for requiring the esplanade reserve did not seem justified and that the RMA made provision for other means of granting the Council access to the river that did not include an esplanade reserve.

The Mayor enquired if H Wood had a written agreement with the Council that they would not need an esplanade reserve. H Woods explained that the agreement was captured in e-mails between herself and staff, of which she tabled. She also noted that they had previously discussed the subdivision of their property with the former Mayor and Council staff.

Councillor Redmond sought clarity if H Wood would be agreeable with a 20-metre esplanade strip. H Wood confirmed that they would be happy with the provision of an esplanade strip for conservation and maintenance purposes only however for it not to allow public access.

**RESOLUTION TO CONSIDER SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA ITEM**

Moved: Councillor Doody

Seconded: Councillor Blackie

**THAT** the Council:

- (a) **Agrees** to consider supplementary agenda Item 7.2, as listed below, at this meeting:

Whistler Bridge Protection – Lees Valley – J McBride (Roading and Transportation Manager) and D Young (Senior Engineering Advisor)

*At this time, supplementary Item 8.1 was taken. The Minutes have been recorded in the order of the Agenda.*

## 6. **ADJOURNED BUSINESS**

### 6.1. **Approval to Consult on the Waimakariri District Walking and Cycling Network Plan and Infrastructure Prioritisation Programme Update – A Mace-Cochrane (Graduate Engineer) and D Young (Senior Engineering Consultant)**

Mayor Gordon advised that Councillor Barnett had submitted several questions regarding the feedback received from the Community Boards. A Mace-Cochrane confirmed that Councillor Barnett's concerns would be addressed as part of the staff presentation.

A Mace-Cochrane advised that Waka Kotahi's 2021/24 National Land Transport Programme for the Waimakariri District did not include any funding for new walking and cycling infrastructure. Therefore, the only available funding for the next three years was on average \$500,000 per annum that the Council had included in the 2021/31 Long Term Plan. Staff could not predict whether any funding from Waka Kotahi would become available in the future; however, staff would continue to work closely with Waka Kotahi in an attempt to secure additional funding.

D Young highlighted the consultation process undertaken with the Community Boards. Staff had tried to capture all the comments made by the Community Boards, and most of the requested amendments had been included in the proposed Walking and Cycling Network Plan. However, today the Council was only being asked for approval to undertake public consultation. The Community Boards would be given an opportunity to provide input on the response received during the public consultation.

*The meeting adjourned from 2.22pm to 2.35pm to allow Councillors to study the staff's responses to the questions submitted by Councillor Barnett.*

Councillor Stewart questioned if it may be worth stating in the consultation documents that for the next three years. There would be no funding available from Waka Kotahi. D Young confirmed that the current uncertainty of Waka Kotahi funding would be noted in the consultation documents.

Councillor Williams asked if the costs associated with the public consultation would be covered from the funding allocated by Council to this project. D Young confirmed that approximately \$50,000 had been budgeted for consultation and would be allocated from the project budget.

Councillor Doody raised a concern that the Walking and Cycling Network Plan did not differentiate between rural and urban paths, which could lead to public confusion regarding the level of service to be provided. D Young noted that due to the issue's complexity, staff were struggling to explain the grading of paths to the public. However, they were trying to convey to the public what they could expect by providing photos of surfaces and corresponding maps.

Mayor Gordon asked that if the Council was able to show the extensive work it had done on the project, would it be in a better position to request funding from Waka Kotahi. D Young believed that the Council may have a better chance of receiving funding if it could show what it would be spending the money on over the next three years, hence the importance of the Walking and Cycling Network Plan. J Harland noted that it was essential to prioritise the commuter routes, as Waka Kotahi was more likely to fund alternative transport than recreational cycling.

In response to a question, D Young confirmed that the consultation document would include various maps conveying different information.

Councillor Atkinson expressed apprehension that the public would be consulted on a project with insufficient funding, no set delivery timeframe and no clear designs. He, therefore, questioned the reason for the proposed public consultation. D Young noted that a significant benefit of the Walking and Cycling Network Plan was that it provided staff with information on where provision had to be made for future walking and cycling infrastructure. Also, Council was hoping that identifying a priority would assist them in securing Waka Kotahi funding.

In reply to a question from Councillor Mealings, D Young confirmed that any work funded by the Council as part of this project could not in future be claimed back from Waka Kotahi.

Moved: Councillor Ward

Seconded: Councillor Redmond

**THAT** the Council:

- (a) **Receives** Report No. 210920151361.
- (b) **Approves** consultation being carried out on the Walking and Cycling Network Plan (Attachment ii), and the proposed infrastructure prioritisation programme shown in Attachment iii and iv, noting that the timing of specific works would not be part of the consultation information.
- (c) **Approves** retaining the current local share budget of \$563,500 over the next three years of the Long Term Plan cycle infrastructure construction, noting the uncertainty regarding the availability of Waka Kotahi funding.
- (d) **Notes** that the duration for delivery of the prioritisation programme would be subject to the budget allocated.
- (e) **Notes** that pre-engagement on improving the understanding of cycleways would be carried out in February 2022, with district-wide consultation occurring at a time to be determined during February and March 2022.
- (f) **Notes** that the change in the timing of consultation would be advised to the Community Boards and to the Walking and Cycle Network Plan Reference Group.
- (g) **Notes** that the results of the public consultation and final proposals would be presented to the Community Boards and then Council for approval.
- (h) **Notes** the Plan and prioritisation of routes would be reviewed every three years.

**CARRIED**

Councillor Atkinson Against

Councillor Ward commented that it was important for the Council to have a Walking and Cycling Network Plan to show its commitment to alternative transport. A plan would also clarify the walking and cycling infrastructure to be provided while considering new subdivisions. Finally, the Plan may assist in securing funding from Waka Kotahi in the future.

Councillor Redmond congratulated staff on the development of the Walking and Cycling Network Plan and their early engagement with the Community Boards. He noted the large amount of work had gone on the Plan, and he would like to see the project's conclusion. He, therefore, supported going out to public consultation.

Councillor Williams believed that it was important for the Council to have a Walking and Cycling Network Plan to assist with the planning for future development. However, he doubted that the Plan would help in securing funding from Waka Kotahi in the future. He expressed his disappointment with Waka Kotahi's decision not to fund the project, especially in light of their previous championing of alternative transport options.

Councillor Mealings thanked staff for the development of such a comprehensive plan and the extensive consultation undertaken. She believed that it was important for the Council to have a Walking and Cycling Network Plan to demonstrate that it was serious about developing walking and cycleways, therefore she would support public consultation. Councillor Mealings stated that she found it disheartening that Waka Kotahi opted not to subsidise this project. It was especially disappointing for rural areas with no public transport that needed alternative options to using vehicles to take their children to facilities and schools.

Mayor Gordon commended staff for the work done and noted that he would support going out for public consultation. He advised that the Chief Executive of Waka Kotahi, Nicole Rosie, would be visiting the Waimakariri District shortly. At which time the Council's disappointment about Waka Kotahi's lack of commitment to the project would be shared. Hopefully, the Council's work on the development of the Walking and Cycling Network Plan would encourage Waka Kotahi to rethink their position.

Council Stewart endorsed the comments of previous speakers. She believed that it was important to consult the public on the proposed Walking and Cycling Network Plan, as it would provide clarity to the public and staff on the walking and cycling infrastructure to be provided in future. She hoped that the rural community would use the public consultation process as a platform to highlight their needs in terms of alternative transport infrastructure. Thus enabling the Council to petition Waka Kotahi for rural infrastructure.

Councillor Atkinson noted the benefit of the Walking and Cycling Network Plan for the Council's future planning. However, he did not support the Plan going out for public consultation, as there was insufficient funding and no clear designs. In his opinion, the Plan and complicated maps would only confuse the public and encourage expectations that the Council would not be able to meet. He expressed his frustration that the Council seemed only to be focusing on walking and cycling and no other means of alternative transport.

## **7. RECOVERY PROJECTS**

### **COVID-19 RECOVERY PLANNING / SHOVEL READY PROJECTS**

*Refer Public Excluded Agenda Item 19.2.*

### **29-30 MAY 2021 ADVERSE WEATHER EVENT RECOVERY**

#### **7.1. May 2021 Flood Recovery – Completion Report – S Hart (District Recovery Manager)**

S Hart advised that the report signalled the completion of the organised recovery following the extreme weather event that occurred on 30 and 31 May 2021. Whilst some ongoing work generated by the flood continued as part of the Council's daily operations, there was no longer a need for a resource dedicated recovery coordination. He noted that most of the \$55,400 from the Mayoral Relief Fund had been allocated mainly to rural residents in need. The \$4 million fund held by the Ministry of Primary Industries (MPI) targeted commercial farms, primarily defined as those that derived more than 51% of their income from the property. Any farms that did not qualify were considered lifestyle blocks.

As such, only \$20,000 was allocated to rural properties in the Waimakariri District. In conclusion, S Hart highlighted the various Recovery learnings from this event, especially the development of a generic Recovery Plan that would better prepare the Council to support rural property owners by focusing on risk reduction, resilience building and event readiness.

Mayor Gordon acknowledged the guidance and support of staff and the Deputy Mayor in the allocation of funding from the Mayoral Relief Fund. He noted that in addition to the funding received from the Crown, the Council received funding from other sources. To ensure transparency, he requested S Hart submit a report to the Council on the allocations made from the Mayoral Relief Fund following this event.

Councillor Doody enquired if MPI considered requests for funding for the replacement of fencing. S Hart explained that the criteria set by the MPI to qualify for funding were very restrictive, which resulted in many applications not qualifying. However, there was still money in the fund to be allocated, and the MPI was reviewing the set criteria. Nevertheless, it should be noted that this was a regional event, and the funding may be allocated to other districts considered to be in more need.

Moved: Councillor Atkinson

Seconded: Councillor Williams

**THAT** the Council:

- (a) **Receives** Report No. 210922153158.
- (b) **Notes** the significance and scale of the May Canterbury Flood event as detailed in section three of this report.
- (c) **Notes** the activities and programme of work undertaken during the flood recovery phase of the May flood event.
- (d) **Notes** the ongoing flood recovery work that would continue as part of Council BAU Work Programmes, and would be reported on through normal management and governance processes.
- (e) **Notes** termination of formal 'coordinated recovery' had occurred, and the support provided by the Recovery Management function was no longer required.
- (f) **Acknowledges** the support of key organisations involved in the recovery phase of this event, and in particular the North Canterbury Rural Support Trust for their work within the rural communities.
- (g) **Notes** both the learnings captured from this flood event, and the opportunities identified for improvements to future recovery activities of the Council.
- (h) **Supports** a further review of the Council's Recovery Management arrangements by staff, with the intention of considering how the learnings and opportunities identified in this report might be used to improve recovery operations for future events.
- (i) **Notes** the importance of ongoing development and inclusion of critical GIS resources to support both the EOC for future emergency responses, and the Recovery Management Team for future recovery activities.
- (j) **Notes** a report would be made to the draft 2022/23 Annual Plan Budget meeting in February 2022 regarding funding for specialist advice in developing the Council's Recovery Plan and related processes for use in future recovery events.

- (k) **Notes** that the development of a District Recovery Plan may result in a request for further resourcing to enable greater disaster recovery capacity within the Council. Any such further resourcing would be subject to a further report to Council for consideration.
- (l) **Circulates** this report to the Community Boards for their information.

**CARRIED**

Mayor Gordon commented that the Council had shared its concerns with the Government, and they needed to relook at their definitions of lifestyle blocks and rural properties. He thanked the staff for the work they did as part of the recovery.

Councillor Atkinson advised that the groups working with Enhanced Taskforce Green were investigating the possibility of assisting farmers with replacing their fencing. He noted that dealing with extreme events would always be difficult as there was not enough funding to assist those in need. However, he recognised the vulnerability of the four-hectare block owners and that the Council would need to be better prepared to assist them during any future events.

*The Supplementary agenda item was taken at this time.*

**7.2. Whistler Bridge Protection – Lees Valley – J McBride (Roading and Transportation Manager) and D Young (Senior Roading Engineer)**

D Young provided a brief background to the damage caused to the Whistler Bridge during previous flooding events. He explained the work to be done as part of the proposed Whistler Bridge Abutment Project, which included bedding the containers in the river bed and installing gabions along the top. Waka Kotahi and Environmental Canterbury supported the proposed project, for which Waka Kotahi provided funding.

Council Atkinson enquired how long the containers were expected to last. D Young advised that the holes would be cut in the bottom of the containers to ensure proper drainage. The containers were expected to last 30 to 40 years.

Councillor Doody raised a concern that the containers may become hazardous if they were washed away. D Young explained that the containers were not expected to wash away during flood events, as they would be weighted down and embedded into the river bed. Worst case scenario, the containers may slump out of alignment, which could easily be corrected.

Councillor Mealings questioned if the containers could be painted to guard against rust and to make them more aesthetically pleasing. D Young noted that painting the containers had been considered and it was agreed that it may be considered in future if the gravel kept washing away and the containers were exposed.

Councillor Atkinson asked if the stacking of containers was considered to allow them to be embedded deeper into the river bed. D Young advised that it was agreed not to stack the containers due to the negative visual impact it may have.

Moved: Councillor Doody

Seconded: Councillor Atkinson

- (a) **Receives** Report No. 210922152878.

- (b) **Notes** that the cost of the bridge protection works at Whistler Bridge in Lees Valley of approximately \$300,000 could be carried out within the overall budget, but that some budget had needed reallocating from slope stability works on several minor washouts to achieve this.
- (c) **Acknowledges** that the bridge protection methodology to achieve this involves using open-topped shipping containers filled with gravel, supplemented by rock and gabions (see attachments i), ii), and iii).
- (d) **Notes** that this would provide a stronger and more resilient solution than traditional rock and gabion solutions, which had not been successful in the past.
- (e) **Notes** that this river was in a high natural values area, and so the aesthetics need to be carefully considered.
- (f) **Notes** that ECan accept this approach, provided the effects were mitigated by the following:
  - a. Bedding the containers approx. 1.0-1.5m below river bed level
  - b. Installing gabions along the top to minimise the visual impact
  - c. Banking up material along the front face to minimise the impact
  - d. Applying for a retrospective resource consent
- (g) **Notes** that staff were continuing discussions with Waka Kotahi about emergency works funding and would seek additional budget for the slope stability works on several minor washouts. Staff would report separately on any additional Council funding share required.
- (h) **Notes** that staff would provide an update to the Lees Valley residents of the next steps for their information.

**CARRIED**

Councillor Doody congratulated the staff on the initiative. Councillor Atkinson concurred with Councillor Doody and noted that it was an ingenious way of solving the problem.

Mayor Gordon agreed that Lees Valley residents would appreciate the Council's efforts to ensure that the bridge was not continuously washed away during future flood events.

## 8. REPORTS

### 8.1. Esplanade Reserve/Strip 108 Butchers Road – C Brown (Manager Community and Recreation)

*Note: This report was considered immediately following Deputation 5.1.*

*Having declared a conflict of interest Councillor Atkinson stepped away from the table and did not participate in the discussion.*

G Cleary advised that staff recommended that the Council acquired the land located adjacent to 108 Butchers Road as an esplanade reserve. He explained the significance of the Ohoka Stream in this area, which was near the confluence of the Kaiapoi, Cam and Cust Rivers, and Silverstream. It was therefore critical that the Council was able to gain access to this part of the Ohoka Stream for drainage maintenance and flood control.



Other reasons for the esplanade reserve included public access to the waterways, recreational use of the esplanade reserve via the Arohata Te Awa initiative and protection of conservation values.

Regarding the Council previously not wanting the esplanade reserve, G MacLeod noted that the correspondence with the property owner related to the Council purchasing the reserve outside the subdivision process. However, as the property owner had now applied for subdivisions, it would be ideal to acquire the esplanade reserve. The Greenspace Team were keen to protect the biodiversity corridors along waterways across the district.

Councillor Doody enquired if the 20-metre strip would be measured from the centre of the river. G MacLeod noted that the esplanade reserve would be taken from the banks of the river outwards. The difference between an esplanade strip and a reserve was that the boundaries of the strip, which was taken from the centre of the river, moved. Thus the amount of land taken could become less over time, thereby impeding the work that needed to be done. The boundaries of the esplanade reserve were set.

Councillor Doody also enquired if the reserve would be fenced, or if the property owners would be allowed to graze. The Council would generally not allow grazing down to a waterway margin. However, no plans had been made regarding the fencing of the reserve, as this would be done in conjunction with the property owner.

Councillor Redmond sought clarity between an esplanade reserve and an esplanade strip with regards to public access. G MacLeod advised that both an esplanade strip and a reserve would allow for public access. However, an esplanade strip would be held under land tenure, whereas an esplanade reserve would provide the Council with land ownership. This ownership would allow the Council to develop a long-term vision for the land to increase biodiversity. The Council would also be able to better ensure public access to land that it owned, as the esplanade reserve's boundaries were defined, there would be a clearer understanding of where the public would be allowed to access.

Councillor Redmond inquired what the purpose of the esplanade reserve would be, in light that it did not lead anywhere. G MacLeod noted that a reserve would allow for various activities such as the development of a walking track, the enhancement of the environment through increased biodiversity and streamside planting, the creation of a buffer zone and the management of flood mitigation. He further noted that esplanade reserves would allow for the reinstatement of the Queen's Chain that had been set aside for public use around the coast, lakes, and many rivers. G Cleary highlighted the previous flooding experienced in this area and stressed the importance of the esplanade reserve for flood mitigation along this part of the Ohoka Stream.

Mayor Gordon sought clarification of the alleged agreement reached between the Council and the property owner. G MacLeod stated that, to his knowledge, correspondence with the property owner included a letter in response to a Long Term Plan submission. There was also an e-mail advising the property owner that the Council would not purchase the reserve outright, however the Council would reconsider obtaining the esplanade reserve if the property was subdivided.

The property owner, H Woods, tabled a copy of her correspondence with the Council.

Councillor Blackie enquired why an esplanade reserve of 20-metres would be needed. G Cleary explained that due to the importance of the Ohoka Steam area, access for flood mitigation and management was vital. A 20-metre reserve would allow large machinery and trucks access to the waterway.

There would be sufficient space to ensure that the biodiversity of the waterway was protected through planting along the riverbank while also providing pedestrian access.

Councillor Williams asked what the difference in width was between an esplanade reserve and an esplanade strip. G MacLeod advised that the esplanade strip did not have a standard width. Generally, the width of the strip was determined through negotiation with the property owner. Councillor Williams further asked if a narrower esplanade strip would be sufficient if the Council could stop the river bank from eroding. G Cleary believed that a width less than 20-metres would compromise access and limit the Council's ability to provide all the required services.

Councillor Ward questioned how close the large trees that required maintenance were to the Ohoka Stream. G MacLeod noted that some trees were adjacent to 108 Butchers Road on the strip that led down to Butchers Road. The Council's Property Team were currently managing these trees. The Council's 3Waters Team were dealing with the trees along the waterway. It was not possible to provide the exact location of the trees.

Councillor Ward inquired who would be responsible for fencing the esplanade reserve to ensure the property owner's security. G MacLeod noted that this would be finalised during the subdivision process. He, therefore, undertook to follow up on the matter and advise the Council accordingly.

Mayor Gordon questioned if staff were adamant that the esplanade reserve should be 20-metre wide. G Cleary advised that the Ohoka Stream was a substantial waterway in the district, which was of high value to the community. Any area less than 20-metres would compromise the Council's ability to undertake flood mitigation, ensure biodiversity and to provide public access.

Moved: Councillor Stewart

Seconded: Councillor Blackie

**THAT** the Council:

- (a) **Receives** Report No. 210827138860.
- (b) **Approves** an Esplanade Reserve as the appropriate esplanade to be acquired should subdivision of 108 Butchers occur.
- (c) **Approves** the width of the Esplanade reserve to be 20m wide.
- (d) **Notes** that Council would be responsible for maintenance and any future development of the land should an esplanade reserve be acquired.
- (e) **Notes** that the provision of an esplanade reserve is considered the best option due to the reasons detailed in the District Plan being that the Ohoka Stream had conservation, natural hazard mitigation, access and recreational use values.

Councillor Stewart acknowledged the concerns of the property owner, however, she noted the importance of this part of the Ohoka Stream and its flood potential. Many farmers had raised concerns at Ohoka Rural Drainage Advisory Group meetings regarding flooding upstream in Ohoka Stream. As this area was close to the confluence of the Kaiapoi, Cam and Cust Rivers, and Silverstream, it was critical for flood mitigation and drainage maintenance. She explained that the water quality of the Ohoka Stream was compromised as it contained high levels of nitrates. A 20-metre esplanade reserve would enable the Council to extensively plant a five to six-metre area down the river, creating a filter strip. It would further allow the creation of a walkway and also a "buffer" strip of extensive planting near the boundary with the property owner to enhance their security.

Acquiring the 20-metre esplanade reserve showed vision as it would improve access to waterways from the mountains to the sea Councillor Stewart stated. Councillor Stewart believed property owners needed to embrace the establishment of esplanade reserves as they were fundamental to restoring native planting and improve water quality. She encouraged staff to work closely with the property owner to alleviate all their concerns.

Councillor Blackie commented that from previous experience, that the establishment of an esplanade reserve reduced crime in an area as it improved security by allowing people access to an otherwise isolated area.

#### Amendment

Moved: Councillor Williams

Seconded: Councillor Redmond

**THAT** the Council:

- (c) **Approves** the width of the Esplanade strip.

**LOST**

Councillor Williams noted that he was not convinced that the Council needed a 20-metre wide esplanade reserve. He believed that the Council would be able to provide all the services required within a 10-metre wide esplanade strip.

Councillor Redmond concurred with the points raised by Councillor Williams. He explained that under Schedule 10 of the Resource Management Act (RMA), an esplanade strip could provide public access to the waterway. The Council would have to purchase the land if it established an esplanade reserve. This would add up to a high cost to the Council if it occurs throughout the district. It, therefore, made sense to acquire an esplanade strip, which would benefit the property owner in that it remained on the property title, but would also provide public access. He did not believe that the river bank would erode to such an extent that the strip would not be accessible.

In response to questions, G MacLeod explained that the Council would own an esplanade reserve, allowing the Council to develop a long-term plan for the land. The Council would also be able to better maintain land that it owned. G Clearly believed that an esplanade reserve would provide the Council with more secure rights and access to the land.

Councillor Mealings enquired if the Ohoka Stream Walkway and the area of the Cam River that had been plated as part of the Arohata Te Awa initiative were esplanade reserves or strips. It was noted that most of the Ohoka Stream Walkway was reserve as was the Arohata Te Awa area.

Councillor Ward sought clarity on if the esplanade reserve, would be more secure due to fencing. G MacLeod confirmed that in a 20-metres reserve the Council could provide planting and fencing, thereby providing a buffer between the public walkway and the adjoining property.

The motion then became the substantive motion.

Moved: Councillor Stewart

Seconded: Councillor Blackie

**THAT** the Council:

- (a) **Receives** Report No. 210827138860.
- (b) **Approves** an Esplanade Reserve as the appropriate esplanade to be acquired should subdivision of 108 Butchers occur.

- (c) **Approves** the width of the Esplanade reserve to be 20m wide.
- (d) **Notes** that Council would be responsible for maintenance and any future development of the land should an esplanade reserve be acquired.
- (e) **Notes** that the provision of an esplanade reserve is considered the best option due to the reasons detailed in the District Plan being that the Ohoka Stream has conservation, natural hazard mitigation, access and recreational use values.

**CARRIED**

Councillors Williams and Redmond Against

Councillor Stewart noted that a 20-metre esplanade reserve would provide certainty to all parties. It would also enable the Council to plant a buffer between the public walkway and the adjoining property while allowing access for flood mitigation work. She, therefore, urged Councillors to support the motion.

## 8.2. Maintenance of Pou at Entrance to Pegasus Town – C Brown (Community and Recreation Manager)

G MacLeod explained that the purpose of this report was to seek Council's approval to undertake work in refurbishing and restoring the six pou situated at the entrance to Pegasus township. No maintenance had been done to the pou since their unveiling in 2008. It was anticipated that the restoration works would cost approximately \$20,000. G MacLeod clarified that although the pou were situated on land owned by the Pegasus Golf Course, the artworks themselves were gifted to the people of the Waimakariri District.

Councillor Williams enquired if the pou could be relocated onto Council-owned property. G MacLeod stated that the option had not been explored, as it would entail an extensive process due to the culture and historical significance of the artwork.

Councillor Williams questioned if the proposed restoration of the pou could not be funded from the Woodend-Sefton Community Board's Landscaping budget, as part of maintaining the Pegasus Town entrance. G MacLeod advised that the matter had not been discussed with the Community Board, however, the possibility could be investigated, noting that the Community Board's Landscaping budget had limited funding.

Councillor Blackie raised a concern regarding the completeness of the quotation received for the work. G MacLeod acknowledged that sourcing quotations for the restoration of artwork was difficult, hence the additional funding requested.

Councillor Redmond asked if the current owners of Pegasus Township, the Templeton Group, had been approached for a contribution. G MacLeod advised that the Templeton Group had not been approached to contribute to the restoration of the pou.

Councillor Atkinson enquired if the continued maintenance of the pou could fall under the Waimakariri Public Arts Trust or if application could be made to the Council's Heritage Fund. G MacLeod noted that the matter would be investigated.

Moved: Councillor Atkinson

Seconded: Mayor Gordon

**THAT** the Council:

- (a) **Receives** report No. 210923153767.

- (b) **Notes** the quoted cost for restoration of the six pou at Pegasus town entrance and others at the pā site boundary as \$9,600.00.
- (c) **Approves** additional budget allocation of \$20,000 for the Pegasus pou restoration project.
- (d) **Notes** that should this be approved, staff would work with Tribal Pataka Management (Fayne Robinson, Riki Manuel) to complete this restoration project.
- (e) **Notes** that staff would contact the current land owners to engage and collaborate with for the restoration of the pou.
- (f) **Notes** that staff would engage with the current land owners to develop a legal agreement between Council and the Golf Club for the provision of maintenance and preservation of this area of land and the pou.
- (g) **Notes** that staff would advise the Council of any progress, project dates etc.
- (h) **Circulates** this report to the Mahi Tahī Joint Development Committee and the Woodend-Sefton Community Board for information.

**CARRIED**

Councillor Williams Against

Councillor Atkinson noted that the pou were gifted to the Waimakariri community by the Kaikoura iwi and should be maintained and preserved. The pou were in public ownership and their continued maintenance therefore needed to be ensured either by the Waimakariri Public Arts Trust or through the Council's Heritage Fund. Councillor Doody concurred with the comments made by Councillor Atkinson.

Mayor Gordon commented that the pou were beautiful artworks that needed to be maintained. The Rūnanga had requested the Council to maintain the pou at Mahi Tahī Joint Development Committee meetings, and failure to do so would be a reputational risk to the Council. He agreed with Councillor Atkinson that the responsibility of the future maintenance of the pou should be clarified.

Councillor Mealings supported the maintenance of the pou as they were public art that needed to be preserved.

Councillor Williams noted that the Council did not own the land that the pou were situated on, as such, the Council had no control of the future preservation of the pou. He was therefore not in support of spending public money on artwork not situated on Council-land.

In his right of reply Councillor Atkinson stated that it was clear that the pou were owned by the public, and the Council therefore needed to maintain them for future generations. He noted that the Council currently maintained many things in the public interest that were not located on Council-owned land.

**8.3. District Parking Strategy draft approval to publicly consult – V Thompson (Business and Centres Advisor)**

V Thompson and S Hart were present for consideration of this report seeking approval of the draft District Parking Strategy and for a one month consultation period from 18 October to 14 November 2021. It is proposed to present the final District Parking Strategy document to the Council in December for consideration and adoption.

V Thompson pointed out that this consultation period coincides with the draft District Plan, but suggested that these two consultations would target different audience groups in the community. It is important to have the adopted parking strategy in place by the end of the year, noting that the minimum parking requirements have been removed from the operative District Plan in February 2022. The optimal parking benchmark has been kept at 85% in the Strategy and it was not considered to lower this threshold.

There were no questions.

Moved Councillor Williams                      Seconded Councillor Blackie

**THAT** the Council:

- (a) **Receives** report no. 210901140170;
- (b) **Notes** the draft District Parking Strategy at attachment (i);
- (c) **Notes** the proposed public consultation timeframe from 18 October to 14 November 2021 (a period of four weeks);
- (d) **Notes** the draft Strategy reflects feedback (where appropriate and practicable) from the Community Boards as well as Ableys Transportation Consultants;
- (e) **Notes** the public consultation document (attachment ii) and the proposed engagement process outlined in the consultation communications plan (attachment iii);
- (f) **Notes** that following public consultation, the draft Strategy will be updated to reflect community feedback before a final version is brought back to the Council for adoption on 7 December 2021, along with a report detailing consultation feedback;
- (g) **Notes** that disability parking provision will be further addressed as part of the Accessibility Strategy Review in 2022;
- (h) **Approves** the draft Strategy (attachment i) for public consultation once it has been updated to reflect Councillor feedback (where applicable).

**CARRIED**

8.4. **North East Rangiora Development Area proposal - Hearing Panel, Mayor D Gordon (Chair), Councillors P Williams and J Ward**

K LaValley and L Beckingsale spoke to this report presenting the recommendations of the Hearing Panel for the North East Rangiora Development Area proposal. There were two options presented for the funding of a series of roading development projects to service development between Kippenberger Avenue north to Coldstream Road. Public consultation was held from 23 July to 24 August. The hearing and deliberations were held on 15 September, with seven submissions received and none being against the proposal. The hearing panel unanimously supported Option 1 which adopted the budgets and the development contributions becoming effective immediately.

Following a question from Councillor Redmond, L Beckingsale advised that all the submitters except one were in support of this development and the option recommended. The one submitter in opposition was actually in opposition to all development in the district, which was outside the scope of the consultation process.

**THAT** the Council:

- (a) **Receives** Report No. 210916149478.
- (b) **Adopts** Option 1 thereby adopting the following budgets and approving the changes to the Development Contributions Policy Schedule as described.

<b>Budget/Project Name</b>	<b>Financial year</b>	<b>Budget Amount</b>
Outer East Rangiora North/South Collector Road – District Level of Service	2023/24	\$500,000
Outer East Rangiora North/South Collector Road – District Level of Service	2028/29	\$500,000
Outer East Rangiora North/South Collector Road - District Growth	2023/24, 28/29	\$1,000,000
Outer East Rangiora North/South Collector Road – Outline Development Plan Growth	2023/24, 28/29	\$6,000,000
Kippenberger/MacPhail Roundabout – District Level of Service	2022/23	\$416,250
Kippenberger/MacPhail Roundabout - District Growth	2022/23	\$416,250
Kippenberger/MacPhail Roundabout - Outline Development Plan Growth	2022/23	\$416,250
Outer East Rangiora Shared Path (East/West Collector Road) - Outline Development Plan Growth	2028/29	\$220,000

- (c) **Notes** that on adoption, the development contributions become effective immediately. The rates impact will be effective at the financial year the works are planned for.
- (d) **Notes** the updated Development Contributions Policy Schedule will be available on the Council's website or on request.

### **CARRIED**

Councillor Williams suggested there be communication with the developer on keeping the levels of traffic onto Kippenberger Avenue to a minimum while the development is being progressed, to cause as little disruption as possible. He suggested that a temporary vehicle access from Golf Links Road would assist with this.

Mayor Gordon acknowledged the work of staff and the level of information that was provided during this hearing and deliberation process, enabling a good process to be undertaken.

Councillor Mealings acknowledged as a good indication from the community, that there were no objections received against the proposal. The development will allow for more housing which is needed in the district and also fulfilled the Council's obligations to the Greater Christchurch partnership.

Councillor Stewart enquired what the width of the esplanade reserve would be on the Cam River. Staff would provide this information.

8.5. **Reconsideration of 3 Waters Rating Structure – K Simpson (3 Waters Manager)**

S. Collin and K Simpson presented this report which provided background to a review of 3 Waters rating structures that was previously carried out in 2017 and looked at options for re-engaging on this issue. S Collin advised that the original programme had a 2021 start for reconsidering this issue but this report proposed a delay until the outcome of the Governments Three Waters Review is known. The original review resulted from rates challenges, and although there have been some relief with stimulus and shovel ready funding, there was still the ongoing issue of the affordability of rates for small rural schemes. Consideration was given to include reviewing stockwater and drainage rates in a review and this was included as an option. Staff noted that if a decision of the Three Waters Reform is not known by March 2022, there will not be enough time to consider 3 Waters rating information for the 2024 – 2034 Long Term Plan (LTP).

Councillor Stewart asked if this was not considered again until March 2022, what would be the timeframe if the Council wanted to consider stockwater and drainage rates independently of the 3 Waters, and to include it in the next 2022-23 Annual Plan as a consultation item. Councillor Stewart pointed out that all areas of 3 waters needed to be considered, but there was a real issue with the rural drainage rating. S Collin advised that a minimum lead in time of approximately 18 months would be required, before an LTP.

Mayor Gordon asked what the staff capacity would be to undertake reviews at this time. G Cleary responded that this would put a lot of pressure on current staff levels, noting that there has been four senior engineering staff leave the Council in recent months and there is currently a difficult recruitment environment. The staff capacity is very minimal at this time and any additional workload will impact on other projects.

Following a question from Councillor Mealings, relating to recommendation (e), S Collin advised that stockwater is not included as part of the Three Waters Reform, but it is still unclear whether rural land drainage activities would be included, in its current form. There would be risks in proceeding with a consultation process until this was clarified.

Moved Councillor Williams

Seconded Councillor Redmond

**THAT** the Council:

- (a) **Receives** report No. 210517078096.
- (b) **Notes** the difficulties that the Government's Three Waters Reform proposals have made to the originally intended programme for public consultation on the matter of 3 Waters district wide rating.
- (c) **Agrees** that any decision to commence reconsideration of 3 Waters rating structures should be postponed until after clarity about the outcome of the Three Waters Reforms has been reached.
- (d) **Requests** that staff will report back to Council on this matter after the outcome of the proposed Three Waters Reforms is known.
- (e) **Notes** that an opportunity exists to proceed with consideration of rating structure changes for stockwater and or rural land drainage activities, whether or not the Three Waters Reforms proceed in their current form.



- (f) **Notes** the following possible programme of key dates, based on the assumption that certainty regarding the Three Waters Reforms is achieved by March 2022, and which could apply to either a full 3 Waters activities rates review, or stockwater and rural land drainage only:

Period	Action
March 2022	Signal Council's intent to consider proposal for 3 Waters district wide rating review in the draft Annual Plan
April - July 2022	Establish a Working Party to review and update the proposals and effects on rates considered by the original Working Party, potentially extending the scope to include stockwater
August 2022	Report to Council seeking endorsement of the updated conclusions from the Working Party
October 2022	Local Body elections
February 2023	Report to new Council to confirm the August 2022 resolution
April - July 2023	Special Consultative Procedure to seek community views
August - December 2023	Prepare draft budgets based on the SCP outcome
July 2024	Implementation with 2024/34 LTP

- (g) **Notes** that if decisions about the Three Waters Reform have not been made by March 2022, there will not be adequate time to reconsider 3 Waters rating structure in time for their implementation in the 2024/34 LTP.

**CARRIED**

Councillor Stewart Against

Councillors Williams and Redmond both agreed that it is the right move to put this review on hold as it could be confusing for the public if the Council undertook consultation on this matter now.

Councillor Stewart acknowledged the comments, though did not support this matter being put on hold and supported this review commencing in-house now, even before the national Three Waters Reform is decided. She believed that if this matter is put on hold for a further period, it may be that by the time it is considered, the Council may not have any influence on the rating system at all. Councillor Stewart suggested that this was a disservice to our ratepayers and the rating issues needed to be addressed.

Councillor Atkinson did not believe the Council is letting ratepayers down, but the Council needs to make sure that people understand the process that would need to be undertaken. There is also the possibility of the Government making changes and the Local Government reform may also impact on this.

Mayor Gordon concurred with the comments of Councillor Atkinson, and also acknowledged the comments on the issue of the capacity of staff. The Three Waters response has already put huge pressure on staff resources. Mayor Gordon acknowledged the comments of Councillor Stewart but believed this is not the right time to undertake this consultation.

Councillor Blackie acknowledged the comments of Councillor Stewart and the anomalies of rating but also agreed this was not the right time to undertake consultation on 3 Waters rating.

8.6. **Confirm Storage Upgrade Solution and Budget for Mandeville Water Head Works Storage Upgrade – S Fauth (Project Engineer and C Roxburgh (Water Asset Manager))**

C Roxburgh presented this report, which informed the Council of the increase in the cost estimate for the storage upgrade at Mandeville and sought approval for additional budget for the single stainless steel tank option to be progressed. This is considered to be a critical asset and the stainless steel tank option is preferred. An alternative option of having 14 interlocking plastic tanks was discussed, but this is not preferred, with these having operational and maintenance challenges. Staff have had discussions with neighbouring Council staff on this matter, and are confident in recommending the stainless steel tank built to the standard required, however the original budget was not enough to cover the cost of the stainless steel tank

Councillor Doody enquired about stability of this stainless steel tank if there was an earthquake. C Roxburgh advised it would be built onto a concrete pad, which would be fixed to the ground. There would be some plastic tanks kept on site, in case these were needed as a back-up.

Moved Councillor Mealings

Seconded Councillor Williams

**THAT** the Council:

- (a) **Receives** report No. 210819136073;
- (b) **Approves** a \$350,000 budget increase on the Mandeville Storage Upgrade budget (PJ 101592.000.5103) for 2021/22 in order to achieve the single stainless steel tank solution.
- (c) **Notes** that it has been calculated that there will be an increase to the Mandeville water supply development contribution by about \$174 per unit, from \$1,236 currently to \$1,410 per unit.
- (d) **Notes** that there will be an increase to the Mandeville water rate of approximately \$12 per unit of water per year, which is approximately 4% of the water component of the rate.
- (e) **Notes** that this single stainless steel tank option is the recommended solution due to greater resilience, lowest risk of contamination, and minimal ongoing operating costs.
- (f) **Notes** that an alternative option was assessed by Council staff to instead provide a multiple plastic tank (“tank farm”) solution, such that the project can be completed within the total budget available. However this option is not recommended due to the heightened risk of failure and operational and maintenance challenges.
- (g) **Circulates** this report to the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board for their information.

**CARRIED**

Councillor Mealings noted that Mandeville is a growing area and this would be the best option available for residents. The stainless steel welded option is preferred from a maintenance point of view and also aesthetically. It is disappointing that the cost has escalated over recent years, but supported this as the best option and encouraged colleagues to support the motion.

Councillor Williams believed this is the best option, noting that it could be that in future plastic tanks will not meet compliance of the Water Regulator.

In reply, Councillor Mealings said that this is an asset that will also have a longer operational life than the other options considered and in the long term, would be a neutral cost.

8.7. **Greater Christchurch Partnership and Urban Growth Partnership Memorandum of Agreements – J Harland (Chief Executive)**

J Harland presented this report involving the recommendations of the Greater Christchurch Partnership Committee to approve the Urban Growth Partnership Committee Memorandum of Agreement and the Updated Greater Christchurch Partnership Committee Memorandum of Agreement. This supports the Greater Christchurch Partnership continuing and dealing with non-urban growth strategic matters. There will be a new committee of the same membership with the addition of two Crown Ministers; Ministers Woods and Mahuta. The Crown is seeking more involvement in the urban environment and looking for a sustainable and well-functioning environment, priorities around de-carbonising the transport system, increasing resilience to natural hazards, climate change, accelerating provision of affordable housing and access to employment, education and services. The first joint project is a special plan with Christchurch City Council. The membership from this Council would remain unchanged, being Mayor Gordon, and Councillors Atkinson and Mealings. Similar agreements have been enacted around the country and this will align Christchurch in this process.

Moved Councillor Atkinson

Seconded Mayor Gordon

**THAT** the Council:

- (a) **Receives** Report No. 210915148047.
- (b) **Approve** the Greater Christchurch Urban Growth Partnership Committee Memorandum of Agreement (Attachment i) and updated Greater Christchurch Partnership Committee Memorandum of Agreement (Attachment ii).
- (c) **Delegate** responsibility to the Greater Christchurch Partnership Independent Chair to make any minor non-material amendments to the Agreements.
- (d) **Delegate** responsibility to the Mayor to execute the Agreements.
- (e) **Note** that officers are in discussions with mana whenua representatives on the potential of mana whenua / Ngāi Tahu gifting a name for the Greater Christchurch Urban Growth Partnership Committee.
- (f) **Note** that Mayor Dan Gordon, Deputy Mayor Neville Atkinson and Councillor Niki Mealings remain the appointed members of the Greater Christchurch Partnership Committee until the conclusion of the 2022 triennial general election under Clause 31 of Schedule 7 of the Local Government Act 2002.
- (g) **Note** that once the Greater Christchurch Urban Growth Partnership Committee Memorandum of Agreement (Attachment i) has been approved by all parties to the Agreement the Waimakariri District Council are recommended to:
  - a) **Resolve** to appoint the Greater Christchurch Urban Growth Partnership Committee, in accordance with Clause 30 and Clause 30A of Schedule 7 of the Local Government Act 2002;

- b) **Appoint** the Waimakariri District Council's Greater Christchurch Partnership Committee members being Mayor Dan Gordon, Deputy Mayor Neville Atkinson and Councillor Niki Mealings as the appointed members of the Greater Christchurch Urban Growth Partnership Committee until the conclusion of the 2022 triennial general election under Clause 31 of Schedule 7 of the Local Government Act 2002.
- c) **Resolve** under Schedule 7 Clause 30(7) of the Local Government Act 2002 that the Greater Christchurch Partnership Committee and the Greater Christchurch Urban Growth Partnership Committee are not discharged following triennial general elections, in accordance with clause 5.6 of the Memorandum of Agreements.
- d) **Delegate** to the Greater Christchurch Urban Growth Partnership Committee the authority to adopt a new name.

**CARRIED**

Councillor Atkinson said he is looking forward to working with the Ministers on this partnership committee.

Mayor Gordon said that achieving an urban growth partnership had been something sought for some time. Having Ministers at the table and participating will take the Greater Christchurch Partnership to the next level. Mayor Gordon said this a positive move and commended the motion to all colleagues.

Councillor Mealings concurred with colleagues comments.

8.8. **2022 Council Meeting Schedule – S Nichols (Governance Manager)**

S Nichols presented this report seeking adoption of the meeting schedule until early October 2022 for the ordinary Council and Standing Committee meetings. Following on from having the two meeting break weeks included in the 2021 calendar year, it was pointed out that there have been four meeting break weeks spread throughout the 2022 year. This excludes meeting times for Councillors, but does not include any other commitments that councillors may have with the community. Prior to this meeting, Councillor Barnett had asked if the meeting start time for Audit and Risk Committee meetings could be changed from 9am to 10am. There had been discussion with the Manager Finance and Business Support and it was noted that there were times when three hours is required to cover all the business of an Audit and Risk Committee meeting, particularly when presentations from Council controlled organisations, (CCOs) or the Auditor or Treasury are scheduled. It was suggested that for days when presenters are attending these meetings that the start time remain at 9am, however for other meetings of this Committee, there could be a later start time of 10am. Following discussion, it was agreed that the start time for Audit and Risk Committee meetings in the recommendation would remain at 9am however there would be flexibility to change this to 10am for some meetings as deemed appropriate by the Manager of Finance and Business Support.

Moved Mayor Gordon

Seconded Councillor Atkinson

**THAT** the Council:

- (a) **Receives** report No 210920151295.

- (b) **Adopts** the following meeting schedule for the period from 24 January to 4 October 2022 (as outlined in Trim 210902141186).

- (i) Ordinary Council Meeting Dates commencing at 1pm on the first Tuesday of the month:

1 February 2022	1 March 2022	5 April 2022
3 May 2022	7 June 2022	5 July 2022
2 August 2022	6 September 2022	4 October 2022

- (ii) Council meetings relating to (Draft) Annual Plan and Annual Report including submissions and hearings:

2 and 3 February 2022 (Budgets)	4 and 5 May 2022 (Hearings)	24 and 25 May 2022 (Deliberations)
14 June 2022 (Adoption)	21 June 2022 (Reserve Adoption)	4 October 2022 (Annual Report)

- (c) **Adopts** the following meeting schedule for the period from 24 January 2022 to 4 October 2022 for Committees:

- i. Audit and Risk Committee commencing at 9am on Tuesdays:

15 February 2022	15 March 2022	17 May 2022
19 July 2022	23 August 2022	20 September 2022

- ii. District Planning and Regulation Committee at 1pm on Tuesdays:

22 February 2022	26 April 2022	21 June 2022
23 August 2022	20 September 2022	

- iii. Community and Recreation Committee generally at 3.30pm on Tuesdays:

15 February 2022	15 March 2022	31 May 2022
19 July 2022 (1pm)	16 August 2022	20 September 2022

- iv. Utilities and Roading Committee generally at 3.30pm on Tuesdays:

22 February 2022	22 March 2022	26 April 2022
17 May 2022	21 June 2022	19 July 2022
23 August 2022 (4pm)	27 September 2022	

- v. Mahi Tahi Joint Development Committee at 9am on Tuesdays:

8 February 2022	8 March 2022	5 April 2022
14 June 2022	12 July 2022	6 September 2022

- vi. Land and Water Committee at 1pm on Tuesdays

15 February 2022	22 March 2022	17 May 2022
16 August 2022	27 September 2022	

- vii. District Licencing Committee at 9am on Fridays

25 February 2022	25 March 2022	29 April 2022
27 May 2022	15 July 2022	26 August 2022
23 September 2022		

viii. Waimakariri Water Zone Committee at 3.30pm on Mondays

31 January 2022	4 April 2022	4 July 2022	5 September 2022
--------------------	--------------	-------------	---------------------

- (d) **Notes** the Mahi Tahi Joint Development Committee dates and locations will be subject to further confirmation with our Ngāi Tūāhuriri partners.
- (e) **Notes** the Waimakariri Water Zone Committee dates will be subject to further confirmation with Environment Canterbury, although it is anticipated that meetings will occur quarterly.
- (f) **Notes** the Community Boards will adopt their own timetable at their meetings held during October and November 2021, as proposed in Trim 210902141186.
- (g) **Notes** that no formal meetings are scheduled for Councillors on the weeks of 18 April, 27 June, 25 July and 29 August 2022.
- (h) **Circulates** a copy of the finalised meeting times to Ngāi Tūāhuriri partners and the Community Boards for their reference.

**CARRIED**

Mayor Gordon extended thanks for the work in setting this meeting calendar and also the factoring in meeting break weeks during 2022, which allows Councillors to plan other activities. Mayor Gordon agreed with Audit and Risk remaining at 9am commencement, however where practical, this could be moved to 10am subject to the items of business on the agenda.

Councillor Atkinson supported the need to accommodate Councillors other commitments and the flexibility of start time for Audit and Risk Committee.

Councillor Williams also supported this meeting schedule, but does have a preference to have start times to be consistent for each committee meeting as he felt it was important meetings have consistent start times for the public interested in attending meetings.

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

Nil.

10. **WELLBEING, HEALTH AND SAFETY**

10.1. **Wellbeing, Health and Safety Report September 2021 – J Harland (Chief Executive)**

J Harland took this report as read and advised that there is work underway looking at how staff report on the health and safety performance and the risks that there are. There is also consideration being given to the safety of Customer Services staff and making sure that everything is being done in this respect.

There were no questions.

Moved Councillor Blackie

Seconded Councillor Ward

**THAT** the Council:

- (a) **Receives and Notes** Report No. 210924154678.

- (b) **Notes** that there were no notifiable event this month. WDC is, so far as is reasonably practicable, compliant with the Person Conducting a Business or Undertaking (PCBU) duties of the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015.

**CARRIED**

11. **COMMITTEE MINUTES FOR INFORMATION**

Nil.

12. **COMMUNITY BOARD MINUTES FOR INFORMATION**

Due to the national Covid Level 4 lockdown restrictions, there were no Community Board meetings held during September 2021. Mayor Gordon noted that although there had not been any formal meetings held, there had been engagement with the Board members during this time.

13. **REPORTS FOR INFORMATION FROM THE UTILITIES AND ROADING COMMITTEE MEETING OF 21 SEPTEMBER 2021**

13.1. Eastern Districts Sewer Scheme Annual Compliance Monitoring Report 2020-2021 – L Hurley (Project Planning and Quality Team Leader) and K Simpson (3 Waters Manager)

13.2. May 2021 Flood Event – Update on Service Requests – C Fahey (Water Operations Team Leader) and K Simpson (3 Waters Manager)

Moved Councillor Williams

Seconded Councillor Blackie

**THAT** Items 13.1 and 13.2 be received for information.

**CARRIED**

14. **CORRESPONDENCE**

Nil.

15. **MAYOR'S DIARY**

15.1. **Mayor's Diary 1 - 28 September 2021**

Moved Councillor Doody

Seconded Councillor Ward

**THAT** the Council:

- (a) **Receives** report no 210929157054.

**CARRIED**

16. **COUNCIL PORTFOLIO UPDATES**

16.1. **Iwi Relationships – Mayor Dan Gordon**

Mayor Gordon spoke of the words that were included in the District Plan and the words included by iwi into this document. This was a good reflection on this Council and the progress that had been made over the years with the District Plan Review.

**16.2. Greater Christchurch Partnership Update – Mayor Dan Gordon**

Mayor Gordon referred to J Harland's report considered earlier in the meeting and also highlighted the Spatial Plan timeline. There needed to be consideration given to the number of Planners with the required experience needed to undertake this work. The next meeting of the Partnership is scheduled for Friday of this week.

**16.3. Canterbury Water Management Strategy – Councillor Sandra Stewart**

Councillor Stewart referred to her update at the September Council meeting on the lack of progress after ten years of the Canterbury Water Management Strategy, which has been referred to Council staff, and awaits a report back on this. Councillor Stewart finds it extremely sad that after ten years there has been little progress made

Environment Canterbury have changed the criteria for the Immediate Steps Funding which is the only funding that the Water Zone Committees have to allocate. This is now \$50,000 for the first year (the current year), with no criteria and zone committee members now need to determine how to evaluate projects on this basis, if the money is going to be assigned within the current year.

**16.4. International Relationships – Deputy Mayor Neville Atkinson**

The Waimakariri Passchendaele Advisory Group held their most recent meeting the previous day. Minutes of these meetings would be circulated to Councillors to share information.

Councillor Atkinson spoke of some medals of members of C and D Company (members who were from Kaiapoi and Rangiora), from World War 1, that have been in the Christchurch RSA Club building which has been demolished. It is to be determined how these medals will be shared between the Kaiapoi and Rangiora RSA Clubs. There is also 11 pillars that were at the front of the Christchurch RSA building which have significance and there was a possibility that some of these could be relocated to strategic places on the Passchendaele Path. There needs to be discussion initiated with the liquidator of the building regarding this possibility and with the Council Greenspace staff.

There is a pamphlet being produced providing information on the Waimakariri Passchendaele Twinning relationship and all the stakeholders involved with this. The pamphlet will be available for the public to view in the RSA Clubs and the libraries.

Mayor Gordon added that the Passchendaele Memorial Service is being held next Tuesday, 12 October, commencing at 11am at the Kaiapoi Cenotaph. All Councillors are welcome to attend.

**16.5. Regeneration (Kaiapoi) – Councillor Al Blackie**

The WOW Aqua Play Park is progressing with the inflatable equipment currently enroute to New Zealand. It was planned for this facility to be operating for the summer.

The Mahinga Kai (Huria Reserve) is progressing and the working group are meeting this week, with work underway on the initial concept.

The detailed plans for the Courtney Hub are currently being worked on before being presented to the Community Board and then public consultation.

The opening of the Motorhome Park had been delayed due to Covid lockdowns and may not be open until February. Originally this was hoped to be open for the start of summer.



The Honda planting day was held three weeks ago and had been a successful day.

**16.6. Climate Change and Sustainability – Councillor Niki Mealings**

Councillor Mealings noted that ENC are embracing sustainability, including providing education and advice to small businesses on being more sustainable, including holding zero waste events. The Staff Sustainability Champions group met last week. The Canterbury Mayoral Forum Climate Change Councillors workshop was also held last week, which included a talk from Trevor Stuthridge, Research Director from Agresearch, who spoke on the six areas that are being researched at Agresearch on more sustainable farming practices. Councillor Mealings noted that the most value in attending these meetings is the opportunity to network with other climate change councillors and discuss issues.

A District Carbon Footprint emissions profile for the community emissions profile is being undertaken.

It was noted that staff member M O'Connell will be leaving the Council later in the month. M O'Connell helped write the Sustainability Strategy and convened the Sustainability Champions staff group and has been instrumental in assisting Councillor Mealings with the Sustainability Champions group.

**16.7. Business, Promotion and Town Centres – Councillor Joan Ward**

A joint promotions meeting with Oxford, Kaiapoi and Rangiora was held recently and there was a consensus reached that businesses are doing okay but the recovery is not as good as after the previous lockdown. Following a meeting with Enterprise North Canterbury, Visit Waimakariri and business owners, it was apparent that the recent Covid lockdown and alert level restrictions had been challenging for some businesses. ENC have advised that there had only been six business requiring assistance, and business owners were more aware of where to access assistance than they were following the lockdown in 2020. A lot of business promotion events are on hold due to the Covid alert level restrictions, however with the most recent update and increased numbers allowed to attend, this will allow for some of these events to take place. It is hoped that the Business Awards will take place in late November.

The Kaiapoi Cultural Festival is planned for mid-November and the River Parade is planned for March 2022.

**17. QUESTIONS**

There were no questions.

**18. URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS**

There was no urgent business.

**19. MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED WITH THE PUBLIC EXCLUDED**

*Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987.*

Moved Councillor Atkinson

Seconded Councillor Doody

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

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

Item No	Minutes/Report of	General subject of each matter to be considered	Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter	Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution
19.1	Minutes of public excluded portion of Council meeting of 7 September 2021	Confirmation of minutes	Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7	Section 48(1)(a)
<b>REPORTS</b>				
19.2	Report of R Kerr	Kaiapoi Stormwater and Flooding Improvements Scope of Tranche Two and financial Delegations	Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7	Section 48(1)(a)
19.3	Report of D Young (Senior Engineering Advisor) and J McBride (Roading and Transportation Manager)	Purchase of land at realigned portion of Lees Valley Road	Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7	Section 48(1)(a)
19.4	Report of S Hart (Business and Centres Manager)	Kaiapoi South Mixed Use Business Area – Development Proposal MOU	Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7	Section 48(1)(a)
19.5	Report of S Hart (Business and Centres Manager)	North of High Car Parking Building proposal	Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7	Section 48(1)(a)
19.6	Report of C Brown (Community and Recreation Manager)	Property Purchase, Rangiora	Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7	Section 48(1)(a)
19.7	Report of R Hawthorne (Property Manager)	Ashley Gorge Kiwi Holiday Park Lease	Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7	Section 48(1)(a)
19.8	Report of R Hawthorne (Property Manager)	Land Purchase Rangiora	Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7	Section 48(1)(a)
19.9	Report of C Roxburgh (Water Asset Manager)	Agreement for Oxford Water Main Joints	Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7	Section 48(1)(a)
19.10	Report of J Millward (Manager Finance and Business Support)	Reappointment of Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trustees	Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7	Section 48(1)(a)
<b>MATTER REFERRED FROM AUDIT AND RISK COMMITTEE MEETING OF 21 SEPTEMBER 2021</b>				
19.11	Report from J Harland (Chief Executive)	Reappointment of Waimakariri Irrigation Limited (WIL) Director	Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7	Section 48(1)(a)

This resolution is made in reliance on section 48(1)(a) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987, and the particular interest or interests protected by section 6 or section 7 of that Act which would be prejudiced by the holding of the whole or relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public are as follows:



19.6 **Edward Street, Rangiora, Purchase – C Brown (Manager Community and Recreation)**

Resolves that the report, discussion and resolutions remain public excluded to enable Council to continue with commercial negotiation without prejudice or disadvantage.

19.7 **Ashley Gorge Kiwi Holiday Park – Request for Additional Renewal Term – R Hawthorne (Property Manager)**

Resolves that the report and discussion remain public excluded, to enable the Council to carry out commercial activities without prejudice and the resolutions be made public once the sale of the business has been concluded

19.8 **Land Purchase Durham Street, Rangiora – R Hawthorne (Property Manager)**

Resolves that the report and discussion remain public excluded to enable the Council to conduct commercial activities and for the protection of privacy of natural persons and the resolutions be made public once the purchase of the land has been concluded,

19.9 **Settlement Agreement for Failed Joints on Bay Road Water Main – C Roxburgh (Water Asset Manager)**

Resolves that the report, discussion and resolutions remain public excluded as these contain legally sensitive information that could invalidate the settlement.

19.10 **Reappointment of Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trustees – J Millward (Manager Finance and Business Support)**

Resolves that the report and resolutions be made public, once the Trustee reappointments have been confirmed and the Trustees advised of the Council decision.

**MATTER REFERRED FROM THE AUDIT AND RISK COMMITTEE MEETING OF 21 SEPTEMBER 2021**

**Reappointment of Waimakariri Irrigation Limited (WIL) Director – J Harland (Chief Executive)**

Resolves that the report and resolutions be made public, once the Board reappointment has been confirmed and the person involved has been advised of the Council decision.

**CARRIED**

*The public excluded part of the meeting occurred from 5.08pm to 6.51pm.*

**OPEN MEETING**

19.5 **North of High Car Parking Building – Ashmore Holdings Ltd Proposal –S Hart (Business and Centres Manager)**

- (a) **Receives** Report No. 210825138057.
- (b) **Notes** the significance of the North of High concept, as identified in the Rangiora Town Centre Strategy, in relation to developing the Town Centre to the North, creating new retail opportunities to help stem the

flow of retail leakage, and providing much great car parking supply to the centre of the Town Centre.

- (d) **Notes** the information related to current Rangiora Town Centre car parking supply, demand and utilisation information, as set out in section three of the report.
- (e) **Notes** that whilst the current parking challenges within the Rangiora Town Centre were manageable, known risks highlighted potential supply constraints that would result in greater parking challenges, vehicle circulation, and commuter frustration in the near future.
- (l) **Notes** review of the timing of current Long Term Plan provisions related to Rangiora Town Centre parking projects would be an element for consideration alongside implementing the MOU.
- (n) **Notes** that should Council support the recommendations within this report, staff would brief the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board on this matter, and collect the Board's feedback for inclusion in any future reports to Council.
- (o) **Circulates** this report to the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board.

19.2 **Kaiapoi Stormwater and Flooding Improvements Scope of Tranche Two and Financial Delegations – R Kerr (Delivery Manager – Shovel Ready Programme)**

*Tender awarded resolutions was subsequently made public.*

**THAT** the Council:

- (a) **Receives** report No. 210830139414.
- (b) **Approves** the scope of tenders for Tranche Two of the Shovel Ready Programme as:
  - (i) *Beach Road Pumping Station; and*
  - (ii) *Beach Road Rising Main and Bund*
- (c) **Notes** that this decision was subject to the Council's future decision in regard to section 181 of the Local Government Act, 2002, and 213 Beach Road, Kaiapoi.
- (d) **Notes** there may not be any further tranches of tenders depending on the tender prices received, and so the following projects may not be funded under the programme:
  - (i) *McIntosh Drain Pumping Station*
  - (ii) *Feldwick/McIntosh SMA*
  - (iii) *McIntosh Drain Channel Upgrade*
  - (iv) *Dudley Drain Pumping Station renewal*
  - (v) *Feldwick Drain Pumping Station renewal.*
- (e) **Note** that these projects were not identified in the Council's current 2021/31 Long Term Plan but could be considered in future long term plan deliberations.
- (f) **Delegates** authority to enter into construction contracts for the Kaiapoi Stormwater and Flooding Improvements to the Mayor and the Chief Executive up to a total value of \$4.84 million for the following:
  - (i) *Beach Road Pumping Station; and*
  - (ii) *Beach Road rising main and bund*

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

**CARRIED**

19.4 **Kaiapoi South Mixed-Use Business Area – Development Proposal MOU – S Hart (Business and Centres Manager)**

The signing of the Memorandum of Understanding with the developer had been concluded and the resolution was subsequently made public.

**THAT** the Council:

- (a) **Receives** Report No. 210921151571.
- (b) **Notes** the background information provided in this report detailing the Request for Concept Proposals (RFCP) process, and subsequent evaluations and reporting.
- (c) **Approves** the Chief Executive and Business and Centres Manager to conclude the attached Draft Memorandum of Understanding relating to the Kaiapoi South Mixed-Use Business Area Proposal, and associated Draft Schedule (Outline Stage Plan) with William Hill Ltd.
- (d) **Notes** that following confirmation of the MOU and associated Schedule, staff would progress the appropriate tasks, and work with William Hill to assess the current development proposal in terms of feasibility, viability and 'consentability', with the aim of bringing a further report back to the Council on this matter.
- (e) **Notes** that Council had previously approved a budget of \$100,000, from the existing Kaiapoi Town Centres budget (100243.000.5014) to allow the Council related evaluation tasks to be progressed.

**CARRIED**

19.5 **North of High Car Parking Building – Ashmore Holdings Ltd Proposal – S Hart (Business and Centres Manager)**

The project did not continue as the external party decided to retract their proposal, and so no further consideration was given to the matter by the Council and the resolution was subsequently made public.

**THAT** the Council:

- (a) **Receives** Report No. 210825138057.
- (b) **Notes** the significance of the North of High concept, as identified in the Rangiora Town Centre Strategy, in relation to developing the Town Centre to the North, creating new retail opportunities to help stem the flow of retail leakage, and providing much great car parking supply to the centre of the Town Centre.
- (c) **Notes** the relevant history, and previous work undertaken on the North of High project by the Council and Ashmore Holdings Ltd, who were formerly part of Ashmore Estates Limited (AEL).
- (d) **Notes** the information related to current Rangiora Town Centre car parking supply, demand and utilisation information, as set out in section three of the report.
- (e) **Notes** that whilst the current parking challenges within the Rangiora Town Centre were manageable, known risks highlighted potential

supply constraints that would result in greater parking challenges, vehicle circulation, and commuter frustration in the near future.

- (f) **Notes** Council had received a high-level car parking and retail building development proposal from Ashmore Holdings Ltd.
- (g) **Notes** that in May 2021, the Council had previously acknowledged Ashmore Holdings' desire to work with Council on a Parking Building, and supported the delay of the at-grade extension of the Blake Street Car Park while staff worked with Ashmore Holdings to better understand their proposal.
- (h) **Approves** the development of a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between Ashmore Holdings Ltd. and the Council that enabled the feasibility, viability and suitability of the Ashmore Holdings Ltd. proposal to be better understood.
- (i) **Delegates** to the Town Centre Strategies Implementation Working Group of elected members to finalise and approve any final MOU with Ashmore Holdings to do the work necessary to determine whether the Council, through its Annual Plan process, would or would not wish to further the proposal, with any modifications it might deem appropriate, in association with Ashmore Holdings.
- (j) **Approves** funding of up to \$50,000, from the existing Blake Street Car Park Extensions budget (101777.000.5135 and 101782.000.5133), for the technical and legal inputs required to achieve the outcomes sought in Recommendation (g) above.
- (k) **Notes** the Ashmore Holdings would be required to fund costs associated with further concept design and development proposal advice.
- (l) **Notes** review of the timing of current Long Term Plan provisions related to Rangiora Town Centre parking projects would be an element for consideration alongside implementing the MOU.
- (m) **Notes** staff would bring back a further report, through the coming Annual Plan process, detailing the results of the more detailed investigation into the Ashmore Holdings Ltd. proposal, and the review of the current Long Term Plan provisions, and making appropriate recommendations with regards to how Council should respond.
- (n) **Notes** that should Council support the recommendations within this report, staff would brief the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board on this matter, and collect the Board's feedback for inclusion in any future reports to Council.
- (o) **Circulates** this report to the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board.


**CARRIED**

20. **NEXT MEETING**

The next scheduled ordinary meeting of the Council will occur on Tuesday 2 November 2021, Waimakariri District Council Chambers, Rangiora Service Centre, 215 High Street, Rangiora.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE MEETING CLOSED AT 6.52PM.

CONFIRMED



---

Chairperson  
Mayor Dan Gordon

2 November 2021