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COUNCIL MEETING

Tuesday 4 June 2019
Commencing at 1.00pm

Waimakariri District Council Chamber
215 High Street
Rangiora

Members:
Mayor David Ayers
Deputy Mayor Kevin Felstead
Councillor Neville Atkinson
Councillor Kirstyn Barnett
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Councillor Robbie Brine
Councillor Wendy Doody
Councillor Dan Gordon
Councillor John Meyer
Councillor Sandra Stewart
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The Mayor and Councillors

WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

A meeting of the WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL will be held in the COUNCIL CHAMBER, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA on TUESDAY 4 JUNE 2019 at 1.00PM.

Sarah Nichols
GOVERNANCE MANAGER

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

BUSINESS

1. APOLOGIES

2. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
Conflicts of interest (if any) to be reported for minuting.

3. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

4. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

4.1. Minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on 7 May 2019

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Confirms as a true and correct record the circulated minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on Tuesday 7 May 2019.

4.2. Minutes of the public excluded portion of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on 7 May 2019

(refer to Public Excluded Agenda)

MATTERS ARISING

5. DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

5.1 Gail Midgley

Gail will present a petition and views in relation to glyphosate use in public places
6. ADJOURNED BUSINESS
Nil.

7. REGENERATION REPORTS
Nil

8. REPORTS

8.1 Adoption of the Vehicle Crossing Bylaw 2019 Recommendation of the Hearing Panel – Hearing Panel (Councillors John Meyer, Sandra Stewart and Paul Williams)

RECOMMENDATION
THAT the Council:
(a) Receives report No. 190514068065;
(b) Revokes The Vehicle Crossing Bylaw 2007;
(c) Adopts the Waimakariri District Council Vehicle Crossing Bylaw 2019 (Trim: 190218018229) to come into effect on 4th June 2019.

8.2 Adoption of final Waimakariri Rural Residential Development Strategy – Heike Downie (Principal Planning Analyst)

RECOMMENDATION
THAT the Council:
(a) Receives report No. 190520070416.
(b) Adopts the final Waimakariri Rural Residential Development Strategy (190510066945), which supersedes and now revokes the Waimakariri Rural Residential Plan adopted in 2010.
(c) Nominates the Portfolio Holder for Communications and District Planning Development to confirm any minor edits to the Waimakariri Rural Residential Development Strategy (final print ready version) as required in conjunction with staff prior to finalising.
(d) Circulates a copy of this report to the Community Boards for their information.
8.3 Establishing the Proposed Mahi Tahi Committee – Mayor David Ayers

**RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 190522072219.

(b) **Agrees** to the establishment of the Mahi Tahi (Working Together) Development Committee with terms of reference as set out in the Attachment iii (190125007826).

(c) **Appoints** the Mayor and Councillor…………,and Councillor…………, to be the three Council members on the Committee

8.4 North Eyre Road and Browns Road Sealing Statement of Proposal for Special Consultative Procedure for Targeted Rate and appointment of Hearing Panel – Joanne McBride (Roading and Transport Manager)

**RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 190522072233;

(b) **Approves** the attached Statement of Proposal for a Targeted Rate for North Eyre Road and Browns Road property owners for their contribution for sealing North Eyre Road and Browns Road adjacent to their properties (Doc 190415055924);

(c) **Appoints** Councillors Meyer (Chair) and ……………… and ………………… to the North Eyre Road and Browns Road Sealing Targeted Rate Hearing Panel;

(d) **Notes** that the targeted rate will take effect for 1 July 2020;

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

8.5 Funding for Park and Ride Facilities – Joanne McBride (Roading and Transport Manager) and Gerard Cleary (Manager Utilities and Roading)

**RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 190523072402;

(b) **Commits** to funding Park & Ride facilities required as part of Travel Demand Management Measures during the 2020/21 financial year and up to a maximum value of $4 million as allowed for in the Long Term Plan, subject to NZTA confirmation of a 51% Funding Assistance Rate;

(c) **Advises** NZTA that if they front fund the project then Council will repay the local share in 2020/21;

(d) **Notes** that funding of $4 million for Park & Ride currently sits in 2025/26 and 2026/27 and that this resolution will commit Council to bringing forward funding into the 2020/21 financial year;

(e) **Notes** that the current high level estimate for these facilities is $3,420,000 (including $600,000 of operational capex);
Notes that $100,000 of funding has been brought forward to 2019/20 for investigation;

Notes that further work is needed to refine costs, confirm locations of the facilities and consider options around staging of the delivery of these sites before funding is brought forward;

Notes that staff will continue to work in conjunction with the Greater Christchurch Partners to confirm the scope of Travel Demand Management required and report back to Council;

8.6 Report for Town Centre Feature Lighting and Decorations Terms of Reference and Working Group Membership and Endorsement – Joanne McBride (Roading and Transport Manager) and Gerard Cleary (Manager Utilities and Roading)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 190519070361;
(b) Appoints two elected members to the Town Centre Feature Lighting and Decorations Working Group. The elected members shall be as follows:

(c) Approves the Terms of Reference for the working group;
(d) Approves the formation of the Working Group with the representatives as recommended by the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi and Rangiora-Ashley Community Boards.

8.7 Land and Water Working Group Proposal – Gerard Cleary (Manager Utilities and Roading) and Chris Brown (Manager Community and Recreation)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 190215017783.
(b) Approves the establishment of a Land and Water Working Group, with direct reporting to Council.
(c) Approves the Terms of Reference for the Land and Water Working Group. (TRIM 190305026331)
(d) Appoints the following representatives to the ‘Land and Water’ Working Group:

• Councillor with the Canterbury Water Management Strategy portfolio - Cr. Sandra Stewart
• A Councillor from the Utilities and Roading Committee - To be confirmed
• A Councillor from the Community and Recreation Committee - To be confirmed
• A Councillor from the District Planning and Regulation Committee - To be confirmed
• A Councillor – To be confirmed
• Manager of Utilities and Roading - Gerard Cleary
• Manager of Community and Recreation – Chris Brown
• Chair of the Land and Water Project Action Group (LWPCG) - To be confirmed.

(e) **Notes** the Land and Water Project Action Group, comprising of staff will be established to draft and implement a work programme.

(f) **Notes** that the Land and Water Working Group could be expanded to govern aligned Waimakariri District Council projects, such as the proposed ‘Arohatia te Awa’, and non-ZIPA biodiversity operations by the Biodiversity Officer role, subject to Council approval.

(g) **Notes** that the Land and Water Working Group could be expanded to include the work of the Cam River Enhancement Fund Subcommittee and Kaiapoi River Rehabilitation Working Party, if so decided by a future Council.

(h) **Circulates** this report to Community Boards and the Waimakariri Water Zone Committee.

8.8 **Council Submission on Waimakariri Bus Service Review – Simon Markham (Manager Strategy and Engagement)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 190527073770

(b) **Approves** the Submission attached to this report as the WDC Submission on the Waimakariri Bus Service Review (Trim doc. 190527073769).

8.9 **Rangiora-Ashley Community Board Chairperson’s Report for the period December 2016 to December 2018 – Jim Gerard QSO (Chairperson Rangiora-Ashley Community Board)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 190412055415.

(b) **Circulates** a copy of this report to all the Community Boards.

8.10 **Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board Chairperson’s Report for the period December 2016 to December 2018 – Jackie Watson (Chairperson Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 190501061834.
(b) Circulates a copy of this report to all the Community Boards.

8.11. Oxford-Ohoka Community Board Chairperson’s Report for the period December 2016 to December 2018 – Doug Nicholl (Chairperson Oxford-Ohoka Community Board)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives report No. 190501061797.
(b) Circulates a copy of this report to all the Community Boards.

8.12. Woodend-Sefton Community Board Chairperson’s Report for the period December 2016 to December 2018 – (Shona Powell (Chairperson Woodend-Sefton Community Board)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives report No. 190501061717.
(b) Circulates a copy of this report to all the Community Boards.
9. HEALTH AND SAFETY


RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No 190521071448

(b) Notes that there are no significant Health and Safety issues at this time, and that WDC is, so far as is reasonably practicable, compliant with the PCBU duties of the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015.

10. MATTERS REFERRED

10.1. Mandeville Village car parking concern – Grant MacLeod (Greenspace Manager)

(Refer to attached copy of report no. 190424059175 to the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board meeting of 16 May 2019, and minutes of that meeting, Item 12.3 in this agenda). NOTE: The Board approved an additional recommendation, as below, to what was in the staff report)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 190424059175.

(b) Supports a change in Local Purpose classification of the Council-owned reserve at 975 Tram Road, from Local Purpose (Plantation) Reserve, to Local Purpose (Community Purposes) Reserve.

(c) Supports staff to prepare a resource consent based on the 50-space car park concept noting that no development can occur for a formalised car park unless a change of purpose and the process for that is completed. The status of the reserve at present does not legally support a formalised car park.

(d) Notes that the proposed change in the type of Local Purpose Reserve requires public consultation and Council approval. Approval by the Minister of Conservation is not required.

(e) Notes that Council’s Property Unit no longer has an interest in the reserve for plantation purposes and supports the proposed change. The current purpose is no longer appropriate given the reserves location, site characteristics and competing options for future use.

(f) Notes that the proposed Community Purposes sub-classification will allow greater flexibility in providing for community needs within the reserve.

(g) Notes that a key driver for a change of reserve purpose is to consider an allowance of a portion of the reserve to be available for formed car park.

(h) Notes that funding would need to be sought from a future Annual Plan or Long Term Plan to support the creation of a car park.

(i) Notes that sufficient open space for community recreation purposes would exist within the reserve should a 50-space car park be installed.

(j) Notes that staff will come back to the Community Board and Council with a report on the feedback and results of the change of purpose process. Staff will also be preparing resource consent for the car park based on the 50-space concept.
(k) **Supports** an urgent investigation for a temporary car park be carried out to relieve the pressure of car parking at the Mandeville Village, and the safety issues resulting from this, while further action is taken on the change of purpose of the reserve and public consultation.

10.2. **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)**

(Refer to attached copy of report no. 190424059105 to the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board meeting of 15 May 2019 and minutes of that meeting, Item 12.2 in this agenda)

**RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 190424059105;

(b) **Approves** the Terms of Reference for the working group;

(c) **Approves** the formation of the Working Group and membership as recommended by the Board.

(also refer to Agenda Item 8.8 on this matter)

11. **COMMITTEE MINUTES FOR INFORMATION**

11.1. **Minutes of a meeting of the Utilities and Roading Committee held on 16 April 2019**

11.2. **Minutes of meeting of the Regeneration Steering Group held on 6 May 2019**

**RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the information in items 11.1 to 11.2 be received.
12. COMMUNITY BOARD MINUTES FOR INFORMATION

12.1 Minutes of a meeting of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board held on 13 May 2019

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the information in items 12.1 to 12.3 be received.

13. CORRESPONDENCE

14. MAYOR'S DIARY

14.1 Mayor's Diary 1 – 28 May 2019

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report no. 190524073551.

15. COUNCIL PORTFOLIO UPDATES

15.1 Iwi Relationships – Mayor Ayers

15.2 Canterbury Water Management Strategy – Councillor Stewart

15.3 International Relationships – Deputy Mayor Felstead

15.4 Regeneration (Kaiapoi) – Councillor Blackie

16. QUESTIONS

(under Standing Orders)

17. URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS

(under Standing Orders)

18. MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED WITH THE PUBLIC EXCLUDED

Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

RECOMMENDATION

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
---|---|---|---|---
18.1 | Minutes of the public excluded portion of a meeting of the Council of 7 May 2019 | Confirmation of Minutes | 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Reason for protection of interests</th>
<th>Ref NZS 9202:2003 Appendix A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>Protection of privacy of natural persons. To carry out commercial activities without prejudice</td>
<td>A2(a) A2(b)ii</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CLOSED MEETING**

*See Public Excluded Agenda*

**OPEN MEETING**

19. **NEXT MEETING**

The next scheduled ordinary meeting of the Council is at 1.00pm on Tuesday 2 July 2019 in the Council Chambers.
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA, ON TUESDAY 7 MAY 2019 COMMENCING AT 1PM.

PRESENT:


IN ATTENDANCE:

J Palmer (Chief Executive), G Cleary (Manager Utilities and Roading), N Harrison (Manager Regulation), C Sargison (Manager Special Projects), C Roxburgh (Water Asset Manager), J McBride (Roading and Transport Manager), R Hawthorne (Property Manager), D Roxborough (Implementation Project Manager-District Regeneration), G Meadows (Policy Manager), S Hart (Business and Centres Manager), S Nichols (Governance Manager) and A Smith (Governance Coordinator).

Representing the Waimakariri Zone Committee: D Ashby (Chairperson), G Edge (Deputy Chairperson), M Griffin (CWMS Facilitator, ECAn)

1. APOLOGIES

There were no apologies.

2. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

There were no conflicts of interest recorded.

3. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There were no acknowledgements.

ITEM 18.4 FROM PUBLIC EXCLUDED AGENDA TO BE CONSIDERED IN THE OPEN MEETING

Moved Mayor Ayers seconded Deputy Mayor Felstead

(a) That Item 18.4 in the Public Excluded Council Agenda (Travel Demand Management Funding) be considered in the open meeting.

CARRIED

4. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

4.1 Minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on 2 April 2019

Moved Councillor Gordon seconded Councillor Meyer

THAT the Council:

(a) Confirms as a true and correct record the circulated minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on Tuesday 2 April 2019.

CARRIED
4.2 Minutes of the public excluded portion of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on 2 April 2019

This matter was considered in the public excluded portion of the meeting.

MATTERS ARISING

Subsequent to the previous meeting of the Council, Councillor D Gordon withdrew his attendance to the LGNZ National Conference in July 2019 (refer para 8.3 of minutes). Councillor Doody advised she wishes to be a delegate and this was agreed by all members.

5. DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

5.1 Little Peppertree Preschool Performance

Kate Swaine (Preschool Supervisor) and a group of children and parents from the Little Peppertree Preschool were in attendance. The preschool was presented with an Enviroschools Bronze Award in October 2018 and had performed their “Bokashi song” at that presentation. The group also performed this for the Council today. K Swaine explained the benefits of the Enviroschools programme to the children and the sharing of this information at home with their families. Mayor Ayers thanked them all for their presentation.

Toni Watts from Enviroschools was also present with the group and took the opportunity to acknowledge the support of the Waimakariri District Council for the Enviroschools programme.

6. ADJOURNED BUSINESS

Nil.

7. REGENERATION REPORTS

Nil.

8. REPORTS

8.1 Canterbury Water Management Strategy (CWMS) Waimakariri Zone Committee Annual Report 2018 – G Meadows (Policy Manager)

Dave Ashby, Chairperson of the Waimakariri Water Zone Committee and Grant Edge, Deputy Chairperson presented the Annual Report of the Waimakariri Water Zone Committee. Also attending in support was Murray Griffin (CWMS Zone Facilitator, ECan).

D Ashby noted the different backgrounds of both himself and G Edge, representing the diversity of the membership of the Zone Committee. The Annual Report was taken as read, and D Ashby highlighted some issues. Community action to improve the quality of fresh water is the key he stated. The ZIP addendum which was presented to the Council in December consists of 93 recommendations; of which approximately one third are statutory and the balance being non-statutory. This reinforces the importance of community buy-in to achieve. The committee are wanting to achieve and the committee wants to see active engagement by the farming community and interacting with the urban development as well to work progressively to improve water quality. The Zone Committee can be happy with the achievements to date. The Annual Report highlighted some of the key achievements; the most important one being the development of Farm Environment Plans over most of the farms covered in this Zone, through the irrigation schemes and also independently. D Ashby
believes there is a very robust plan in place to achieve improvements in water quality over time. There is a recognition by farmers within the zone of improvements required, and also looking at localised solutions (denitrification zones). There is a huge cost and commitment to farmers through the zone, but they are doing it D Ashby stated. He advised people are concerned about what is happening in the environment, but the science is good and this shows what can be achieved on a non-statutory basis. D Ashby mentioned a big concern of his is that there is a lot of money being spent on bureaucracy, such as land use consents and other regulations, with the costs of consents increasing dramatically. D Ashby tabled an educational booklet that lists a range of practices that farmers can be undertaking, noting that it is important to get the buy-in of the urban and peri-urban population as well.

G Edge spoke on the need for a holistic and integrated approach, across farming operation. There is to be three sub-catchment management plans to be prepared in the first year. These strategy plans will have implications for costs and projects on the ground. It will be important for a coordinated effort between ECan, the Council, and other agencies in the future and also engaging with the community.

Questions

Councillor Blackie noted a correction required in the Annual Plan document, under the heading “Infiltration trial could solve Silverstream nitrate issues” second paragraph should read “seven kilometres west of Silverstream’s headwaters”.

Councillor Doody asked for an update on the dryland project on Dagnum Farm at Burnt Hill. M Griffin said this Immediate Steps funding application was for the protection of a remnant of kanuka stand. It is important for biodiversity to be preserved and G Edge said this includes both aquatic and terrestrial areas.

Councillor Barnett commented on the significant number of small block owners in this district and asked what these owners could be advised to do to improve water quality. D Ashby suggested the best thing they could do would be to keep stock out of drains and waterways. If a property is more than 10 hectares there needs to be a management plan completed and lodged with the Ecan portal by 1 July 2019. There will be more in-depth guidelines provided to small (lifestyle) block holders, from a springhead to property owners along a waterway. All information is on the ECan website.

Councillor Atkinson asked if the Water Zone Committee had any plans around reducing the costs of land use consents. D Ashby said the sub-catchment management plans will give movement to water quality. Regarding resource consents D Ashby commented personally that there is money being wasted on beauracratic matters and there is not a bottomless pit of money for funding. D Ashby spoke on the requirements for completing land use consents, noting that these are very extensive with a lot involved to complete with many conditions. It was suggested that there are generic conditions and there needs to be some way of speeding up the issuing of these generic consents.

D Ashby suggested what needs to happen is for farmers, and any land owners, to be proud of their involvement in the project to improve water quality. It needs to be easier for people to get the consents that are required, but then these need to be policed, so that the conditions of the consents are being achieved.

G Edge suggested as a way forward, it would be good to have a more generic template to make up the consent process.

Councillor Stewart spoke on the Schedule One consultation of the Draft Plan Change which has been with this Council since April, noting the 15 May deadline. There is only a few days left to submit on this and enquired if the Zone Committee would have time to comment on. J Palmer provided a brief overview
of the process for the Schedule One, which is more of a technical assessment. It is expected that the Schedule One has been drafted within the expectations of the ZIPA. It was agreed that Council staff would follow up with this in the next two days, noting that the Zone Committee will also be considering it at its next workshop.

Moved Mayor Ayers seconded Councillor Doody

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report no. 19042059362

(b) Receives the Waimakariri Water Zone Committee Annual Report 2018 (Trim 190429060467)

(c) Circulates the Zone Committee Annual Report 2018 to Community Boards, and Drainage and Water Supply Advisory Groups, for their information.

CARRIED

Mayor Ayers thanked the Zone Committee for the report and the extensive work that the committee has undertaken in the past year. He acknowledged the leadership of the Chair, Dave Ashby, during this time, noting his decision to stand down as Chairperson before the upcoming Refresh programme of committee membership. Mayor Ayers noted that there is a general consensus throughout the community of the need to improve water quality and based on this there will be real improvements made to water quality over the next few decades. Mayor Ayers also thanked the work of ECan staff and WDC staff for the support work.

Councillor Atkinson believed there needs to be further discussion on the cost associated with land use consents and the need for some uniformity in these processes, highlighting the comment of G Edge on having a template.

Mayor Ayers acknowledged the comments of Councillor Atkinson and the barriers currently in front of land owners within the district.

D Ashby acknowledged the work of Deputy Chairperson, G Edge, during his time on the Committee, which has been since its inception.

R 2 Notice of Motion 4 December 2018: Fireworks Ban Sale and Use

Notice of Motion 5 February 2019: Property Maintenance and Nuisance – M O’Connell (Senior Policy Analyst)

N Harrison presented the report which deals with the two Notices of Motion which were submitted to the Council; firstly seeking a ban on the sale and use of fireworks and secondly developing a bylaw to deal with property maintenance and nuisance matters such as long grass.

Ban the Sale and use of Fireworks – N Harrison referred to the remit that Auckland City Council have sent to LGNZ, (a copy of which was circulated to members the previous week). The current central government regulations have allowed the sale of fireworks, so it would be difficult to ban it. Fireworks can be purchased between the 2nd and 5th November each year. It would be possible to draft a bylaw with regard to the use of fireworks, particularly in public places. There is some practical issues, primarily around the enforcement of trying to control the use of fireworks in public places. Most enforcement would have to be patrolled at night and involve increased staff resources. Also any infringements would need to be dealt with in the District Court as there would be no infringement fee. Auckland City Council are seeking Parliament to change
the law, to ban the sale, unless you are a licensed operator. This is included in
the remit to LGNZ. The process to support this remit is relatively straightforward.

Property Maintenance and Nuisance Bylaw – legal advice advises that this
appears relatively straight forward and fits within the Local Government Act. The
reason for the development of the Bylaw is for public health and safety. There
would be no infringement regime, and any prosecution would need to be through
the District Court, but there could be inspection fees charged to people who do
not respond to requests. A workshop could be held to develop a draft Property
Maintenance and Nuisance Bylaw to be brought back to the Council before going
out for public consultation.

Mayor Ayers suggested the Nuisance Bylaw could apply to all urban sections,
not just undeveloped sections. N Harrison agreed this could be possible.

Councillor Williams suggested that as well as supporting the Auckland City
Council remit to LGNZ on the ban on the sale and use of fireworks, that a letter
be sent to Parliament from the Council, which he understood Wellington City
Council have done. It was agreed that a letter could be sent to Parliament.

In relation to the Property Maintenance and Nuisance Bylaw, Councillor Barnett
asked how much does it cost to develop a bylaw, including staff time,
consultation, advertising etc. N Harrison suggested an estimated figure of
between $8,000 – $10,000.

Moved Councillor Gordon seconded Councillor Williams

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 190328045254

(b) Notes that The Local Government Act 2002 s145 provides for councils
to make bylaws to protect the public from nuisance and maintain public
health and safety.

(c) Acknowledges that the Council does not have the ability in law to ban
the sale of fireworks as Parliament has specifically legislated for its sale;

(d) Supports Auckland City (and other Councils) in its bid to make a remit
to the Local Government NZ July conference seeking the Government to
introduce legislation to ban the private sale and use of fireworks and to
write a letter to the Minister of Local Government.

(e) Notes that Council, through the LGA does have the ability to develop a
bylaw to restrict the use of fireworks in public places, but in the first
instance seeking a change to the law is more effective, as enforcement
of a bylaw would be problematic and its application to private land
uncertain;

(f) Authorises staff to develop a draft Property Maintenance and Nuisance
Bylaw to address such matters as long grass on undeveloped urban
sections and other nuisances, and this draft to be brought to the August
District Planning and Regulation Committee meeting for its consideration;

(g) Circulates this report to all Community Boards.

CARRIED

Councillor Gordon noted that there had been good discussion on these matters
previously and believes the Council should support the Auckland City Council
remit at the upcoming Local Government Conference. He supported the Council
regulating the sale of fireworks, but notes the difficulty with this, however would
like to see further work undertaken. D Gordon suggested that the Council
representatives at the LGNZ Conference in July should speak on behalf of the Council in support of the Auckland City Council remit. Writing to the Minister of Local Government is also the right approach. There has been a lot of feedback from the community since this matter has been raised he advised.

Councillor Gordon supported a Property Maintenance and Nuisance Bylaw and there could be a number of situations that this bylaw could cover. Regarding prosecution matters, Councillor Gordon remarked that having to take a case to the District Court would be a last resort. With the changes to legislation there is no ability for the Council to encourage property owners to deal with their properties. Councillor Gordon believes this is the right approach and encourages others to support it.

Councillor Williams is encouraged by the support of both Auckland and Wellington City Council’s for the ban of sale and use of fireworks. Councillor Williams stated he would like to see more power in all the Bylaws that the Council have in place, with possibility of some instant fines.

Councillor Barnett noted concern with the Property Maintenance and Nuisance Bylaw and potential for costs. She suggested that the Committee, when considering this Bylaw, should look at mechanisms for getting something done, rather than the mechanism for telling people what to do. Councillor Barnett remarked that enforcing bylaws should include simpler options. Councillor Barnett held concerns that when developing bylaws they do not have a positive impact for the community without a major cost.

In reply, Councillor Gordon stated he was hopeful of having a sensible Bylaw that will come up with the practical measures to address issues.

8.3. **Joining of Woodend and Pegasus Water Supplies – C Roxburgh (Water Asset Manager)**

C Roxburgh presented to the report, which seeks to amend the project budget for the joining of the Woodend and Pegasus water supplies. This is due to the project currently being ahead of schedule and under budget. The project was anticipated to be completed in late May 2019, rather than in June or July.

There were no questions.

Moved Councillor Williams seconded Councillor Atkinson

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 190423058867.

(b) **Notes** that the project to join the Woodend and Pegasus water supplies is due to be completed for $84,000 less than the original budget allocated of $811,000.

(c) **Notes** that the project to join the Woodend and Pegasus water supplies is due to be completed ahead of programme, with a completion date forecast of late May 2019 rather than early in new financial year.

(d) **Re-allocates** $281,500 of the budget currently allocated for the ‘Gladstone and Pegasus Raw Water Main’ project from the 2019-20 financial year into the 2018-19 financial year.

(e) **Removes** the remaining $84,000 of budget allocated for the Gladstone and Pegasus Raw Water Main project from the 2019-20 financial year.
(f) **Notes** that the reason for the above changes is that the project to join the Woodend and Pegasus schemes is to be completed ahead of programme and under budget.

(g) **Circulates** this report to the Utilities and Roading Committee for their information.

CARRIED

Councillor Blackie had received a letter from the Woodend-Sefton Community Board, regarding the chlorine coming out of the water supply in Pegasus once the joining of the schemes was complete. C Roxburgh noted that this was the intent originally, but it has been decided not to turn the chlorine off in the Pegasus supply until there is some more certainty from the Government on the longer term requirements for drinking water standards. The Woodend water supply will continue without chlorine.

8.4. **Elected member Code of Conduct Refresh – S Nichols (Governance Manager)**

S Nichols presented the report, which follows on from a recent briefing and councillors feedback had been incorporated into the document. The report sought approval of the updated Code of Conduct, amendment to the Standing Orders and associated Terms of Reference for the Code of Conduct Committee, should such a matter arise to warrant the calling of the Committee together.

Following a question from Councillor Barnett, it was agreed that notification of any meeting arranged for the Code of Conduct Committee would be provided to all Councillors. It was agreed that this was an operational matter.

Moved Mayor Ayers seconded Deputy Mayor Felstead

**THAT** the Council:

- (a) **Receives** report No. 190311029913.
- (b) **Adopts** the 2019 Elected Member Code of Conduct, effective from 7 May 2019. (Trim 190228024595).
- (c) **Amends** Standing Orders section 17, as per Trim 190424059255, enabling the Committee Chair to exclude elected members not directly involved in the Code of Conduct Committee under the same regulations as LGOIMA.
- (d) **Adopts** the 2019 Code of Conduct Committee Terms of Reference (Trim 190424059278).
- (e) **Circulates** a copy of this report to all Community Boards.

CARRIED
9. HEALTH AND SAFETY


J Palmer presented the report for the Councillors information. There were no questions.

Moved Councillor Atkinson seconded Deputy Mayor Felstead

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No 190416056804.

(b) Notes that there are no significant Health and Safety issues at this time, and that WDC is, so far as is reasonably practicable, compliant with the PCBU duties of the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015.

CARRIED

10. MATTERS REFERRED

10.1. Town Centre feature Lighting and Decorations Terms of Reference and Working Group membership – J McBride (Roading and Transport Manager) and G Cleary (Manager Utilities and Roading)

J McBride was present for consideration of this report. Chris Greengrass and Phillip Redmond were nominated by the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board as representatives on this group. The equivalent report will go to the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board at their next meeting asking for representatives from the Board to be appointed to the Working Group, which will ultimately come back to the Council. There will also be a request for two members of Council to be appointed to the Working Group.

G Cleary added comments on the planned maintenance programme for the tree lights and the plans in place over the coming months. Mainpower have been carrying out inspection work on the lights in recent days and it was noted that the lights have been performing well for the past few months.

Moved Councillor Gordon seconded Councillor Meyer

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 190403049853;

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

(c) Approves the formation of the Working Group and membership as recommended by the Board.

CARRIED

Councillor Gordon noted the positive feedback he had received regarding the street lighting in Rangiora. It is especially more visible now that daylight saving has finished he stated. Councillor Gordon remarked that keeping the decorative lights on the trees going all year around is a good outcome and he looked forward to this being ratified at a future council meeting.
10.2. **Good Street Road Stop (for the pedestrianised portion between High Street and the Service Lane) – V Thompson (Business and Centres Advisor)**

S Hart spoke to the report, noting the report was presented to the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board in April, which supported the recommendation and seeks approval of the Council to formally stop the road status of Good Street between High Street and the Service Lane. The area has been in the public’s perception, a pedestrian area, but it is still a legal road, noting there have been complaints from people about vehicles driving in that space. There will need to be survey lodged with LINZ and public notification. The public notification period is 40 days. If there were any objections, they would need to be referred to the Environment Court. If the road closure was approved, it would be the intention of the Council for it to be a local purpose reserve, which would be similar to the Conway Lane space. It is also planned to undertake a Memorandum of Understanding with property owners of 140 High Street and 5 Good Street, as noted in the report. Property boundaries of these both extend out into the pedestrianised portion of Good Street and these owners have both agreed to enter into a formal easement arrangement with the Council preventing vehicle access to the street through their existing property boundaries. S Hart advised that the owner of 5 Good Street would expect to have an “opt out” clause in any easement, should he wish to undertake a rebuild of his property, as there is a historical building restriction line imposed by the Council preventing a build to the boundary line in Good Street.

Discussions have also been held with the tenant at 140 High Street who has had an historical car parking arrangement behind the store for the duration of their business hours. There has also been discussion with other tenants who have indicated their requirements for loading zones, if the road is stopped.

Councillor Barnett asked if loading zones could also be designated as “drop-off zones”, to be a dual purpose. S Hart noted there is already a loading zone at the end of Good Street where the pedestrian area stops at the back of New World. The Rangiora Town Centre Strategy and Parking Review will be looking at parking, drop off zones and loading zones.

Following a question from Councillor Doody, S Hart said that once the road stopping exercise has been progressed, there will be consideration of a change of name and upgrades to the area.

Following a question from Councillor Williams, regarding the possible financial compensation to property owners, there are issues with loading zones and car parking still to be resolved and S Hart advised that this will come back to the Council for approval.

Moved Mayor Ayers seconded Councillor Gordon

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Initiate** a formal road stop process through Land Information New Zealand and the legal requirements around a public consultation period.

**CARRIED**

Mayor Ayers noted that this part of Good Street has been operating as a pedestrian mall for about 30 years. It is in the interest of the Council to have agreement with the property owners and business owners in the area. The name change will be a decision for the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board.

Councillor Gordon acknowledged the work of the Council staff on this matter and the work done with other businesses in the district with a positive outcome. It is important that there is a solution in the Good Street area.
11. COMMITTEE MINUTES FOR INFORMATION

11.1. Minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri Youth Council held on 26 February 2019.
11.2. Minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri Youth Council held on 26 March 2019.
11.3. Minutes of a meeting of the Community and Recreation Committee held on 26 March 2019.
11.4. Minutes of a meeting of the Audit and Risk Committee held on 26 March 2019.
11.5. Minutes of a meeting of the Regeneration Steering Group held on 1 April 2019.

Moved Deputy Mayor Felstead seconded Councillor Atkinson

THAT the information in items 11.1 to 11.5 be received.

CARRIED

12. COMMUNITY BOARD MINUTES FOR INFORMATION

12.1. Minutes of a meeting of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board held on 3 April 2019.

It was noted a decision on the car parking matter at Mandeville Village will be coming to the Council for a decision in June or July.

12.2. Minutes of a meeting of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board held on 8 April 2019.

12.3. Minutes of a meeting of the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board held on 10 April 2019.

Councillor Barnett noted an interesting presentation to the Board on undergrounding of power lines.

12.4. Minutes of a meeting of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board held on 15 April 2019.

Moved Councillor Barnett seconded Mayor Ayers

THAT the information in items 12.1 to 12.4 be received.

CARRIED

13. CORRESPONDENCE

Nil.

14. MAYOR’S DIARY

14.1 Mayor’s Diary 27 March – 30 April 2019

Moved Councillor Blackie seconded Councillor Atkinson

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report no. 190424059282.

CARRIED
15. COUNCIL PORTFOLIO UPDATES

15.1. **Iwi Relationships – Mayor Ayers**

Noted the annual Hui tomorrow being held at the Tuahiwi Marae. The gifted artwork would be placed on the back wall of the Council Chambers and will be covered until a time is arranged for a blessing.

15.2. **Canterbury Water Management Strategy – Councillor Stewart**

Councillor Stewart was unable to attend the April meeting, due to other commitments. She advised the translation of the ZIPA into the Plan Change will come to the next Zone Committee workshop on Monday 13 May.

Councillor Stewart posed a question on the minimum flow of the Waimakariri River which is 41 cumecs (as noted in the Waimakariri River Regional Plan). The river flow gets far below this, when it is measured at the old highway bridge and Councillor Stewart believes this needs to be reviewed.

15.3. **International Relationships – Deputy Mayor Felstead**

Deputy Mayor Felstead advised that the first meeting of the Enshi Sister City Advisory Group was held on 1 May. This was a time for introductions and there was discussion on the Terms of Reference. A function will occur in August which the Group have been asked to support. This is to be a children’s art exhibition coming to Christchurch and some may be displayed in Waimakariri. It is planned to have some local children’s art to be displayed as well.

Mayor Ayers noted the Māori pou that has been erected in Zonnebeke, Belgium. This is a carving from Rotorua and has been erected in a garden which has different areas for the different combatant countries involved in the First World War in the Ypres area. The pou is located at the entrance to the New Zealand garden and forms another link with Zonnebeke and New Zealand.

15.4. **Regeneration (Kaiapoi) – Councillor Blackie**

The BMX track is nearly finished, with corners being sealed, but there is still the need to make access safe before it can be opened for use, as it is still a construction site. Progress is good and SOL Quarry Ltd donated $25,000 of soil for the track.

The tender for the Dog Park has come in below budget and is progressing.

Regarding Mahinga Kai matters, Councillor Blackie advised he is working with Arapata Rueben and some experts from the Runanga to work through a concept of which direction is best to take.

It was advised that the Honda Forest project will hold an open day on Saturday 25 May at 9.30am with a blessing following by a public planting day.

M Flannagan has been receiving enquires from members of the community on forms of remembrance of where they lived. There has been discussion on different forms of remembrance and generally plaques are not supported. There is more public approval for trees to be planted, and there has been offers of money for seating. M Flannagan is following up with these enquiries and will provide a concept plan. It has also been suggested to uplift the red letterbox memorial which is in Williams Street. It was always intended that this be located in the Regeneration area.

16. QUESTIONS

Nil.
17. URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS

Nil.

MATTER BROUGHT FROM THE PUBLIC EXCLUDED AGENDA.

Travel Demand Management Funding – J McBride (Roading and Transport Manager) and G Cleary (Manager Utilities and Roading).

J McBride and G Cleary presented the report. J McBride provided an update on progress made with the Travel Demand Management planning to support the new managed lane on the Northern corridor. The package will include a number of measures to help support the managed lane and these include education, software, park and ride, research and travel planning. Staff have been working with those involved from Greater Christchurch and Ableys Consulting and have been undertaking work for the Council on park and ride, particularly where facilities would be best located.

Councillor Barnett sought clarification on the park and ride question being put out to the community as part of the Annual Plan consultation process and how it links in with this. It was confirmed there has been changes since the Council released its draft Annual Plan. J Palmer noted that the Annual Plan asked for funding to be brought forward to enable investigation into park and ride and this is likely to be funding to actually undertake work, however the scope of works is yet to be defined. Funding options with NZTA are still to be confirmed, however it is proposed a further report will be presented to the Council in June or July.

Councillor Stewart spoke on the concerns of the residents of St Albans, with the traffic bottle necking from four lanes to two outside their properties. Councillor Stewart questioned if this Council should be advocating more than we are for their environment and the concerns of the possible adverse impact. J McBride advised that Christchurch City Council have been charged with developing a downstream effects management plan. This is to address traffic movement around the St Albans and Cranford Street area and it has had a public consultation process, with submissions being heard this week. Staff advised it is an extremely complicated process with a number of parties involved. G Cleary said the work that is being done on the High Occupancy Vehicle Lane (HOV) proposal is quite comprehensive and goes a long way to address the issues raised by the St Albans Residents Association. G Cleary noted that the work that has been done on the HOV lane is quite comprehensive and that it goes a long way to addressing the issues that are raised by the St Albans Residents Association. The Association have come up with a solution that they prefer, which precludes HOV vehicles from that lane.

Moved Councillor Barnett Seconded Councillor Atkinson

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 190424059181.
(b) Notes the proposal from NZTA to fund the local share up front with an expectation that Council share will be brought forward;
(c) Notes that it is very likely funding for Park & Ride will need to be brought forward from 2025/26 and 2026/27 years as part of the next Annual Plan process, to allow for these facilities to be developed or following a separate report to Council;
(d) Notes that staff will continue to work in conjunction with the Greater Christchurch Partners to confirm the scope of Travel Demand Management required;
(e) Notes that staff will bring back a further report to Council.

CARRIED

Councillor Barnett stated that she looked forward to the further report with more detail going forward.
Councillor Atkinson noted that transport is a major part of growth and it is important that there is investment in the future of different modes of transport. Councillor Atkinson supports having an HOV lane and would not like to see just bus lanes as he felt this would not be the best use of a new lane. Councillor Atkinson believed the matter needed to be part of the holistic picture for the future of Greater Christchurch. There will always be some “pinch points” getting traffic in and out of a city, especially when traffic infrastructure is being retro-fitted he remarked.

Mayor Ayers commented that it is important for not just the current transport and traffic situation to be considered, but also looking ahead to future requirements. According to a recent media article, Mayor Ayers noted that the traffic counts show higher volumes on Southbrook Road, than there is on Cranford Street. Southbrook Road also has traffic lanes merging at both ends. It is possible that the Council will need to bring forward the park and ride project, noting that it is important to consider the needs of all commuters travelling into Christchurch, as not all come from either Kaiapoi or Rangiora. A significant number travel into Christchurch along Tram Road from as far as the Oxford area.

18. MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED WITH THE PUBLIC EXCLUDED

Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

Moved Mayor Ayers seconded Councillor Blackie

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:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Minutes/Report of</th>
<th>General subject of each matter to be considered</th>
<th>Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter</th>
<th>Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>Minutes of the public excluded portion of a meeting of the Council of 2 April 2019</td>
<td>Confirmation of Minutes</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>Minutes of the public excluded portion of a meeting of the Regeneration Steering Group 1 April 2019</td>
<td>Minutes for Information</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>Report of Kelly LaValley (Project Delivery Manager)</td>
<td>RC185313 DC180134, 79 West Belt Request for Consideration of Development Contributions</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>Report of Joanne McBride (Road and Transport Manager)</td>
<td>Travel Demand Management Funding</td>
<td>This item was considered in the open meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>Report of Craig Sargison (Manager Special Projects)</td>
<td>Contract 19/09 Expression of Interest Main Facility Contractor Selection Report and Project Update</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>Report of Craig Sargison (Manager Special Projects)</td>
<td>Draft Heads of Agreement North Canterbury Sport and Recreation Trust for management and operation of the Multi Sports Facility at Coldstream Road.</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>Report of Rob Hawthorne (Property Manager)</td>
<td>Update on Coastal Campgrounds</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>Report of Gerard Cleary (Manager Utilities and Roading)</td>
<td>Ocean Outfall Corrosion Issue – Update and Proposal for Legal Settlement</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a) (g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.10</td>
<td>Memo of Rob Hawthorne (Property Manager)</td>
<td>Civic Accommodation: Indicative Business Case</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CARRIED
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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Reason for protection of interests</th>
<th>Ref NZS 9202:2003 Appendix A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18.1 – 18.10</td>
<td>Protection of privacy of natural persons. To carry out commercial activities without prejudice</td>
<td>A2(a) A2(b)ii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>In addition: Maintain legal professional privilege</td>
<td>A2(g)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CLOSED MEETING**

The public excluded portion of the meeting occurred from 3.28pm to 5.23pm.

19. **NEXT MEETING**

The next scheduled ordinary meeting of the Council is at 1pm on Tuesday 4 June 2019 in the Council Chambers.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 5.26pm.

CONFIRMED

________________________
Chairperson
________________________
Date
1. SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is to recommend that Council adopt the Waimakariri District Vehicle Crossing Bylaw 2019.

On 19 March 2019 the Utilities and Roading Committee approved the review of The Vehicle Crossing Bylaw 2007, and agreed to consult via a special consultative procedure as described in the Local Government Act 2002, s83.

Public submissions were sought between 1 April 2019 and 1 May 2019. No submissions were received on the proposal. As such a formal hearing was not required. The Hearing Panel met on 14 May 2019, to consider the proposed bylaw and make recommendations to Council as described in this report.

Attachments:

i. Existing Vehicle Crossing Bylaw 2007 (Trim: 070704020912)
ii. Proposed Vehicle Crossing Bylaw 2019 (Trim: 190218018229)
iii. Minutes of the meeting of the Vehicle Crossing Bylaw Hearing Panel (Trim: 190513067236)

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council

(a) Receives report No. 190514068065;

(b) Revokes The Vehicle Crossing Bylaw 2007;

(c) Adopts the Waimakariri District Council Vehicle Crossing Bylaw 2019 (Trim: 190218018229) to come into effect on 4th June 2019.
3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1. *The Vehicle Crossing Bylaw 2007* was adopted by Council on 5 June 2007 under the *Local Government Act 2002*. This is a statutory ten year review. The bylaw has been reviewed to bring it into line with current legislation, and to update it in terms of current operating practices.

3.1 Vehicle crossings are an important part of the roading network as they provide legal access from the public road to private properties. As such they need to be constructed to the required standards so they are safe, don't unduly affect the existing infrastructure and are cost effective to maintain.

3.2 The main areas of proposed change, prior to public consultation, between the current bylaw and the draft bylaw are summarised below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Vehicle Crossing Bylaw 2007</th>
<th>Vehicle Crossing Bylaw 2019</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Objectives</td>
<td>Objectives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The objective of the Bylaw is to ensure that vehicle crossings (entranceways) provide safe and convenient access to property:</td>
<td>The objective of the Bylaw is to ensure that vehicle crossings (entranceways) provide safe and convenient access to property:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a) allowing for other traffic and pedestrians.</td>
<td>(a) allowing for other traffic and pedestrians.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) allowing for good drainage without damaging the roading asset.</td>
<td>(b) allowing for good drainage without damaging the roading asset.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c) are constructed and maintained in a timely and safe manner to the Council's specifications</td>
<td>(c) are constructed and maintained in a timely and safe manner to the Council's specifications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d) Protect future property owners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Footpath</td>
<td>Footpath</td>
<td>Correction of wording.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>means so much of any road as is laid out or constructed by authority of the Council primarily for pedestrians, and includes the edging but excludes the kerbing and channeling</td>
<td>means so much of any road as is laid out or constructed by authority of the Council primarily for pedestrians, and includes the edging but excludes the kerb and channel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Any removal or relocation of street trees must be done in accordance with the Street and Reserve Trees Policy 2017.</td>
<td>In discussion with the PIU it was noted that there was no reference to the Street and Reserve Trees Policy 2017 advising the public how to proceed with removing or relocating a tree to place a Vehicle Crossing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>The Council will accept responsibility for the ongoing maintenance of that portion of the vehicle crossing that crosses a footpath, after the maintenance period as detailed in the vehicle crossing permit has expired.</td>
<td>The Council will accept responsibility for the ongoing maintenance of that portion of the vehicle crossing that crosses a footpath, after the 12 month maintenance period as detailed in the vehicle crossing permit has expired.</td>
<td>The Roading Department wish to clarify the maintenance period within the Vehicle Crossing Bylaw.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.9 The landowner will be responsible for the maintenance of all other portions of the vehicle crossing. However where the Council are replacing the kerb and channel for asset renewal, it will be replaced at no cost to the landowner whose land is accessed.

3.6 Any person who causes damage to the road reserve (including footpaths and berms) by not using the designated vehicle crossing commits an offence against this bylaw.

4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

4.1. The Council can either adopt the recommendations as proposed, decline to adopt them or refer the matter back to the Hearings Panel to consider changes to the proposal.

4.2. If the Bylaw is not amended within the statutory time (5 June 2019), it will lapse and the whole process of establishing a new bylaw would have to be undertaken.

4.3. Adopting the proposed Vehicle Crossing Bylaw 2019 is the recommended option as the Bylaw provides a means to ensure that vehicle crossings can be controlled in an effective manner. The proposed minor amendments to the Bylaw will make it more robust and align with best practice.

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

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. Groups and Organisations

All vehicle crossing permit applicants (applications received in the last 2 years) have received an email or letter advising them of the review including a copy of the Statement of Proposal offering them the opportunity to submit and be heard. No submissions were received.

5.2. Wider Community

5.3. Views of the community have been sought through public consultation in accordance with the Local Government Act 2002, using the Special Consultative Procedure. The public were notified of this proposal through a public notice in the Northern Outlook, and information on the Council’s website. A quarter page advertisement was also included in the Northern Outlook during the consultation period. Copies of the proposed revised bylaw and statement of proposal were also available at service centres, libraries and our website.
6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**

The costs associated with preparation and adoption of the bylaw are mostly internal. External costs can be covered in existing budgets.

The on-going costs for the administration of this bylaw are covered in existing Roading budgets.

6.2. **Community Implications**

The Bylaw provides clarity around responsibilities for the safe operation and maintenance of access to properties. The consultation period allowed the public to express any views or possible implications.

6.3. **Risk Management**

The reviewed Bylaw will decrease the risk of non-compliant behaviour because it is clearer and more applicable to today’s practices.

6.4. **Health and Safety**

The Bylaw will ensure safe and appropriate controls are in place for access to properties and that safe operation of access is maintained.

7. **CONTEXT**

7.1. **Policy**

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

7.2. **Legislation** *(Local Government Act 2002 Section 145 & Section 159)*

*Section 145 of the Local Government Act 2002* empowers the Council to make a bylaw for its district to manage, regulate against, or protect from, damage, misuse, or loss, or for preventing the use of, the land, structures, or infrastructure associated with (vi) reserves, recreation grounds, or other land under the control of the territorial authority.

*Section 159 of the Local Government Act 2002* states that this bylaw must be reviewed every 10 years.

7.3. **Community Outcomes**

*There is a safe environment for all*

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

7.4. **Delegations**

A Bylaw may only be adopted by the Council. There is no appropriate delegation to a committee or committees.
VEHICLE CROSSING BYLAW 2007

OBJECTIVE
To ensure that vehicle crossings (entranceways) provide safe and convenient access to property, allowing for other traffic and pedestrians, allowing for good drainage without damaging the roading asset, and are constructed and maintained in a timely and safe manner to the Council’s specifications.

Adopted at a Council meeting held on 5 June 2007

Mayor
Administration Manager

June 2007
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT VEHICLE CROSSING BYLAW 2007

In pursuance of the powers vested in it by the Local Government Act 2002, the Waimakariri District Council makes this Bylaw.

1 TITLE AND COMMENCEMENT

1.1 This Bylaw may be cited as the Waimakariri District Vehicle Crossing Bylaw 2007.

1.2 This Bylaw shall come into force on 6th June 2007.

2 DEFINITIONS

2.1 Vehicle Crossing means the area within public road or other public land from a road carriageway to a property boundary intended for use by vehicles accessing the property.

2.2 Vehicle crossing permit means the written approval issued by the council detailing the standards and conditions that are required to install the vehicle Crossing.

2.3 Significant Building means any building; or any other structure with a floor area to, or greater than, 10 m² (ten square metres) that requires a building consent under the Building Act 2004; or that requires the use of more than 3 m³ (three cubic metres) of concrete.

2.4 Footpath means so much of any road as is laid out or constructed by authority of the Council primarily for pedestrians, and includes the edging but excludes the kerbing and chanelling.

2.5 Berm means a grassed, soil or metal area between the road carriageway and the property boundary, and includes road verges in rural areas.

2.6 The Council means the Waimakariri District Council.

2.7 Bylaw means this bylaw as altered, varied or amended from time to time.

2.8 Words implying the singular include the plural and vice versa.

3 VEHICLE CROSSINGS

3.1 All properties for which it is anticipated that vehicle access will occur directly from the roadway will require a vehicle crossing.

3.2 Where an application is made to construct a significant building, then an application for a vehicle crossing permit must be made before the vehicles begin to access the property, unless a complying vehicle crossing already exists.

3.3 Where an application for a vehicle crossing permit must be made, it shall be made using the standard Council application form and shall include all necessary details as requested.
3.4 The Council may from time to time set either deposits or inspection fees to be paid. These must be paid at time of application for a vehicle crossing permit.

3.5 Except for emergency services vehicle access, vehicles must not access the property until the vehicle crossing permit has been approved by the Council, and then only in a manner approved by the vehicle crossing permit.

3.6 The vehicle crossing must be installed to the standards and conditions as detailed in the vehicle crossing permit, and all costs shall be borne by the landowner whose land is accessed via the vehicle crossing.

3.7 The Council will accept responsibility for the ongoing maintenance of that portion of the vehicle crossing that crosses a footpath, after the maintenance period as detailed in the vehicle crossing permit has expired.

3.8 The landowner will be responsible for the maintenance of all other portions of the vehicle crossing. However where the Council are replacing the kerb and channel for asset renewal purposes, it will be replaced at no cost to the landowner whose land is accessed.

3.9 Notwithstanding clause 3.1, existing properties that do not have a vehicle crossing do not require one to be installed unless Council determines there is a traffic or pedestrian safety issue, or there is impediment to good drainage, or damage to the roadway is likely.

3.10 Existing vehicle crossings do not require an application for a vehicle crossing permit to be made unless the scale and nature of the use of the crossing is likely to change, or unless landowners are advised by the Council that it determines there is a traffic or pedestrian safety issue, impediment to good drainage, or damage to the roadway is likely. Upon receiving this advice, the vehicle crossing is deemed to be non-complying and is required to be upgraded to current standards by the landowner whose property is accessed by such vehicle crossing.

4 OFFENCES

4.1 Subject to the provisions of 3.9 and 3.10, any person who knowingly operates a vehicle that accesses a property for which a vehicle crossing permit has not been issued, or doesn't use the vehicle crossing for access or accesses the property not in accordance with the vehicle crossing permit, commits an offence against this bylaw, except when access is required by emergency service vehicles.

4.2 Subject to the provisions of 3.9 and 3.10, any landowner or occupier who allows access (other than for emergency service vehicles) on to their property in situations where a vehicle crossing permit has not been issued, or the access is not occurring over a vehicle crossing, or the vehicle crossing is not in accordance with the vehicle crossing permit, commits an offence against this bylaw.

4.3 Any person who applies for a vehicle crossing permit and then starts work and doesn't complete the works in the time noted on the vehicle crossing permit, or doesn't complete the works within 30 days of the Code Compliance Certificate for the building, or doesn't carry out the works in accordance with the standards and conditions on the vehicle crossing permit, or doesn't pay the appropriate fees, commits an offence against this bylaw.
4.4 Any person who begins work on a vehicle crossing without first receiving a vehicle crossing permit from the Council commits an offence against this bylaw.

4.5 Any person who fails to comply with a notice given under Section 335 of the Local Government 2002 commits an offence against this bylaw.

4.6 Any person who causes damage to the road reserve (including footpaths and berms) by not using the designated vehicle crossing commits an offence against this bylaw.

4.7 Any landowner who does not maintain the vehicle crossing to their property to a proper standard commits an offence against this bylaw. A proper standard is defined as a crossing that provides safe and comfortable access to properties, does not impede any stormwater channels or stormwater flow, and is not a hazard to traffic or pedestrians.

5 PENALTIES/REMEDIES

5.1 Any person who commits an offence against this bylaw shall be liable for fines as provided in Section 242 of the Local Government Act 2002.

5.2 The Council may remove or alter any vehicle crossing that has not been constructed in accordance with the standards and conditions of the vehicle crossing permit, and recover the costs of removal or alteration from the person who committed the breach, as provided in Section 163 of the Local Government Act 2002.

5.3 Any person who breaches clause 4.6 above shall be liable to pay the costs of remediying any damage caused in the course of committing the offence, as provided in Section 176 of the Local Government Act 2002.

6 BYLAW TO BE REPEALED

6.1 All bylaws concerning vehicle crossings in force made by the Council or its predecessors are hereby repealed, provided that this repeal shall not affect the past operation of any such repealed bylaws, or the validity or invalidity of anything done or suffered, or any right required, or duty or liability incurred under those bylaws.

The resolution to review this Bylaw was passed by the Waimakariri District Council's Utilities & Roading Committee held on the 20 February 2007, which was confirmed at a subsequent meeting of the Council held on the 6th day of June 2007.
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Waimakariri District Draft Vehicle Crossing Bylaw 2019

1 General

1.1 Introduction

1.1.1 This Bylaw may be cited as the Waimakariri District Vehicle Crossing Bylaw 2019.

1.1.2 This Bylaw supersedes the Waimakariri District Vehicle Crossing Bylaw 2007 and comes into force on 4th June 2019.

1.1.3 This Bylaw is made by the Waimakariri District Council in exercise of the powers and authority vested in the Council by section 145 of the Local Government Act 2002.

1.1.4 Before making this Bylaw, Council was satisfied that those matters listed in section 147A(3) of the Local Government Act 2002 apply.

1.2 Objectives

The objective of the Bylaw is to ensure that vehicle crossings (entranceways) provide safe and convenient access to property:

(a) allowing for other traffic and pedestrians.
(b) allowing for good drainage without damaging the roading asset.
(c) are constructed and maintained in a timely and safe manner to the Council’s specifications
(d) Protect future property owners

1.3 Definitions

For the purposes of this Bylaw the following definitions shall apply:

Berm has the meaning a grassed, soil or metal area between the road carriageway and the property boundary, and includes road verges in rural areas.

Bylaw means this bylaw as altered, varied or amended from time to time.

Council means the Waimakariri District Council.

Footpath means so much of any road as is laid out or constructed by authority of the Council primarily for pedestrians, and includes the edging but excludes the kerb and channel

Significant Building means any building; or any other structure with a floor area to, or greater than, 10 m2 (ten square metres) that requires a building consent under the Building Act 2004; or that requires the use of more than 3 m3 (three cubic metres) of concrete.

Vehicle Crossing means the area within public road or other public land from a road carriageway to a property boundary intended for use by vehicles accessing the property.

Vehicle Crossing Permit means the written approval issued by the council detailing the standards and conditions that are required to install the Vehicle Crossing.
Words implying the singular include the plural and vice versa.

2 Vehicle Crossings

2.1 All properties for which it is anticipated that vehicle access will occur directly from the roadway will require a vehicle crossing.

2.2 Where an application is made to construct a significant building, then an application for a vehicle crossing permit must be made before the vehicles begin to access the property, unless a complying vehicle crossing already exists.

2.3 Where an application for a vehicle crossing permit must be made, it shall be made using the standard Council application form and shall include all necessary details as requested.

2.4 The Council may from time to time set either deposits or inspection fees to be paid. These must be paid at time of application for a vehicle crossing permit.

2.5 Except for emergency services vehicle access, vehicles must not access the property until the vehicle crossing permit has been approved by the Council, and then only in a manner approved by the vehicle crossing permit.

2.6 The vehicle crossing must be installed to the standards and conditions as detailed in the vehicle crossing permit, and all costs shall be borne by the landowner whose land is accessed via the vehicle crossing.

2.7 Any removal or relocation of street trees must be done in accordance with the Street and Reserve Trees Policy 2017.

2.8 The Council will accept responsibility for the ongoing maintenance of that portion of the vehicle crossing that crosses a footpath, after the 12 month maintenance period as detailed in the vehicle crossing permit has expired.

2.9 The landowner will be responsible for the maintenance of all other portions of the vehicle crossing. However where the Council are replacing the kerb and channel for asset renewal purposes or upgrading footpaths, Council may, at its discretion replace the vehicle crossing at no cost to the landowner whose land is accessed.

2.10 Notwithstanding clause 2.1, existing properties that do not have a vehicle crossing do not require one to be installed unless Council determines there is a traffic or pedestrian safety issue, or there is impediment to good drainage, or damage to the roadway is likely.
2.11 Existing vehicle crossings do not require an application for a vehicle crossing permit to be made unless the scale and nature of the use of the crossing is likely to change, or unless landowners are advised by the Council that it determines there is a traffic or pedestrian safety issue, impediment to good drainage, or damage to the roadway is likely. Upon receiving this advice, the vehicle crossing is deemed to be non-complying and is required to be upgraded to current standards by the landowner whose property is accessed by such vehicle crossing.

3 Offences

3.1 Subject to the provisions of 2.10 and 2.11, any person who knowingly operates a vehicle that accesses a property for which a vehicle crossing permit has not been issued, or doesn't use the vehicle crossing for access or accesses the property not in accordance with the vehicle crossing permit, commits an offence against this bylaw, except when access is required by emergency service vehicles.

3.2 Subject to the provisions of 2.10 and 2.11, any landowner or occupier who allows access (other than for emergency service vehicles) on to their property in situations where a vehicle crossing permit has not been issued, or the access is not occurring over a vehicle crossing, or the vehicle crossing is not in accordance with the vehicle crossing permit, commits an offence against this bylaw.

3.3 Any person who applies for a vehicle crossing permit and then starts work and doesn't complete the works in the time noted on the vehicle crossing permit, or doesn't complete the works within 30 days of the Code Compliance Certificate for the building, or doesn't carry out the works in accordance with the standards and conditions on the vehicle crossing permit, or doesn't pay the appropriate fees, commits an offence against this bylaw.

3.4 Any person who begins work on a vehicle crossing without first receiving a vehicle crossing permit from the Council commits an offence against this bylaw.

3.5 Any person who fails to comply with a notice given under Section 335 of the Local Government 2002 commits an offence against this bylaw.

3.6 Any person who causes damage to the road reserve (including footpaths, street furniture, street trees and gardens, berms and drainage) by not using the designated vehicle crossing commits an offence against this bylaw.

3.7 Any landowner who does not maintain the vehicle crossing to their property to a proper standard commits an offence against this bylaw. A proper standard is defined as a crossing that provides safe and comfortable access to properties, does not impede any stormwater channels or stormwater flow, and is not a hazard to traffic or pedestrians.
4 Penalties/Remedies

4.1 Any person who commits an offence against this bylaw shall be liable for fines as provided in Section 242 of the Local Government Act 2002.

4.2 The Council may remove or alter any vehicle crossing that has not been constructed in accordance with the standards and conditions of the vehicle crossing permit, and recover the costs of removal or alteration from the person who committed the breach, as provided in Section 163 of the Local Government Act 2002.

4.3 Any person who breaches clause 3.6 above shall be liable to pay the costs of remedying any damage caused in the course of committing the offence, as provided in Section 176 of the Local Government Act 2002.

5 Bylaw to be Repealed

5.1 All bylaws concerning vehicle crossings in force made by the Council or its predecessors are hereby repealed, provided that this repeal shall not affect the past operation of any such repealed bylaws, or the validity or invalidity of anything done or suffered, or any right required, or duty or liability incurred under those bylaws.

6 Revocation

The following Bylaw is hereby revoked: Vehicle Crossing Bylaw 2007 (June 2007)

7 Review of Bylaw

This Bylaw shall be reviewed by 4th June 2029.

This Bylaw can be reviewed at any other time before that date at the discretion of the Council.
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES OF THE DELIBERATIONS OF THE VEHICLE CROSSING BYLAW HEARING PANEL HELD IN THE WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA, COMMENCING AT 10AM ON TUESDAY 14 MAY 2019

PRESENT
Councillors J Meyer, S Stewart and P Williams

IN ATTENDANCE
J McBride (Roading and Transport Manager), G Maxwell (Policy Technician), A Smith (Governance Coordinator)

A Smith opened the meeting and called for nominations for a Chairperson.

1. APPOINT A HEARING PANEL CHAIRPERSON

Moved Councillor Williams seconded Councillor Stewart

THAT Councillor Meyer be appointed as Chairperson for the Vehicle Crossing Bylaw Hearing Panel.

CARRIED

Councillor Meyer assumed the Chairpersons role at this time.

2. APOLOGIES

There were no apologies.

3. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

There were no conflicts of interest recorded.

4. STAFF REPORT

4.1. Recommendations of Vehicle Crossing Bylaw 2007 Review – Gina Maxwell (Policy Technician) and Joanne McBride (Roading Manager)

J McBride and G Maxwell presented the report to the panel, noting that following the public consultation period which closed on 1 May, no submissions had been received. Vehicle crossings are the legal access from public roads to private properties and it is important that they are constructed to the standards for safety.

Councillor Stewart commented on the explanation from J McBride on the need for having this Bylaw, as there are instances where people don’t necessarily apply, then have a vehicle crossing installed in the wrong place and this can cause issues. The Bylaw is the only mechanism whereby the Council has the legal ability to deal with any instances such as this.

There was discussion on the issue of culverts with vehicle crossings over them and undersized pipes causing some flooding in high rainfall events (Councillor Stewart commented on the 2014 flooding event). Councillor Meyer commented on
the issue at Mandeville and water flow. Councillor Stewart noted the situation in rural areas is quite different to residential and asked what the process is for determining the appropriate size of pipes. J McBride noted two situations, in new subdivisions, vehicle crossing are often approved with the new development and the sizing of the culverts should be done through the resource consent process. This usually applies to the bigger greenfield areas. The second situation is one off vehicle crossing applications, in which the roading staff will work with the drainage modelling team to assess what size the pipes should be.

J McBride explained that if an existing vehicle access requires upgrading then there wouldn’t be the need for a permit because the access is already there. Residents are encouraged to seek advice of the council staff on any vehicle access matters.

There is a $160 fee applicable when applying for a vehicle crossing permit.

Following a question from Councillor Stewart on how often is there complaints under this Bylaw and it was noted that ultimately a matter could get to the Court system to resolve an issue. J McBride said generally if people are made aware of the requirements of the Bylaw, this is usually enough for people to do what is necessary to meet these requirements.

Moved Councillor Stewart seconded Councillor Williams

THAT the Hearing Panel:

(a) Receives report No 190430061339

CARRIED

5. HEARING PANEL DELIBERATIONS

The Hearing Panel agreed with the proposed changes to the current Bylaw as noted in the Staff report 190430061339.

Moved Councillor Williams seconded Councillor Stewart

THAT the Vehicle Crossing Bylaw Review Hearing Panel recommends

THAT the Council

(a) Revokes the Waimakariri District Vehicle Crossing Bylaw 2007

(b) Adopts the Waimakariri District Vehicle Crossing Bylaw 2019 (Trim 190218018229)

CARRIED

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 10.25am.

Confirmed

________________________________________
Chairperson

________________________________________
Date
1. SUMMARY

1.1 This report seeks the adoption of the final Waimakariri Rural Residential Development Strategy. This Strategy provides the framework for the future provision of land zoned for rural residential purposes in the Waimakariri District. It identifies growth locations for rural residential development across the whole Waimakariri District to meet a projected demand of approximately 385 rural residential households over the next 10 years. The final Strategy document is the culmination of technical and expert advice; significant and ongoing engagement with the Council’s District Plan Review and District Development Strategy Technical Advisory Group (TAG) and District Planning and Regulations Committee (DPRC); and community, stakeholder and landowner engagement through a public consultation process and subsequent hearing of submissions. The Rural Residential Development Strategy reflects the recommendations of the hearing panel following panel deliberations, and upon adoption, supersedes the Council’s Rural Residential Development Plan (2010).

Attachments:

i. Waimakariri Rural Residential Development Strategy (amended by decisions - 190510066945)
ii. Summary of Submissions, Officers’ Recommendations and Hearing Panel Recommendations Report (190507064473)

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 190520070416

(b) Adopts the final Waimakariri Rural Residential Development Strategy (190510066945), which supersedes and now revokes the Waimakariri Rural Residential Plan adopted in 2010

(c) Nominates the Portfolio Holder for Communications and District Planning Development to confirm any minor edits to the Waimakariri Rural Residential Development Strategy (final print ready version) as required in conjunction with staff prior to finalising

(d) Circulates a copy of this report to the Community Boards for their information.
3. BACKGROUND

3.1 The Rural Residential Development Strategy (RRDS) provides the framework for the future provision of land zoned for rural residential purposes in the Waimakariri District. It identifies growth locations for rural residential development across the whole District to meet a projected demand of approximately 385 rural residential households over the next 10 years. Once adopted, the RRDS supersedes the Rural Residential Development Plan 2010.

3.2 Rural residential development is the subdivision and use of land (to lots typically sized 2,500m² to 1 hectare) to cater for the needs of those wishing to live within a rural or semi-rural setting, therefore enabling living choices for the people of Waimakariri District. The RRDS will proactively manage the use of rural land for rural residential purposes by enabling ‘clustered’ locations for development and thus also helps to protect the balance of rural land for primary production and rural character purposes.

3.3 It is important the Council carefully plans for the growth of further rural residential development in its role as a planning authority and key service/infrastructure provider, and to ensure it continues to meet the community’s needs. In doing so, known environmental and other constraints and strengths on a location-by-location basis are taken into account, to safeguard people and land. Council must also be consistent with the wider planning framework (e.g. requirements under the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRPS)) within which it operates.

4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

Consultation on the draft RRDS

4.1. Based on expert and technical advice as well as ongoing input from the TAG and DPRC, a draft RRDS was prepared and put out for wide public consultation via the Special Consultative Procedure under the Local Government Act 2002 in March and April 2019. The following consultation and engagement avenues were utilised during this time:

- Adverts, news stories, Council social media and website
- Emails / letters to affected landowners, stakeholders, interested parties
- Drop-in sessions
- Oxford A&P Show
- All Boards and individual meetings with Community Boards

4.2. The draft Strategy proposed three primary areas for further rural residential development (Swannanoa, Oxford and Ashley/Loburn), and two secondary areas (Ohoka and Gressons Road). It was acknowledged the secondary areas generally face greater challenges, particularly in terms of natural hazard constraints.

4.3. The Council received 143 submissions, and 33 submitters spoke to their written feedback at a hearing held on 29-30 April 2019. The hearing panel consisted of Mayor Ayers and Councillors Atkinson and Meyer. The panel then deliberated on all submissions on 6 May and made a number of recommendations to assist in the preparation of the final RRDS. The panel recommendations reflect feedback gained through submissions as well as technical advice and other relevant information. A report summarising the submissions received, officer recommendations and the hearing panel recommendations is attached to this report (190507064473).

Key panel recommendations

4.4. The following key panel recommendations are reflected in the final RRDS:
• Swannanoa is retained in the final RRDS with the existing growth directions north and west as per draft RRDS, reflecting landowner support and avoidance of versatile soils and flooding in these locations.

• Oxford is retained in the final RRDS with the existing growth directions north and southeast as per draft RRDS, reflecting landowner support and avoidance of flood hazards and areas identified for long-term urban growth.

• Ashley/Loburn is retained in final RRDS but with only the growth direction north of Ashley and east of Loburn; the growth directions west of Loburn and east and west of Ashley are removed. This largely reflects key underlying landowner feedback and the remaining growth directions are relatively free from localised flooding (but do impact on land with versatile soils).

• Ohoka is removed from final RRDS, reflecting opposition through submissions as well as technical advice relating to flooding and local drainage issues, and capacity of yet-to-be-developed lots.

• Gressons Rd is retained in final RRDS with existing growth direction south as per draft RRDS, reflecting landowner support and readiness to develop. This area is also relatively free from flooding and avoids community severance over State Highway 1, but does lie within a Silent File area so consultation with Ngāi Tūāhuriri is required.

• Adding any other additional growth areas in the final RRDS that were sought by some submitters (at Rangiora fringes, Woodend fringes, Kaiapoi north, Mandeville, Fernside) is avoided as each of these either triggers one or more preliminary assessment criteria identified in the site identification process ahead of preparing the draft RRDS (these are listed on page 10 of the final RRDS) or were previously excluded from further consideration due to its ‘special circumstances’ status (i.e. Mandeville due to the Mandeville Growth Boundary).

4.5. The panel made a number of recommendations relating to other matters raised in submissions that were outside of the direct scope of the RRDS. These are listed on page 22 of attachment ii (190507064473). These direct, for example, the District Plan process to consider the appropriate future densities of existing and new rural residential zones and seek comment on these through the Notified District Plan process.

Process summary

4.6. The RRDS is the culmination of several process and engagement steps undertaken during 2018 – 2019 (over and above the formal public consultation process outlined in 4.1 to 4.3). In summary these were:

• Reviewing the 2010 Rural Residential Development Plan in light of updating it to apply to the whole of the District.

• Two Inquiry by Design workshops to identify potential rural residential development locations to include in a draft strategy last year – one with staff and some key stakeholders (e.g. ECan) and another with the District Planning and Regulations Committee (DPRC).

• Shortlisting potential locations by applying a set of assessment criteria including requirements for rural residential development under the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRPS) for locations within the Greater Christchurch UDS area.

• A number of briefing sessions with the DPRC to gain their feedback and buy-in for the proposed growth areas, process, planned communications, consultation outcomes and directions for a final Strategy based on hearing panel recommendations.

• Several meetings with the District Plan Review and District Development Strategy Technical Advisory Group (TAG) to gain input into the shortlist of growth locations, specific growth directions proposed for each area, the draft Strategy document and planned consultation, key messages from submissions received, and finally
proposed directions for a final Strategy based on feedback and officer recommendations

- Ongoing close engagement with engineering colleagues to ascertain suitability / serviceability of potential sites throughout the site selection process and drafting of the document
- Endorsement for the final RRDS document from the District Plan Review and District Development Project Control Group (PCG) on 20 May 2019

**Implementation**

4.1. Following adoption of the RRDS, all submitters, key stakeholders including strategic partners, and affected landowners will receive a letter/email advising them of the outcomes of consultation and the directions set in the final document.

4.2. The Waimakariri District Plan Review process is the key vehicle through which the RRDS will be implemented. The Proposed District Plan is intended to be publicly notified from mid-2020. Most likely, the Proposed District Plan will apply a ‘Rural Residential Growth Area Overlay’ (or similar) which indicates that the area is identified for rural residential development and subsequent rezoning. This will be accompanied by District Plan provisions to enable this approach. This work stream will be undertaken as part of the review of the rural / rural lifestyle chapters of the District Plan and the DPRC will continue to be briefed accordingly. Staff may work with key landowners in the growth direction areas confirmed in the RRDS in order to help refine the actual land to which a ‘Rural Residential Growth Area Overlay’ (or similar) will apply.

4.3. Upon notification of the Proposed Waimakariri District Plan, landowners interested in developing their land have the opportunity to submit on the Proposed Waimakariri District Plan, requesting that the land be rezoned rural residential. This approach is commonly used when new District Plans are notified.

4.4. Landowners interested in having their land rezoned will need to provide detailed assessments to support their submission (or as part of a separate private plan change application) that demonstrate their land is suitable for rezoning for rural residential use. These investigations typically address flood hazard; stormwater, water and wastewater servicing; transportation; geotechnical; and soil contamination. District Plan Review decision makers (or in the case of a private plan change application, the decision makers assigned to that private plan change) will then decide, based on the evidence provided, whether the land should be rezoned for rural residential use.

4.5. The pre-application services and the expertise of the Duty Planner offered by Council will have a role in assisting landowners interested in having their land rezoned for rural residential use through the District Plan Review process or otherwise (e.g. private plan change application). Meetings can be requested with staff to help facilitate communication and provide an opportunity to discuss District Plan requirements, processes, and relevant documents required to support a submission to the Notified District Plan to have their land rezoned (e.g. flood hazard, geotechnical reports etc). A Project Advisory Group (PAG) meeting may also be requested by landowners if required. This service draws together key relevant Council staff to review, discuss and provide impartial, and without prejudice advice on development relating to significant land use activities and subdivision proposals and prospective District Plan change requests.

4.6. The Management Team have reviewed this report and support the recommendations.
5. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

5.1. **Groups and Organisations**

Development of the RRDS has occurred with key Council staff. Representatives from Environment Canterbury and Mahaanui Kurataiao Limited (MKT) are members of the TAG.

The views of the Kaitiaki were sought in 14 February 2019 whereby the draft RRDS Strategy was included on the Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga Hui agenda for consideration (arranged via MKT). Feedback was provided on 19 February as follows:

- The Kaitiaki have reservations about further development along / adjacent to the Ashley River / Rakahuri due to risks of flooding which may be exacerbated by climate change.
- The Kaitiaki do not support any further development at Gressons Road due to concerns relating to increased traffic, infrastructure upgrades required, potential adverse effects on waterways within the area, as well as the development encroaching further into a Silent File area.
- The Kaitiaki are generally comfortable with the other proposed locations but are particularly interested in infrastructure / servicing upgrades within the development areas and having input into these upgrades, e.g. stormwater and wastewater management.

Targeted consultation (via key stakeholder letter or otherwise) on the draft Strategy also occurred with the following groups or organisations:

- Strategic partners - Christchurch City Council, Hurunui District Council, Selwyn District Council, New Zealand Transport Agency, and Environment Canterbury
- Ohoka Residents Group
- Community Boards
- Rangiora Airfield
- Christchurch International Airport Ltd
- Department of Conservation
- Infrastructure and service providers - Transpower, telecommunications, Ministry of Education, emergency services

5.2. **Wider Community**

The views of the wider community were sought via the Special Consultative Procedure public consultation period commencing 8 March 2019 until 5 April 2019 (extension granted to 12 April). This period included a number of well-attended evening drop-in sessions. A hearing was held on 29-30 April 2019 at which 33 spoke to their submission in person.

All landowners in the proposed growth areas received a targeted email/letter when consultation on the draft RRDS commenced. These included owners of properties located within the Residential 4A or 4B Zones in Swannanoa, Ohoka (which also included the Residential 3 Zone), Gressons Road, Ashley/Loburn, Oxford North and Southeast, as well as properties located within an 800 metre distance of any point of these Zones (in Oxford, these were limited to those located in surrounding Rural Zone only and not within in the adjoining urban residential zones).

Such letters/email were also sent to all landowners and parties that have expressed an interest in rural residential development. Landowners of Residential 4 zoned properties within the Projected Infrastructure Boundary of the District’s main towns were also contacted as the draft RRDS made references to these areas being ‘up-zoned’ to urban density via the District Plan Review.
The wider public was also reached via adverts, news stories, Council social media and website, and information at the Oxford A&P Show.

6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**

The costs associated with the preparation of the RRDS are being met from within existing budgets for the District Plan Review.

6.2. **Community Implications**

The RRDS provides for future rural residential development for the community and will influence provisions within the proposed District Plan scheduled for notification in mid-2020. It is acknowledged that some interested landowners, particularly within the UDS area, have not had land confirmed within the RRDS. The RRDS signals an intent for the Strategy to be ‘checked’ in 2022, in order to reconcile it against other work including the District Plan Review, if necessary. The quantum of anticipated and/or actual land rezoned for rural residential use as an outcome of the RRDS and the District Plan Review will then be better known and will inform this exercise.

6.3. **Risk Management**

A qualitative approach to managing risks associated with the public consultation phase of the draft RRDS were outlined in the report to Council on 5 March 2019 (190218018241). This included management controls.

Overall, the draft Strategy provided an opportunity for the community and stakeholders to influence future locations for rural residential development. This ultimately assists with risk management in terms of the final document, but also in terms of the level of challenge to the Proposed District Plan (which will take the next step in implementing the Strategy) when notified for submissions in mid-2020.

6.4. **Health and Safety**

There are no health and safety implications associated with the preparation of the RRDS.

7. **CONTEXT**

7.1. **Policy**

This matter is a matter of significance in terms of the Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy in the sense that considerable infrastructure expenditure would follow.

7.2. **Legislation**

Section 75 of the *Resource Management Act 1991* requires District Plans to give effect to any regional policy statement. Section 31 states that the function of a territorial authority includes the establishment of methods to achieve integrated management of the effects of the use, development, or protection of land.

Sections 82 and 83 of the *Local Government Act 2002* set out the principles of consultation to be followed.
The Council through its District Plan is also required to give effect to the CRPS, which sets out a number of requirements in relation to rural residential development.

7.3. **Community Outcomes**

The following community outcomes are particularly relevant to this matter:

- Our rural areas retain their amenity and character.
- Communities in our District are well linked with each other and Christchurch is readily accessible by a range of transport modes.
- The Council takes account of the views across the community including mana whenua.

7.4. **Delegations**

Council has delegated authority to approve the Rural Residential Development Strategy.
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**Foreword from the Mayor**

The Waimakariri District Council is pleased to present the Waimakariri Rural Residential Development Strategy. This document provides an important decision-making framework that drives the future of our rural residential zones and help us review our current Waimakariri District Plan.

People love to live in the Waimakariri District for many reasons. One of those reasons is that we provide so many different living choices. This District offers the very best of town and country. Our rural residential areas in particular are proving to be hugely popular in offering a semi-rural, manageable lifestyle that provides space and a sense of community. Taking a strategic approach to proactively manage rural land for rural residential use by enabling ‘clustered’ locations for development also helps to protect the balance of our rural land for productive and rural character purposes.

Our District continues to grow and the number of households is set to increase solidly over the next 30 years. As part of this growth, we are expecting a demand of about 385 rural residential homes over the next ten years. We already have many great rural residential zones around the District, some historic, some new, from the periphery of Oxford in the west, to Waikuku Beach in the east, and many well established rural residential hubs like Mandeville, Ohoka and Fernside in between.

It is important we carefully and appropriately plan for the growth of further rural residential development in our role as a planning authority and key service/infrastructure provider, and to ensure we continue to meet the community’s needs. In doing so, we need to be mindful of known environmental and other constraints and opportunities on a location-by-location basis, to safeguard our people and land, while taking into account the wider planning framework within which we operate.

With this in mind, this Strategy now enables a number of growth locations for further rural residential development that are considered suitable for rezoning.

This Strategy is underpinned by expert advice, technical information, and importantly, what you have told us you value about our District through a number of forums including your submissions on the draft Rural Residential Development Strategy and through our recent survey of Residential 4 Zones and San Dona Olive Groves households. We are truly thankful for your contribution and feedback to get us to this final strategy and are excited about the future of our rural residential areas.

David Ayers
Mayor of Waimakariri District


**Part 1 - Introduction**

**What is the Rural Residential Development Strategy and Why is it Needed?**

This Strategy provides the framework for the future provision of land zoned for rural residential purposes in the Waimakariri District. The Waimakariri District has experienced sustained growth pressures for some years and this is set to continue with growth projected over the next thirty years. This includes anticipated demand for housing choice in areas providing for rural and rural residential living.

Rural residential development is the subdivision and use of land to cater for the needs of those wishing to live within a rural or semi-rural setting, therefore enabling living choices for the people of Waimakariri District. Rural residential development also efficiently manages the demand for semi-rural living by identifying ‘clustered’ locations for development, which helps to manage the balance of rural land for primary production and rural character purposes. Rural residential development currently occurs in areas zoned ‘Residential 4A’ or ‘Residential 4B’ in the Waimakariri District Plan. It generally involves between one and two households per hectare and some higher density ‘large lot’ residential development consisting of between two and four households per hectare.

This Strategy identifies growth locations for rural residential development across the whole Waimakariri District to meet a projected demand of approximately 385 rural residential households over the next 10 years. It provides a review and update of the Council’s current Rural Residential Development Plan adopted in 2010; however the original plan only focused on rural residential development in the eastern part of the District, which accords with the Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy (UDS) area. Directions identified in this Strategy also have a key role in informing the review of the Waimakariri District Plan.

As with other forms of development, the Council’s role as a planning authority and key service/infrastructure provider for the District...
means it is necessary for it to consider and plan for rural residential development. As part of this, it is necessary to take into account regional planning initiatives and frameworks, as well as issues, strengths and constraints that determine the suitability of particular growth locations. This ensures positive and sound outcomes are achieved for the community. However, this Strategy does not rezone land in its own right. It identifies growth locations that are considered suitable for rezoning and the District Plan Review is then the vehicle for implementation.

This Strategy has now been adopted by Council. It follows community engagement through a public consultation process where Council sough comments on a draft Rural Residential Development Strategy. This final Strategy is based on feedback received through this process and other relevant information including expert advice.

**How has this Strategy been Developed?**

This Strategy has not been developed from scratch. In June 2010, the Council adopted the original Waimakariri Rural Residential Development Plan. By taking into account factors such as rural and rural residential character and amenity, settlement and community, environment, water and wastewater provision, and the transport network, the original Rural Residential Development Plan proposed rural residential growth at a number of locations in the eastern Greater Christchurch area of the District.

The Plan has been a successful vehicle to providing clarity and directions for rural residential development that has occurred following its adoption and as a result, 344 additional lots were generated in Mandeville, Ohoka and southeast Woodend.

Almost ten years on, it is timely to update the 2010 Plan to manage the next 10 years of rural residential development. This updated Rural Residential Development Strategy now applies to the whole Waimakariri District for completion and fair representation of supply, as opposed to the eastern Greater Christchurch area only.

The review was also driven by the Waimakariri District Plan Review. The growth directions determined in this final Rural Residential Development Strategy directly informs relevant chapters of the reviewed District Plan, which is intended to be notified mid-2020.

Existing relevant internal information was drawn on to help assist in understanding community values. As part of the District Plan Review, topic specific issues and options papers were released for public comment in October 2017. Feedback revealed a public desire to concentrate rural residential development around nodes or clusters of existing settlements and to provide smaller lots for rural residential living.

Expert external advice was also sought to provide relevant context and background information necessary to developing this Strategy and the growth directions within it.

In June 2018, Boffa Miskell Ltd completed a Rural Character Assessment for the Waimakariri District, to inform the management of activities and effects within and around the District’s Rural Zone, including the relationship with rural residential activities and small-lot rural development.

In December 2018, QV completed a Rural Subdivision and Lifestyle Property Analysis for the Waimakariri District to inform the demand for and supply of small holding rural lots (4–7.99ha) and rural residential (0.25–2ha) property in the District.

Internal Inquiry by Design workshops were held in late 2018 to identify and refine potential locations for further rural residential development.

In order to better understand how people living in, and/or owning property in, the District’s current Rural Residential Zones (and San Dona Olive Groves area adjacent to Mandeville) view the area they live in, the Council invited all residents living in these areas to complete a survey in December 2018. The objective was to gain insight into property size preferences, character and amenity preferences and property turnover. Around 350 surveys were completed and the findings have informed some of the directions in this document.

The development of this Strategy has been informed and overseen by the Council’s District Planning and Regulation Committee (DPRC), which has responsibility, among other things, for activities relating to planning for growth and development strategies.
A Rural Residential Development Strategy project webpage was developed as an accessible and extensive public portal of material. This contains all background reports and other information and dates relating to the project.

A draft Rural Residential Development Strategy was released for public consultation for one month from March 2019, and a number of drop-in sessions were held during this time. The Council received 143 submissions and a hearing was held at the end of April 2019. The comments received, together with other relevant information and technical advice, have informed this final Strategy.

Figure 1 demonstrates the project development process.

- Strategy inception, scoping, background reports initiation and review existing material
- Locations options workshops and refinement
- Rural Residential and San Dona Residents Survey
- Draft Strategy preparation and early stakeholder engagement
- Draft Strategy consultation including public drop-in sessions
- Hearing and deliberations
- Strategy confirmation and adoption
- Strategy implementation, including informing District Plan Review

Figure 1: Project development process
Figure 2: Existing rural residential zones
**Existing Rural Residential Areas**

At the time of adoption of this Strategy, there were more than fifteen zoned rural residential locations across the District, from Oxford in the west of the District, through to Waikuku Beach in the east of the District, totaling more than 1,200 individual properties (see Figure 2).

Rural residential locations vary greatly in size, from a small cluster of only eight properties north of Loburn, to some 460 addresses at Mandeville, which encompass more than 350 hectares of land.

The 2005 Waimakariri District Plan refers to rural residential development as Residential 4A or 4B Zones. These zones are intended to exhibit the following characteristics:

- Predominant activity is residential;
- Detached dwellings and associated buildings;
- Some limited farming and horticulture;
- Dwelling density is lowest for Residential Zones;
- Dwellings in generous settings;
- Average lot size of 0.25-1.0 hectare;
- Limited number of lots located in a rural environment;
- Rural style roads or accessways;
- Opportunity for a rural outlook from within the zone;
- Few vehicle movements within the zone;
- Access to zones not from arterial roads;
- Community water and/or wastewater schemes; and
- Kerb, channelling and street lighting.

In the interest of maintaining rural character, the District Plan also requires each Rural Residential Zone to have an average lot size to allow for a mix of sizes. The average is 5000m² for Residential 4A Zones and one hectare for Residential 4B Zones. The intent is to simplify rural residential zoning to a single zone and density across the District, in accordance with the CRPS which requires rural residential development in Greater Christchurch to develop at an average density of one to two households per hectare. This will be addressed in the District Plan Review.

Some of the District’s Residential 4A and 4B Zones have extended since being established as rural residential zones under previous County/District Schemes, and/or later following the implementation of the 2010 Rural Residential Development Plan.

Some rural residential zones, such as at Chinnerys Road in Woodend, River Road / Ballarat Road in Rangiora, South Belt in Rangiora (undeveloped), and northwest Kaiapoi, are situated within the Projected Infrastructure Boundary (PIB). The PIB is identified by the CRPS and provides additional urban development capacity for the District’s main towns. The PIB was determined by the Land Use Recovery Plan (LURP) to assist rebuilding and recovery of communities in the Greater Christchurch area. The intent is to ‘up-zone’ these rural residential zones within the PIB to a residential zone so long-term urban growth of these main towns can be accommodated. This will be subject to a separate process through the District Plan Review.

The San Dona subdivision, north of Tram Road at Mandeville, was established in the 1990s, comprising small lots for olive production. Today, San Dona comprises around 115 households, and is similar to rural residential in nature and scale with lot sizes ranging from approximately 1.2 hectares to 2.2 hectares, however it is zoned rural. Rezoning this area to rural residential was considered, but deemed impractical, due to servicing constraints, flooding and access issues.
The existing rural residential zones have a mix of infrastructure including Council maintained and operated wastewater and water reticulations, private water supplies or wells, and collectively run private wastewater schemes. Some households have individual on-site septic tanks and disposal fields. There are also rated drainage areas in parts of the District for stormwater.

Between 2000 and 2018, the Council has issued 465 building consents for new dwellings in a rural residential zone. Figure 3 shows slower housing development in the early 2000s, followed by an upturn from 2012 and a noticeable spike in 2013 (97 new consents). This was a result of displacement effects caused by the Canterbury earthquakes which saw the District become home to many new residents and existing District residents relocating within the District.

There is a current capacity of around 260 lots within the existing rural residential zones that are either vacant or could be subdivided to rural residential zone size. The Waimakariri District requires approximately 385 further rural residential lots/households to meet demand over the ten year life of this Strategy. This figure takes into consideration both data from Statistics New Zealand Population Estimates to determine the historical level of development in existing rural residential areas and the assumption that demand for rural residential properties over the next ten years remains broadly similar to that of the most recent ten years. Current capacity of around 260 lots suggests an additional 120 lots/households could be required to meet this demand. This Strategy identifies locations to meet this need. A general range is adopted for the purpose of this Strategy as the concept of demand is fluid. Demand could be affected by a number of factors including a potential offset in current supply by way of ‘up-zoning’ existing rural residential zones within the PIB to an urban residential zone; introducing a single rural residential zone; and a potential downturn in the creation of small holding lots sizes in the Rural Zone.

Planning Context

This Strategy is set within a wider strategic planning context to ensure that it contributes to coordinated and sustainable development, responds to community needs, and ultimately meets the purpose of the Resource Management Act (RMA) of promoting sustainable management of natural and physical resources.

Where provided for, District Plans are required to adopt an appropriate and comprehensive zoned approach to new rural residential development to manage effects arising from this based on the demands, constraints and opportunities within respective districts. New rural residential development within the Greater Christchurch UDS area (which applies to the eastern part of the Waimakariri District, see Figure 2) must be provided for only in accordance with an adopted rural residential strategy, at a density of 1 to 2 households per hectare, and be located in areas zoned for such development, maintaining and improving the functioning and qualities of the existing urban area.
The CRPS sets out a number of locational and design matters, including that all rural residential subdivision and development must be located so that it can be economically provided with a reticulated sewer and water supply integrated with a publicly owned system, and appropriate stormwater treatment and disposal. Individual property access must be provided to a sealed road, but not directly to a Strategic Road, Arterial Road or State Highway. An Outline Development Plan (ODP) must be prepared which sets out an integrated design for subdivision and land use, and provides for the long-term maintenance of rural residential character. A rural residential development area shall not be regarded as in transition to full urban development. Furthermore, the location and design of any proposed rural residential development shall:

- Avoid noise sensitive activities occurring within the 50 dBA Ldn air noise contour surrounding Christchurch International Airport;
- Not compromise the operational capacity of the Rangiora Airfield;
- Support existing or upgraded community infrastructure and provide good access to emergency services;
- Avoid significant reverse sensitivity effects with adjacent rural activities, including quarrying and agricultural research farms, or strategic infrastructure;
- Avoid significant natural hazard areas;
- Avoid significant adverse ecological effects, and support the protection and enhancement of ecological values;
- Support the protection and enhancement of ancestral land, water sites, wāhi tapu and wāhi taonga of Ngāi Tahu;
- Where adjacent to or in close proximity to an existing urban or rural residential area, be able to be integrated into or consolidated with the existing settlement; and
- Avoid adverse effects on existing surface water quality.

The Greater Christchurch Partnership review of the strategic land use planning framework, Our Space 2018-2048, includes land use and development proposals to ensure sufficient development capacity for housing and business growth across Greater Christchurch to 2048. The Review, required under the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity (NPSUDC), provides for additional growth in urban areas and efficient infrastructure; balances future demands of housing and business growth while still achieving good urban form; identifies locations for housing growth to 2048 and reinforces the role of key centres for retail/office floor space while confirming sufficient industrial land provision. Overall, it provides an allocation of future households in a Greater Christchurch context, with 1,500 to 2,000 additional households provisionally allocated to Waimakariri District over the next ten years.

This allocation includes a portion in a rural residential setting.

The Waimakariri District Council adopted a District Development Strategy (DDS) in July 2018, which provides direction for growth and development over the next 30 years. This document considers the natural environment, growing communities, the rural area and small settlements, connections, the economy and centres, and community spaces and places. In planning for the provision of rural residential development, the DDS confirms the Council will focus on creating new rural residential areas, and directs it to review the 2010 Rural Residential Development Plan. This final Strategy now supersedes the 2010 Plan.

Lastly, the updated Waimakariri District Plan, by way of revised chapters, objectives, policies and rules relating to rural residential development, will become the vehicle to implement growth directions set within this final adopted Rural Residential Development Strategy. The reviewed District Plan is intended to be notified in mid-2020.

**Identifying New Rural Residential Areas**

The growth directions for future rural residential development in Part 2 of this Strategy were informed by examining key environmental, social and infrastructure constraints and opportunities at a District level. Factors considered include the location of any historic and archaeological sites; biodiversity sites and biodiversity values; versatile...
soils; soil drainage; intensive farms; slope of land; irrigation areas; natural hazards including fault lines, liquefaction susceptibility areas, tsunami evacuation areas, flooding risks, overland flow paths, and groundwater levels; and major electricity pylons and other infrastructure assets such as wastewater ponds.

The location of any cultural sites, silent file areas, wāhi tapu and wāhi taonga sites were considered with particular reference to the significance of Ngāi Tahu objectives, issues and policies for natural resources and environments management in the region, as set out in the Mahaanui Iwi Management Plan (IMP).

The constraints and opportunities maps are provided in Appendix 1.

Two internal Inquiry by Design workshops were held to identify potential District-wide locations for future rural residential development, in the context of known environmental constraints and opportunities. Workshops were held with Council staff in August and the Council’s DPRC in October 2018. Proposed locations, including those identified in the 2010 Rural Residential Development Plan but that had not yet been developed, were then considered and shortlisted by assessing them against seven key criteria. Proposed locations were excluded from further consideration if they were:

1. Within high flood hazard areas
2. Within undeveloped areas inside of the existing PIB of the District’s main eastern towns
3. On the direct edges of main towns outside of the Infrastructure Boundary thereby foreclosing more intensive long-term urban development
4. Not connected to existing rural residential nodes or small settlements
5. Not able to economically connect to the network scheme for wastewater
6. Within the Christchurch International Airport noise contour
7. Within areas that would compromise the operational capacity of the Rangiora Airfield.

In additional to these criteria, three suggested areas were excluded from further consideration due to their ‘special circumstances’ status. These include Fernside (within Environment Canterbury’s Ashley River Breakout area therefore subject to flood hazard challenges); Mandeville (a Mandeville Growth Boundary has been in place since 2012 to limit further sprawl, which will be carried over into the Proposed Waimakariri District Plan, in addition to undercurrents / groundwater resurgence, high groundwater levels and overland flows issues); and Tuahiwi (comprises Māori Reserve land with historical agreements that influence ongoing use and development).

Five remaining growth areas were then proposed in a draft Strategy and public comments invited in March/April 2019. Taking into account feedback received together with other relevant technical information, this final Strategy now confirms four areas for future rural residential development. Individual proposed growth directions, based on a location-by-location assessment of local constraints and strengths, are determined and outlined in more detail in Part 2.
Part 2- Directions for Growth

This Rural Residential Development Strategy confirms four areas for growth of rural residential development across the District.

These are:
1. Swannanoa
2. Oxford
3. Ashley / Loburn
4. Gressons Road (north of Woodend)

The following pages provide an overview of each of these areas, including their strengths and constraints relating to further rural residential development, more defined individual directions for growth, and an area map.

A glossary of terms is provided on page 24.
1. **Swannanoa**

Swannanoa is located approximately 14km west of Kaiapoi. The existing Residential 4B Zone was developed in 1995 and comprises 30 lots on approximately 30 hectares. It is bounded by Two Chain Road to the west and Tram Road to the north.

The area is surrounded by Rural Zone lots ranging from 4 hectares to 20 hectares. Swannanoa School is located on Tram Road, immediately east of the rural residential area, and north of Tram Road is the Swannanoa Domain Reserve. It is connected to the Council’s reticulated water supply and wastewater scheme (Eastern District Sewer Scheme) and is not within a rated drainage area.

**Strengths**

Overall, the Swannanoa area enjoys the following strengths relevant to further rural residential development:

- Potential connectivity to reticulated water and wastewater services; existing capacity in both networks
- Close proximity to local school and domain
- Outside of identified active fault lines and not subject to liquefaction risk or coastal hazards
- Not near high voltage transmission lines infrastructure
- No mapped notable/protected trees, vegetation and habitat sites, heritage sites, wāhi tapu sites, wāhi taonga sites or silent file areas nearby
- Good transport connections via Tram Road
- Clear from flood hazard shown in Environment Canterbury’s Ashley River breakout modelling
- Good support for more rural residential development at Swannanoa through submissions on the draft Strategy

**Constraints**

In general, the Swannanoa area faces some environmental and other constraints:

- Council Localised Flood Hazard Modelling shows some low to medium flood hazard, particularly to the south and east
- High groundwater conditions and possible groundwater resurgence issues
- Medium soil drainage
- A local airfield located further to the east
- Versatile soils to south and east that should be protected for productive rural activities
- An intensive poultry farm operating further to the south
- Outside of rated drainage scheme.

**Growth Directions**

Taking into account identified local strengths and constraints, further rural residential development will be enabled to the north and west of the existing Rural Residential Zone, as shown in Figure 4.

These directions largely avoid versatile soils and flood hazard areas more prevalent to the south.

Some key underlying landowners in these directions have signalled their support for rural residential development through the submission process on the draft Strategy.

Appropriate connectivity, particularly to the school, across Tram Road and Two Chain Road will need to be considered in any development proposal.
Figure 4: Swannanoa rural residential growth direction

Figure 5: Swannanoa area aerial map 2016
2. Oxford

Oxford is a town located approximately 33km west of Rangiora, at the base of the foothills. Five rural residential areas (Residential 4A Zone) surround the town to the north, east, southeast, west and southwest comprising a total of 159 lots.

The town has a reticulated water supply (Oxford Urban Water Supply and Oxford Rural No 2 Supply), and a reticulated wastewater network. Oxford has the Oxford Urban and Oxford Rural East rated drainage areas.

As an established town, Oxford is home to many facilities and services including an area school, town hall, library and service centre, parks and reserves, as well as a range of shops in the Oxford town centre. Industrial land is also provided in the southeast of the town.

Strengths

Overall, the Oxford area offers a number of strengths that support further rural residential development:

- Oxford is well served by community and social infrastructure including a library, area school, town hall, sports fields
- Close proximity to retail and services available in the Oxford town centre, and other business activities in the southeastern business area
- Proximity to local employment opportunities available in the established Oxford town
- Extension of rural residential areas will not have a major impact on the character of existing areas, or the town, given the established scale of Oxford
- Medium soil drainage to the south, high to the southeast, east, north and northwest
- Potential connectivity to reticulated wastewater network and drainage rated area
- No mapped notable plants/protected trees, vegetation and habitat sites, heritage sites nearby
- No mapped wāhi tapu site, wāhi taonga sites or silent file areas nearby
- Oxford Road provides good transport network connections
- No issues with liquefaction or coastal hazards
- Clear from flood hazard shown in Environment Canterbury’s Ashley River breakout modelling.

Constraints

The Oxford area also faces some environmental and other constraints:

- Council Localised Flood Hazard Modelling shows some areas of low to medium localised flooding to the east, west and north
- Oxford has some drainage challenges due to the absence of a well-developed stormwater pipe network
- Versatile soils to north and northwest should be protected for productive rural activities
- Some distance from the District’s main eastern towns thus potentially creating a larger community reliant on commuting
- Proximity to identified active fault line
- Some pockets of low soil drainage to the north and northwest
- High voltage transmission lines infrastructure situated to the south
- Some existing capacity in Oxford Rural No 2 water supply; planned upgrades would be required to be brought forward thereafter
- Areas identified for future urban expansion should be avoided.

Growth Directions

In light of these local constraints and opportunities, rural residential development will be enabled to the north and southeast of Oxford, as shown in Figure 6.

These areas largely avoid flood hazard areas particularly prevalent to the southwest and northeast. They also avoid areas directly adjacent to the existing urban Residential Zone of Oxford protected for long-term residential growth and signalled in the Council’s DDS, for example the area to the immediate east of the Residential 2 Zone towards the current Rural Residential Zone. The southern growth direction will create improved urban form by joining two existing but fragmented rural residential zoned areas. Most key underlying landowners in these directions have signalled their
support for rural residential development through the submission process on the draft Strategy. Caution will need to be applied to avoid any potential reverse sensitivity issues that could arise from proximity to the Wastewater Treatment Plant and established business activities on Harewood Road.

Figure 6: Oxford rural residential growth directions

Figure 7: Oxford area aerial map 2017
3. Ashley / Loburn
The Ashley area borders the northern banks of the Ashley River. The Residential 3 Zone village (approximately 16 hectares) comprises 107 lots and the Residential 4B Zone (approximately 43 hectares) area comprises 35 lots. The Loburn Lea Residential 4B Zone area is located north of the Ashley area (approximately 40 hectares) and contains 44 lots. These areas are surrounded by Rural Zone lots.

The Loburn Domain Pavilion and Loburn School are located northwest of Loburn Lea and Ashley School is located in Ashley Village. Rangiora is located on the south banks of the Ashley River and provides a wide range of community facilities, social infrastructure, retail and service offerings, as well as employment opportunities.

The area is not part of a reticulated wastewater network so wastewater disposal currently occurs via on-site septic tanks and disposal fields. The area is serviced by the Hurunui District Water Supply. Loburn Lea is within a rated drainage area while the Ashley area is not.

**Strengths**
Overall, the Ashley / Loburn area offers a number of strengths that support further rural residential development:

- No issues relating to liquefaction or coastal hazards
- Well connected to Rangiora via upgraded Ashley Bridge
- Existing local community hall and very close to Rangiora’s abundant community facilities and social infrastructure
- Close proximity to retail, services and industrial activities available in Rangiora
- Proximity to local employment opportunities available in Rangiora
- No nearby intensive farms
- No nearby mapped protected trees/notable plants, vegetation and habitat sites, heritage sites, wāhi tapu sites, wāhi taonga sites or silent file areas
- Rated drainage area for Loburn Lea area therefore potential to connect to this
- Ability to connect to reticulated wastewater, provided a sufficient number of new lots is planned to make it viable, with existing capacity in the network
- Clear from flood hazard shown in Environment Canterbury’s Ashley River breakout modelling
- Vast support for more rural residential development at Ashley/Loburn through submissions on the draft Strategy.

**Constraints**
The Ashley / Loburn area also faces some environmental and other constraints:

- Under Hurunui District Council water supply which has minimal existing capacity; pipe upgrades would be required once this capacity has been met
- Council Localised Flood Hazard Modelling shows some low to medium flood hazard
- Near an identified active fault line
- Widespread areas of versatile soils that should be protected for productive rural activities
- Low soil drainage
- High voltage transmission lines infrastructure nearby
- No existing rated drainage area for Ashley area.

**Growth Directions**
Taking into account these local constraints and opportunities, rural residential development will be enabled to the east of Loburn Lea and to the north of Ashley village, as shown in Figure 8.

These areas are relatively free from localised flood hazard and some of the underlying lots are large in size and in single ownership, which may make potential development more practicable. However, it is acknowledged that the growth directions do impact on land with versatile soils. Most key underlying landowners in these directions have signalled their support for rural residential development through the submission process on the draft Strategy.
Figure 8: Ashley / Loburn rural residential growth directions

Figure 9: Ashley / Loburn area aerial map 2016

Figure 8: Ashley / Loburn rural residential growth directions
4. Gressons Road

The Gressons Road Residential 4B area comprises approximately 53 hectares and 56 lots. It is located 3km north of Woodend and Pegasus, and 3km west of Waikuku Beach. The area is bounded by State Highway 1 / Main North Road to the east, Gressons Road to the south, and the Waikuku Stream to the north and west.

The area does not contain any community facilities or amenities, however, it is in close proximity to Woodend and Pegasus and their associated community facilities and social infrastructure.

The area is not currently connected to a reticulated wastewater network so wastewater disposal occurs via individual septic tanks. Similarly, the area is not currently connected to a reticulated water supply, which means water is sourced via individual bores. However, given the area’s relatively close proximity to Woodend, Pegasus and Waikuku, connecting to these reticulated networks is possible with sufficient growth. The location is within a rated drainage area.

Strengths

Overall, the Gressons Road area offers a number of strengths that support further rural residential development:

- Close proximity to Woodend and Pegasus which have abundant community facilities and social infrastructure in place
- Close proximity to State Highway 1 providing good transport connections
- Medium soil drainage to the south and east, high soil drainage to the north
- Council Localised Flood Hazard Modelling shows only some small areas of low flood hazard surrounding the existing Residential 4B area. Areas to the south and east of the existing Residential 4B area are clear from medium to high flood hazard under Environment Canterbury’s Ashley River Breakout Flood Modelling.
- Outside of identified active fault lines
- Within a rated drainage area
- No high voltage transmission lines infrastructure nearby
- No nearby mapped notable plants, vegetation and habitat sites or heritage sites.

Constraints

The Gressons Road area also faces some environmental and other constraints:

- Silent File Area SF017 Pekapeka to the south
- Within a Liquefaction Susceptibility Area
- Potential for coastal hazard issues including groundwater level rise associated with sea level rise
- Largely surrounded by versatile soils, except for a small portion to the northeast
- Low soil drainage to the west
- Council Localised Flood Hazard Modelling and Environment Canterbury’s Ashley River Breakout Flood Modelling shows some medium to high flood hazard to the north and northwest of the existing Residential 4B area.

Growth Direction

Taking into account these various constraints and opportunities, further rural residential growth will be enabled to the south of the existing Residential 4B settlement, as shown in Figure 10.

This area is relatively free from localised flood hazard and avoids the potential community severance associated with State Highway 1. It also allows a greater level of integration with the existing settlement via Gressons Road. The key underlying landowner is in support of rural residential development at this site.

It is acknowledged the growth direction is within a Silent File Area indicating the presence of significant wāhi tapu or wāhi taonga somewhere in the area. Therefore, consultation with Ngāi Tūāhuriri is particularly important in order to identify effects of the activity and to avoid, remedy or mitigate those effects. It is also acknowledged that the growth direction does impact land with versatile soils.
Figure 10: Gressons Road rural residential growth direction

Figure 11: Gressons Road area aerial map 2017
Part 3- Making it Happen

Strategy Implementation

The purpose of the Rural Residential Development Strategy is to determine directions for rural residential growth.

The Waimakariri District Plan Review process is the key vehicle through which the Rural Residential Development Strategy will be implemented. The Proposed Waimakariri District Plan, with revised objectives, policies and rules relating to rural residential development, is intended to be publicly notified in mid-2020.

Most likely the Proposed Waimakariri District Plan will apply a ‘Rural Residential Growth Area Overlay’ (or similar) which indicates that the area is identified for rural residential development and subsequent rezoning. This will be accompanied by District Plan provisions to enable this approach. Upon notification of the Proposed Waimakariri District Plan, landowners interested in developing their land have the opportunity to submit on the Proposed Waimakariri District Plan, requesting that the land be rezoned rural residential.

The Rural Residential Development Strategy site selection process involved determination of constraints at a relatively high level. Therefore, landowners interested in having their land rezoned will need to provide more detailed assessments to support their submission (or as part of a separate private plan change application) that demonstrate their land is suitable for rezoning for rural residential use. These investigations typically address flood hazard; stormwater, water and wastewater servicing; transportation; geotechnical; and soil contamination. Council has a regulatory role to review such investigations with a high level of scrutiny. District Plan Review decision makers (or in the case of a private plan change application, the decision makers assigned to that private plan change) will then decide, based on the evidence provided, whether the land should be rezoned for rural residential use.

The design of growth areas and / or individual sites is outside the scope of this draft Strategy. However, the use of sustainable and ‘green’ designs and innovations are encouraged to create sustainable communities and environments.
Monitoring and Review

It is important that the Waimakariri District Council is accountable and committed to the desired outcomes identified in this Strategy. This document has a ten year life from adoption, but will be checked in 2022 in order to reconcile it against other work including the review of the Waimakariri District Plan. The quantum of anticipated and/or actual land rezoned for rural residential use as an outcome of this Strategy and the District Plan Review will then be better known and will inform this exercise.

The Council’s DPRC will have an ongoing role in overseeing the implementation of this Strategy, by way of its responsibility for district development matters and the rezoning of any rural land to rural residential.

Change in household numbers in the rural residential zones will be continually monitored via the Council’s records of building consents for new residential dwellings. In addition, the Council is responsible for producing quarterly reporting on indicators relating to housing and business development capacity under the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity (NPS-UDC) and the associated Our Space 2018-48 regional partnership framework for household allocation.
## Links to Further Information

### Background Reports

This Strategy has been informed by a number of background and technical reports and community surveys. These are available on the Rural Residential Development Strategy project webpage.

[www.waimakariri.govt.nz/ruralresidential](http://www.waimakariri.govt.nz/ruralresidential)

### Waimakariri District Development Strategy (DDS)

The Waimakariri District Development Strategy, which was adopted in 2018, guides the District’s anticipated residential and business growth over the next 30 years.


### Waimakariri District Plan (WDP)

The Waimakariri District Plan manages land use and subdivision activities within the District.


### Land Use Recovery Plan (LURP)

The Land Use Recovery Plan sets out a policy and planning framework necessary for metropolitan greater Christchurch to rebuild existing communities; develop new communities; meet the land use needs of businesses; rebuild and develop the infrastructure needed to support these activities; and take account of natural hazards and environmental constraints that may affect rebuilding and recovery.


### Canterbury Regional Policy Statement 2013 (CRPS)

The Canterbury Regional Policy Statement 2013 provides an overview of the resource management issues in the Canterbury region, and the objectives, policies and methods to achieve integrated management of natural and physical resources. The methods include directions for provisions in district and regional plans.


### National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity 2016 (NPS-UDC)

The NPS-UDC sets out the objectives and policies for providing for development capacity under the Resource management Act 1991.


### Our Space 2018-48, Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update

The Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update was out for consultation in November 2018. It outlines land use and development proposals to ensure there is sufficient development capacity for housing and business growth across Greater Christchurch to 2048.

[greaterchristchurch.org.nz/ourspace](http://greaterchristchurch.org.nz/ourspace)

### Mahaanui Iwi Management Plan (IMP)

The IMP provides a values-based policy framework for the protection and enhancement of Ngāi Tahu values, and for achieving the relationship of Ngāi Tahu with local natural resources.

[www.mkt.co.nz/iwi-management-plan](http://www.mkt.co.nz/iwi-management-plan)
## Glossary of Terms

**Council Localised Flood Hazard Modelling**

Rain on grid flood modelling based on 0.5\% Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP).

**Environment Canterbury Ashley River Breakout Flood Modelling**

Flood modelling undertaken by Environment Canterbury which combines Ashley River breakout and localised flooding. Note, this was modelled on a 1\%, 0.5\% and 0.2\% Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) for the Ashley River Breakout scenarios.

**Intensive Farm Buffer**

Area potentially affected by odour associated with intensive farming activity (poultry, piggery or cattle).

**Wāhi taonga**

Places treasured due to their high intrinsic values and critical role they have in maintaining a balanced and robust ecosystem (e.g. Spawning grounds for fish, nesting areas for birds and freshwater springs).

**Wāhi tapu**

Places of significance that have been imbued with an element of sacredness or restriction (tapu) following a certain event or circumstance.

**Silent File Area**

An area indicating the presence of significant wāhi tapu or wāhi taonga somewhere in the area. Consultation with Ngāi Tūāhuriri is particularly important when considering development within these areas in order to identify effects of the activity and to avoid, remedy or mitigate those effects.

**Versatile Soils**

Land classified as Land Use Capability I or II in the New Zealand Land Resource Inventory. Versatile soils are part of the soil resource that will support the widest range of productive uses with the least inputs.

## Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CRPS</td>
<td>Canterbury Regional Policy Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDS</td>
<td>Waimakariri District Development Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPRC</td>
<td>District Planning and Regulation Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP</td>
<td>Iwi Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LURP</td>
<td>Land Use Recovery Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODP</td>
<td>Outline Development Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIB</td>
<td>Projected Infrastructure Boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPS-UDC</td>
<td>National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMA</td>
<td>Resource Management Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRDP</td>
<td>Rural Residential Development Plan 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEP</td>
<td>Septic tank effluent pump</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDS</td>
<td>Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDP</td>
<td>Waimakariri District Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendices

Appendix 1: Constraints and Opportunities Maps

Ashley River Floodplain

Ashley River Floodplain
Information has been derived from various organisations, including Environment Canterbury and the Canterbury Maps partners. Boundary information is derived under licence from LINZ Digital Cadastral Database (Crown Copyright Reserved). Environment Canterbury and the Canterbury Maps partners do not give and expressly disclaim any warranty as to the accuracy or completeness of the information or its fitness for any purpose.

Information from this map may not be used for the purposes of any legal disputes. The user should independently verify the accuracy of any information before taking any action in reliance upon it.

Disclaimer:
Copyright Environment Canterbury 2019
Map created by Environment Canterbury
Information has been derived from various organisations, including Environment Canterbury and the Canterbury Maps partners. Boundary information is derived under licence from LINZ Digital Cadastral Database (Crown Copyright Reserved). Environment Canterbury and the Canterbury Maps partners do not give and expressly disclaim any warranty as to the accuracy or completeness of the information or its fitness for any purpose.

Information from this map may not be used for the purposes of any legal disputes. The user should independently verify the accuracy of any information before taking any action in reliance upon it.

Disclaimer:

Copyright Environment Canterbury 2019

Map created by Environment Canterbury

Legend note: if you have a large number of layers on the map, they may not all be visible in the legend.
Swannanoa Soil Drainage (1 = lowest to 5 = highest)

Oxford Soil Drainage (1 = lowest to 5 = highest)

Ashley Loburn Soil Drainage (1 = lowest to 5 = highest)

Gressons Road Soil Drainage (1 = lowest to 5 = highest)
Legend

- Waimakariri District Boundary
- Wastewater Serviced Area
- Council Gravity Wastewater System
- Council Low Pressure System
- Council STEP System
- Private STEP System

DISCLAIMER

Boundary information is derived under licence from LINZ Digital Cadastral Database (Crown Copyright Reserved).
The Waimakariri District Council does not give and expressly disclaims any warranty as to the accuracy or completeness of the information or its fitness for any purpose. Information on this map may not be used for the purposes of any legal disputes. The user should independently verify the accuracy of any information before taking any action in reliance upon it.

Land and property information is based on/includes LINZ's data which is licensed by Land Information New Zealand (LINZ) for re-use under the Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 New Zealand licence.
Legend

- Waimakariri District Boundary
- Drainage Rated Area Boundary
- Urban Drainage Rated Property
- Rural Drainage Rated Property

DISCLAIMER
Boundary information is derived under licence from the LINZ Digital Cadastral Database (Crown Copyright Reserved). The Waimakariri District Council does not give and expressly disclaims any warranty as to the accuracy or completeness of the information or its fitness for any purpose. Information on this map may not be used for the purposes of any legal disputes. The user should independently verify the accuracy of any information before taking any action in reliance upon it.

Land and property information is based on/includes LINZ’s data which is licensed by Land Information New Zealand (LINZ) for re-use under the Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 New Zealand licence.
Green shaded circles indicate the presence of significant wāhi tapu or wāhi taonga somewhere in the area. Therefore, consultation with Ngāi Tūāhuriri is particularly important in order to identify effects of the activity and to avoid, remedy or mitigate those effects.

Blue shaded areas indicate land classified as land use capability I or II in the New Zealand Land Resource Inventory.
Target sub regions in the Central Canterbury Plains and Christchurch area where gravel sediments are the most likely to be geologically suitable for aggregate and the groundwater table is generally more than 6m below the ground surface.
Appendix 2: High Level Servicing and Flood Hazard Assessments

The following is a summary of the high level servicing capacity and flood hazard assessments provided by the Council’s 3 Waters Unit to inform the Rural Residential Development Strategy site selection process. The primary purpose of these assessments was to identify any areas with significant flaws with respect to infrastructure services and flood hazard. This was done by considering the capacity of existing infrastructure to service a hypothetical 50 lot and 100 lot rural residential density development, including some comment regarding flood hazard risks.

The Following Points were also Considered:

• Planned infrastructure upgrades;
• Key assumptions;
• Development Contributions;
• Critical mass (e.g. 50 lots or 100 lots would make the surrounding area connecting to reticulated wastewater feasible); and
• Any other matters relevant in identifying the high level flaws or opportunities for an area.

Key Assumptions were:

• Water supplied will only be a restricted supply, and that wastewater connections would be pressure systems, which require homeowners to install a small tank and pump system on their property
• Standard Council policy with respect to management of flood risk applies, including that any development is required to mitigate the effects of increased runoff, with on-site works to retain and treat runoff
• The time span for the assessments is 10-15 years to match the life of the reviewed Waimakariri District Plan which is anticipated to be operative around 2022. Therefore, its next review, 10 years later, would be in 2032
• Development Contributions are calculated from the published Development Contributions for the 2018/2019 year. It is noted these Development Contributions are subject to change as part of the 2019/2020 Annual Plan, which is currently being finalised and includes updated 2019/2020 Development Contributions. Development Contributions are not applicable for drainage as developers are required to carry out any works necessary to mitigate the effects of increased runoff.

The Areas Assessed were:

• Swannanoa
• Ashley / Loburn
• Oxford
• Ohoka
• Gressons Road
• Mandeville
• Sefton
• West Eyreton
• Cust
• Woodend

However, the following summary only covers the assessment undertaken for the four growth areas confirmed in this Strategy. The First Cut Criteria Assessment which outlines why a number of other areas were excluded can be found on the project webpage waimakariri.govt.nz/ruralresidential.

Swannanoa

Water supply – The current water supply network has capacity to accommodate the hypothetical 50 and 100 additional lots. Upgrades are needed to meet Council’s capacity standard and a new well is planned for 2024/2025 to address this. Additional storage will be required, which is planned for within the Long Term Plan. Depending on the location of a new development, additional reticulation may be required, at the developers cost. Refer to Table 1 for costs associated with connecting to the reticulated network.

Wastewater - The reticulated wastewater network delivers wastewater to the Rangiora treatment plant (Eastern District Sewer Scheme) and has capacity to accommodate the hypothetical 50 and 100 lots. There would likely be a need for new local reticulation, at the developers cost. Refer to Table 1 for costs associated with connecting to the reticulated network.
Drainage and flood hazard - Swannanoa is outside any rated drainage scheme. It is part of a wider area that suffers from high groundwater and drainage problems during storm events. While good drainage is available when groundwater levels are low, soak pits cannot be relied upon to manage stormwater for any new developments and secondary flow paths would need to be considered. Any stormwater management capital works that were put in by the developer, would need to be maintained, so a new drainage scheme rated area may need to be set up, or the nearby Ohoka rated drainage area extended. Any proposed development should avoid any significant overland flow paths shown on Council’s Localised Flood Hazard Modelling for the 0.5% Annual Exceedance Probability event.

Ashley / Loburn

Water supply - The water supply network to the north of the Ashley River supplies both Waimakariri District and Hurunui District residents and is managed by Hurunui District Council. The existing reticulation would only be able to support 50 new lots, with a pipe upgrade required to service more than this. A new hydraulic model is being developed which will allow for more accurate assessments of the network capacity. The primary source for the southern end of this network is located adjacent to the northern side of the Ashley River in the vicinity of Beatties Road. Recent source upgrades to the northern end of the network has meant that there is adequate source supply for some growth at the southern end of the network, although it should be noted that the supply does not currently fully meet the New Zealand Drinking Water Standards. Refer to Table 1 for costs associated with connecting to the reticulated network.

Wastewater – The area could connect to the Eastern District Sewer Scheme, which has capacity, via the Rangiora reticulated wastewater network. Refer to Table 1 for costs associated with connecting to the reticulated network. If Loburn and Ashley residents also connected, the cost per lot would come down.

Drainage and flood hazard - There is no drainage rated area in this area. A drainage rated area would need to be set up to maintain any flood mitigation works built during any development. Any development would be required to mitigate stormwater effects. Flooding has occurred around Cones Road, Fawcetts Road and Max Wallace Drive, and minor overland flow has occurred south of Carrs Road. Any proposed zoned areas for rural residential should avoid any significant overland flow paths shown on Council’s Localised Flood Hazard Modelling for the 0.5% Annual Exceedance Probability event.

Oxford

Water supply – It is assumed that any development would be connected to the Oxford Rural No. 2 network. The current network could service an additional 50 lots however any more than this would necessitate bringing forward construction of the new reservoir, which is currently planned and budgeted for 2025/2026. Refer to Table 1 for costs associated with connecting to the reticulated network.

Wastewater – The current Oxford reticulated wastewater network has capacity to accommodate the hypothetical 50 and 100 lots. Depending on the location, and assuming the new development was a pumped pressure scheme, it is likely that any new development would be able to discharge into this scheme. Refer to Table 1 for costs associated with connecting to the reticulated network.

Drainage and flood hazard - Oxford has some drainage challenges due to the absence of a well-developed stormwater pipe network. However any new development would be required to mitigate its stormwater effects, and extend the drainage rated area to include it. Any proposed zoned areas for rural residential should avoid any significant overland flow paths shown on Council’s Localised Flood Hazard Modelling for the 0.5% Annual Exceedance Probability event.

Gressons Road

Water supply - The area is not connected to a reticulated water supply, with water currently sourced from individual bores. However, if there was sufficient growth to require it and make it viable, the area could connect to either the
Pegasus or Waikuku schemes which have capacity for the 50 to 100 hypothetical lots. Refer to Table 1 for costs associated with connecting to the reticulated network.

**Wastewater** – The area is not currently connected to a reticulated wastewater network so wastewater disposal is via individual septic tanks and disposal fields. However, if there was sufficient growth to require it and make it viable, the area could connect to the Eastern District Sewer Scheme, which has capacity for the 50 to 100 hypothetical lots (via either the Pegasus or Waikuku reticulated wastewater networks). Refer to Table 1 for costs associated with connecting to the reticulated network.

**Drainage and flood hazard** – The area is within a rated drainage area. The area is subject to some medium to high flood hazard to the north and north-west of the existing Residential 4B area. It should be noted the area could also be subject to coastal influences on groundwater associated with sea level rise. Any new development should avoid any significant overland flow paths shown on Council’s Localised Flood Hazard Modelling for the 0.5% Annual Exceedance Probability event.

### Table 1: Anticipated Development Contributions and other additional servicing costs per lot based on a hypothetical 100 lot rural residential development

*Note: Development Contributions provided are based on the 2018/2019 Development Contributions which are subject to change as part of the 2019/2020 Annual Plan, which is currently being finalised and includes updated 2019/2020 Development Contributions.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Water Development Contributions per lot</th>
<th>Water additional costs per lot</th>
<th>Wastewater Development Contributions per lot</th>
<th>Wastewater additional costs per lot</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Swannanoa</td>
<td>$2,852</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$18,598</td>
<td>$16,000 for onsite reticulation, pump and chamber</td>
<td>$37,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley / Loburn</td>
<td>$3,970</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$5,434</td>
<td>$16,000 for onsite reticulation, pump and chamber $8,000 for wastewater network connection works</td>
<td>$33,404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>$13,390</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$2,054</td>
<td>$16,000 for onsite reticulation, pump and chamber</td>
<td>$31,444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikuku</td>
<td>$4,136</td>
<td>$15,000 for water network connection works</td>
<td>$5,434</td>
<td>$15,000 for wastewater network connection works $16,000 for onsite reticulation, pump and chamber</td>
<td>$55,570</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Introduction and Purpose
The draft Rural Residential Development Strategy (RRDS) provides a framework for the future provision of land zone for rural residential purposes in the Waimakariri District. It updates the current Rural Residential Development Plan adopted by the Waimakariri District Council in 2010.

The purpose of this report is to:

- summarise the comments made in submissions received during the formal public consultation period for the draft RRDS in order to assist the Council’s hearing panel in understanding the overall key trends emerging from all submissions;
- provide recommendations to the hearing panel to inform their deliberations in relation to the draft RRDS following the hearing held in late April 2019; and
- record the hearing panel recommendations made at their meeting on 6 May 2019.

This report utilises the Summary of Submissions report (dated April 2019) and the Officer Recommendations report (dated May 2019), and adds the hearing panel recommendations in response.

Background
The draft Strategy was released for public comment for four weeks (plus an informal extension for another week) starting 8 March 2019. Several engagement tools were utilised during this period including:

- Dedicated project webpage on Council’s website: waimakariri.govt.nz/ruralresidential, which contained an overview of the project and background reports
- Council’s ‘Let’s Talk’ consultation webpage which set out the consultation process, allowed online submissions to be made, and included links to the full and summary strategy document
- Let’s Talk adverts
- News stories
- Council social media
- Emails and letters sent to affected landowners, stakeholders and interested parties
- Five drop-in sessions (5-7pm) at Loburn, Ohoka, Oxford, Woodend, and Rangiora during the consultation period
- Project information and panel at the Council stand at the Oxford A&P Show
- Presented at the All Boards meeting and individual meetings held with the four District Community Boards
- Hard copies of the full and summary strategy available at all Council Service Centres and libraries

The Council received 143 submissions during the formal consultation period. Submissions were accepted in hard copy (i.e. letter or feedback form) and electronically via the online feedback form or email.

A hearing for those who wished to speak to their written submission was held on 29 and 30 April 2019 and the hearing panel consisted of Mayor Ayers (Chair) and Councillors Atkinson and Meyer. Hearing panel deliberations occurred in May 2019, at which the hearing panel made recommendations for a revised Strategy based on comments received and any further information. These are now inserted in this document.
A revised Waimakariri Rural Residential Development Strategy will be presented to Council for adoption in mid-2019. The Waimakariri District Plan Review process will then be the key vehicle through which the final Waimakariri Rural Residential Development Strategy will be implemented.

**Key Feedback and Recommendations**

Feedback provided in the 143 submissions received was varied. The following pages provide a discussion of comments made against the five areas proposed for further rural residential growth in the draft Rural Residential Development Strategy, as well as outline other areas sought by submitters for rural residential development, and any other relevant comments made that sit within the scope of this Strategy. Each section then provides officer recommendations to the hearing panel to assist in decision making.

Proposed growth areas were identified through a series of Inquiry by Design workshops and then assessed against seven key criteria. Examining key environmental, social and infrastructure constraints and opportunities then informed the particular growth directions proposed within the shortlisted areas including in the draft Strategy. The methodology is further outlined on page 11 of the draft Strategy (“Identifying New Rural Residential Areas”), and the outcomes of the Preliminary Criteria Assessment exercise is available on the project webpage.

The draft Strategy’s five proposed areas for rural residential growth, around which this summary is organised, are:

**Primary Growth Areas**

1. Swannanoa
2. Oxford
3. Ashley / Loburn

**Secondary Growth Areas**

4. Ohoka
5. Gressons Road (north of Woodend)

Primary areas represent preferred development locations due to a number of advantageous factors outlined in the draft Strategy. The secondary areas for potential rural residential growth generally face greater challenges, particularly in terms of natural hazard constraints. While acknowledging such constraints, the Council’s District Planning and Regulation Committee (DPRC) wished to test the secondary growth areas through a public consultation process.

It is possible that a final Strategy, based on community feedback and other updated expert information, does not include all of these areas.

It should be noted that feedback discussed in this document summarises the views of submitters only; they are not the views of the Council. Each proposed growth area stipulated in the draft Strategy is discussed in turn, starting with a reminder of and rationale for the proposed growth directions (arrows), followed by a summary of submitters’ feedback relating to each area. Officer recommendations are then inserted based on submissions received and internal staff discussions.
Overall, the key messages from submissions are:

- The Ashley/Loburn proposed growth area is the most frequently commented on by submitters and received the greatest support for expansion of rural residential development. More than one third of all submitters commented on Ashley/Loburn and around three in four of these want to see further development here. However, the perceived limited capacity of the Hurunui Water Scheme is a concern among some.

- Expanding Ohoka received the greatest opposition (by proposed growth area) from submitters due to local drainage and flooding issues as well as concern over changes to the small village character. The key landowner of the proposed growth direction is in support.

- There is good support for more rural residential development at Swannanoa. Some alternative directions are also proposed including land to the east of the Swannanoa School, north, and west of Two Chain Road.

- Support and opposition to further rural residential development at Oxford is largely equal. Generally there is less support for the northern proposed growth direction, than the southeast. Some alternative growth directions are proposed.

- Gressons Road proposed growth direction received the fewest specific comments through submissions and there is a little more opposition for this area than support. The key landowner of the proposed growth direction to the south is in support.

- Around a quarter of all submitters propose other areas more suitable for rural residential development, including various locations around Mandeville (including San Dona Olive Grove area), on the outskirts of Rangiora including in proximity to Lehmans Road, Fernside, locations close to Woodend, Island Road, around small settlements, and adjacent to the existing urban edge of large centres. It is also suggested that Council allow dwellings to be constructed on historic rural titles that are smaller than the minimum lot size, and subdivide existing 4ha rural lots.

Swannanoa
Taking into account identified local strengths and constraints, the draft Strategy proposes further rural residential development to the north and west of the existing Rural Residential Zone, as shown in figure 1. These directions were identified because they largely avoid versatile soils and flood hazard areas more prevalent to the south. The draft Strategy acknowledges that appropriate connectivity, particularly to the school, across Tram Road and Two Chain Road would need to be considered in any development proposal.
Fourty-four submitters provided comments relevant to Swannanoa as a proposed location for further rural residential development. Around 24 individual submitters support proposals to extend Swannanoa through further rural residential development. Another 13 oppose further rural residential development at Swannanoa.

Among those who support further rural residential development at Swannanoa, growth is considered beneficial to support the local school and established social and community infrastructure. The avoidance of versatile soils is applauded, and some landowners are keenly interested in subdividing their properties to meet rural residential densities. A cluster of such submitters, for example, reside in the land west of Two Chain Road and north of Tram Road.

Some alternative / additional growth directions in and around Swannanoa are suggested by some submitters:

- To east of existing rural residential zone, along from the school – safer for school children not needing to cross Tram Road; could serve to expand school for community space or additional parking; infrastructure in place; avoids further traffic congestion and parking issues; provides connectivity to Mandeville. Landowner is in support and provided flood hazard assessment which stipulates flow paths cannot be obstructed but can be designed around; and traffic assessment. School in support of eastern growth direction.
- Further west of Two Chain Road to include 1419 and 1401 Tram Road
- To the north
- Block of land bounded by Tram Road, Two Chain Road, North Eyre Road and No 10 Road

There are various reasons provided by submitters who oppose further rural residential development at Swannanoa. These include that Swannanoa is an undesirable location lacking key amenities; is too
flood prone with a high water table and existing flooding needs to be addressed in the first instance; and that there is ample supply of rural residential lots and instead, currently zoned properties could be further subdivided. Others suggest that further growth would render the settlement undesirable by locals who moved to Swannanoa to experience a quiet rural lifestyle; create traffic congestion; and result in a dissected community (if growth develops to the north of Tram Road). The potential for reverse sensitivity must also be avoided when considering growth directions.

**Officer Recommendation**

- Retain Swannanoa as growth area for further rural residential development
- Retain the original growth directions to the north and west as per draft RRDS, acknowledging: 1) landowners’ support for rural residential development in these directions, 2) submitters’ general support for further growth at Swannanoa, and 3) the avoidance of versatile soils and flood hazards in these areas
- Avoid adding a new growth direction to the east or south of the existing rural residential zone as sought by submitters due to flooding / overland flow path implications and overall capacity in the sewer scheme which would not be able to accommodate all of these growth directions
- Avoid adding a new growth direction further to the northwest of the existing rural residential zone (west of Two Chain Road, north of Tram Road as sought by some submitters) due to resulting disjointed urban form outcomes

**Changes required to RRDS**

- None identified
Panel Recommendation

The panel noted the overall positive support from submitters for further rural residential growth at Swannanoa and accepted the officer recommendation that Swannanoa is retained as a rural residential growth area in the final RRDS.

The panel acknowledged that the northern and western growth directions identified and tested through the draft RRDS have the benefit of avoiding versatile soils (which should be protected for productive primary activities) and flood hazard areas more prevalent to the south and partly to the east.

In light of the above, the panel accepted the officer recommendation that the original growth directions to the north and west identified in the draft RRDS are retained in the final Strategy, noting landowners’ support for rural residential development in these directions.

The panel further recommended that adding a new growth direction to the east is avoided. The panel appreciated the thorough submission made by the landowner to the east of Swannanoa seeking the opportunity for rural residential development at this site, but concluded that issues relating to flooding / overland flow path implications and overall capacity constraints in the sewer scheme make this growth direction less favourable than the original growth directions identified.

The panel accepted the officer recommendation that adding a new growth direction further to the northwest of the existing rural residential zone is avoided due to resulting disjointed urban form outcomes. The panel acknowledged that this direction, if deemed feasible, could be considered in a future review of the RRDS when the area would potential adjoin new development.

The panel accepted the overall officer recommendation that no changes in relation to Swannanoa are required to the final RRDS.

Oxford

The draft Strategy proposes two rural residential growth directions to the north and southeast of Oxford, as shown in figure 2. These areas largely avoid flood hazard areas particularly prevalent to the southwest and northeast. They also avoid areas directly adjacent to the existing urban Residential Zone of Oxford protected for long-term residential growth and signalled in the Council’s District Development Strategy, for example the area to the immediate east of the Residential 2 Zone towards the current Rural Residential Zone. The proposed southern growth direction has the potential to create improved urban form by joining two existing but fragmented rural residential zoned areas. The draft Strategy acknowledges that caution will need to be applied to avoid any potential reverse sensitivity issues that could arise from proximity to the Wastewater Treatment Plant and established business activities on Harewood Road.
Figure 2. Oxford proposed rural residential growth directions

Thirty-three submitters specifically provide comments relating to Oxford as a proposed area for further rural residential development. Roughly equal number of submissions support and oppose further development at Oxford.

Submitters in favour of further rural residential development at Oxford state there are many amenities and existing infrastructure that an added population could benefit from. A few submitters support one of the proposed growth directions but not the other, with generally more opposition to growth to the north than the southeast. The key landowner of the property within the growth direction to the north is in support of the proposal for further rural residential development here.

Some alternative growth directions are offered by submitters, including:

- West of Bay Road
- Southwest of Harewood Road (22 Harewood Road)
- Directly south of the township ‘into the triangle’
- East of northern Oxford (Victoria Street / Powell Road)
- Directly east of eastern rural residential zone (at Gardiner’s Road / Barracks Road)

Those in opposition of further rural residential development at Oxford believe that Oxford is too remote from main (employment) centres and further development would result in an increased commuter population. Hesitancy of losing their rural outlook north is voiced by submitters who reside at the northern edge of the current north Oxford rural residential zone. Others suggest there is already ample supply of rural residential lots in Oxford to meet demand. Horticulture New Zealand oppose proposed growth that would affect versatile soils to the north. A few submitters would entertain growth by way of intensification of existing residential zones, but oppose further sprawl of Oxford.
One submitter suggests that with expansion comes the required consideration of effects on current approaches and perceived entrances into Oxford. Further growth has the potential to alter the visual and physical character of the town setting. Subsequently, rules would be needed to establish or retain the character of entrance roads as well as good connectivity within the township.

**Officer Recommendation**

- Retain Oxford as a growth area for further rural residential development
- Retain the original growth directions to the north and southeast as per draft RRDS, acknowledging: 1) landowner support for rural residential development in both of these growth directions, 2) the avoidance of flood hazards in these areas particularly prevalent in other directions, 3) the potential to create improved urban form in the southeast, and 4) avoidance of areas identified for long term urban growth in the District Development Strategy
- Avoid adding a new growth direction further to the east as sought by a submitter which would create an unfavourable elongated urban form outcome
- Avoid adding new growth directions in other areas suggested by submitters listed above as they adjoin the Residential 2 Zone and therefore would impede long term urban development of the township

**Changes required to RRDS**

- None identified

**Panel Recommendation**

The panel noted the roughly equal support and opposition to further rural residential growth at Oxford and accepted the officer recommendation that Oxford is retained as a rural residential growth area in the final RRDS.

The panel acknowledged that the northern and south-eastern growth directions identified and tested through the draft RRDS have the benefit of largely avoiding flood hazard areas particularly prevalent to the southwest and northeast, while also avoiding areas directly adjacent to the existing urban Residential Zone of Oxford protected for long-term residential growth.

In light of the above, the panel accepted the officer recommendation that the original growth directions to the north and southeast identified in the draft RRDS are retained in the final Strategy, noting landowners’ support for rural residential development in these directions.

The panel further recommended that adding a new growth direction to the east is avoided at this time as this would create an unfavourable elongated urban form outcome for Oxford.

The panel accepted the overall officer recommendation that no changes in relation to Oxford are required to the final RRDS.

---

**Ashley / Loburn**

The draft Strategy proposes two rural residential growth directions to the east and west of Loburn Lea and three to the north, east and west of Ashley village. These area are relatively free from localised flood hazard and many of the underlying lots are large in size and in single ownership,
which may make potential development more practicable. However, the draft Strategy acknowledges that some of the proposed growth directions do impact on land with versatile soils.

Figure 3. Ashley/Loburn proposed rural residential growth directions

Fifty-two submitters specifically commented on the proposed growth area of Ashley/Loburn. A vast 37 of these are in support of further rural residential development at Ashley/Loburn, making this area the most overtly supported proposed growth location identified in the draft Strategy.

Submitters in support of development agree that the close proximity to Rangiora with its ample social, community and employment infrastructure in place makes the Ashley/Loburn area highly desirable for further rural residential living. Ashley/Loburn is thought to be exceptionally well connected via the new Ashley Bridge. The suggestion of connecting Ashley/Loburn to the Council’s reticulated wastewater network is appealing to many submitters, as is the economic contribution potential of an increased local population. A number of landowners voice their support of being rezoned to rural residential and would welcome the opportunity to subdivide and hence, downsize.

One submitter suggests the inclusion of land at Rossiters Road where there are 3 acre lots already. Two others recommend a minimum lot size of 2000m² at Ashley/Loburn and an average density of 3000m². This is considered possible as Ashley/Loburn falls outside of the Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy area.

Twelve submitters oppose further rural residential development at Ashley/Loburn. A common concern amongst submitters here is the capacity to cater for further households under the Hurunui District Water Supply scheme, which submitters suggest already struggles with supply and water restrictions are frequent. One submitters argues that biodiversity, recreation, amenity and open space values must be protected by prohibiting any development along Ashley River. Further, subdivision should not spread across Cones Road in order to protect the open, rural character of the
land. Others who oppose growth wish to retain the settlement as small and rural as possible and believe there is ample supply of rural residential lots already. It is thought that added development would exacerbate traffic issues and that much land is unsuitable due to flooding. The owner of land east of the Ashley village opposes development as already, his properties suffer from flooding and further subdivision would only worsen this. Horticulture New Zealand oppose the proposal due to inherent impacts on versatile soils in this area, which are a finite resource crucially important for food production.

**Officer Recommendation**

- Retain Ashley/Loburn as growth area for further rural residential development
- Remove the western growth direction from Loburn Lea recognising the landowner’s opposition to rural residential development in this location
- Retain the eastern growth direction from Loburn Lea recognising several underlying landowners’ support of this direction, together with general support for rural residential growth at Ashley/Loburn through submissions, and the avoidance of land subject to localised flooding
- Remove the western and eastern growth directions from Ashley village north of the Ashley River, in recognition of some landowner opposition to the east, a lack of known interest in the development of the land to the west, and the Ngāi Tūāhuriri Runanga’s opposition of development north of the Ashley River bed (shared by some other submitters for biodiversity/ecology reasons)
- Retain the northern growth direction from Ashley recognising the support for further rural residential development from several key underlying landowners, recognising the potential for improved urban form long-term by joining Ashley and Loburn Lea, recognising the avoidance of localised flooding, and in light of general good support for rural residential growth at Ashley/Loburn through submissions
- Avoid adding the suggested growth direction to incorporate land further west of Ashley at Rossiters Road due to a resulting lack of connection to the existing zones and flooding issues related to these sites

**Changes required to RRDS**

- Retention of only the growth direction arrows north of Ashley and east of Loburn Lea; removal of remainder of growth directions shown in draft RRDS
Panel Recommendation

The panel noted the vast support for further rural residential growth at Ashley/Loburn and accepted the officer recommendation that Ashley/Loburn is retained as a rural residential growth area in the final RRDS.

The panel acknowledged the growth directions identified and tested in the draft RRDS are relatively free from localised flood hazard but that some do impact on land with versatile soils. Furthermore, the panel noted the landowner’s opposition to rural residential development to the west of Loburn and thus, accepted the officer recommendation that this growth direction is removed from the final RRDS.

The panel noted landowners’ support for rural residential development to the east of Loburn and the north of Ashley and thus, accepted the officer recommendation that these growth directions are retained in the final RRDS.

The panel noted the opposition to rural residential development voiced by a landowner to the east of Ashley and the lack of known landowner interest to the west of Ashley, together with the Ngāi Tūāhuriri Runanga’s opposition to further rural residential development to the direct north of the Ashley river bed (shared by some other submitters) and accepted the officer recommendation that these growth directions are removed from the final RRDS. The panel felt that removing the growth direction west of Ashley would also help to protect this land (in large lot size) on versatile soils for primary productive uses.

The panel also accepted the officer recommendation that rural residential development to incorporate land further west of Ashley at Rossiters Road should be avoided at this time due to the disconnect from the existing rural residential nodes.

The panel felt that focusing rural residential development to the north of Ashley and east of Loburn has the potential to create good consolidated urban form outcomes.

Ohoka

The draft Strategy proposes further rural residential development to the southwest of the existing Ohoka village Residential 3 Zone. This direction largely avoids versatile soils and flood hazard areas. Ohoka was included in the draft Strategy as a secondary growth location.
Fourty-seven respondents made particular comment in relation to Ohoka as a potential growth location for further rural residential development. Almost half of these submitters (22) oppose further growth at Ohoka and 13 support growth. Another 10 suggest alternative growth locations / directions at Ohoka.

Key reasons provided for opposing further rural residential development at Ohoka include poor drainage of the land coupled with a high water table; the wish to retain the English village character and small scale of the settlement; pressure further growth would place on local infrastructure; a lack of demand for more lots; and a desire to protect productive rural land.

Those who support further development at Ohoka believe growth would benefit from the existing local community and commercial infrastructure and services; is logical because of its proximity to main centres; and avoids versatile soils. The landowner within the proposed growth direction is in support of rezoning. A couple of submitters argue that Ohoka should be a primary growth area, while a few others recommend improvements to the local roading network and the quality of services such as wastewater disposal and water supply. A small number of submitters propose allowing intensification of existing rural residential lots to a higher density.

A few submitters suggest a number of alternative / additional growth directions for Ohoka, including:

- Allow dwellings on rural lots on historical titles if they fall below the current minimum lot size in Ashworths Road (west of Ohoka). It is argued that approval of housing on this small cluster of historical titles will not impact on rural character and more fully utilise land resources for productive use.
- Strip of land towards Threlkelds Road which is currently divided into 4ha lots
- Land at east of Bradleys Rd, 401 Bradleys Road which is 12ha large, owned by submitters
- Only rezone small pockets of land around existing town
- West along Mill Road, which is drier land and has easy access to Mandeville and Rangiora
- Block of land bounded by Mill Road / McRoberts Road / Dawsons Road / Tram Road and Bradleys Road

**Officer Recommendation**

- In light of strong local resident opposition (including from the Ohoka Residents Association) to further rural residential growth at Ohoka, coupled with known flooding and high water table constraints and sufficient capacity of still undeveloped lots zoned rural residential at present, it is recommended that Ohoka is removed as a growth area from the final RRDS. This acknowledges that Ohoka was included as a secondary growth area in the draft RRDS, which the Council was interested in testing through a public consultation process.
- In line with the above recommendation, avoid any new growth direction to the northwest of Ohoka as suggested by a submitter. Irrespective of the recommendation to remove Ohoka altogether, the alternative growth direction to the northwest is within the medium and low flood hazard area, is fully within the versatile soils area, has the lowest soil drainage area classification, and has high voltage transmission lines crossing the middle of the site in question.
- In line with the recommendation to remove Ohoka as a growth area, avoid introduction of any additional growth directions otherwise suggested through submissions

**Changes required to RRDS**

- Remove Ohoka as a growth area in the final RRDS

**Panel Recommendation**

The panel noted the significant opposition to further rural residential development at Ohoka through submissions due to local drainage and flooding issues and concerns that further growth might negatively impact Ohoka’s small village character.

While the panel noted support for rural residential development from the landowner to the south of Ohoka and northwest (the latter by a submitter seeking an additional growth direction), the panel accepted the officer recommendation that Ohoka is removed altogether from the final RRDS as a rural residential growth area.

In light of this, the panel recognised there is still ample capacity of yet-to-be developed lots in the Residential 4A Zone at Ohoka north of Mill Road. Concerns over stormwater run-off causing downstream effects and compounding the localised flooding problems at Ohoka contributed to this decision.

**Gressons Road (north of Woodend)**

The draft Strategy proposes further rural residential growth to the south of the existing Residential 4B settlement. This area is relatively free from localised flood hazard and avoids the potential community severance associated with State Highway 1. The draft Strategy acknowledges the proposed growth direction is within a Silent File Area indicating the presence of significant wāhi tapu
or wāhi taonga somewhere in the area. Therefore, consultation with Ngāi Tūāhuriri is particularly important in order to identify effects of the activity and to avoid, remedy or mitigate those effects. The draft Strategy also acknowledges that the proposed growth direction does impact land with versatile soils. Gressons Road was included in the draft Strategy as a secondary growth location.

![Figure 5. Gressons Road proposed rural residential growth direction](image)

Twenty submitters specifically addressed the proposed growth area of Gressons Road in their submission. More than half (11) oppose further rural residential development here. Reasons provided include that development is proposed across highly versatile soils that should be protected; that the Ngāi Tūāhuriri Runanga’s reluctance to encroach on land within a Silent File area is a significant concern; and that providing infrastructure will be costly not only to new lots but existing lots in the Rural Residential Zone north of Gressons Road which are required to connect to the Council wastewater scheme in accordance with their Certificate of Title. In addition it is thought that existing infrastructure including telecommunication already struggles; that the land experiences poor drainage; and that there are already ample rural residential lots. Some submitters are concerned that the area is within the liquefaction susceptibility area; and that additional traffic on Gressons Road and ultimately through Woodend would be a poor outcome.

The owner of the land proposed for further rural residential development south of Gressons Road (approximately 30ha large) submits his support for such rezoning. Following the site’s inclusion in the 2010 Rural Residential Development Plan, the submitter has progressed plans substantially. The submitter states he has experience in consulting and implementing processes and protocols to address matters of importance to Ngai Tuahuriri. A geotech report, preliminary infrastructure servicing report, and ground contamination assessment have been undertaken which form appendices to his submission, together with an Outline Development Plan.
Officer Recommendation

- Retain Gressons Road as growth area for further rural residential development
- Retain the southern growth direction identified in the draft RRDS in light of the landowner’s support and readiness for further rural residential development, recognising this is relatively free from localised flood hazard, avoids versatile soils, and avoids the potential community severance associated with State Highway 1
- Ensure appropriate discussions are held with Ngāi Tūāhuriri Runanga given the site is within a Silent File area

Changes required to RRDS

- None identified

Panel Recommendation

The panel acknowledged the key landowner’s support and readiness for further rural residential development at the lot south of the existing Residential 4B Zone at Gressons Road. The panel noted that the lot is largely free from localised flood hazard and avoids the potential community severance associated with State Highway 1, though does impact on versatile soils and lies within a Silent File area.

The panel accepted the officer recommendation that Gressons Road remains in the final RRDS as a growth area, providing meaningful consultation is undertaken with Ngāi Tūāhuriri. This decision also acknowledges the fact that this area was included in the 2010 Rural Residential Development Plan and that the landowner in question has made significant effort in recent years to progress plans for rural residential development at this site.

Other Areas

Thirty-seven submitters suggested other areas for rural residential development, outside of the five proposed growth areas. Some of these submitters are landowners of the sites in question, others provide a general recommendation. The following list provides the proposed alternative locations for rural residential development. The rationale for these suggestions are contained in Appendices A and B.

Quite specific alternative locations were suggested at the following sites:

- Mandeville, various locations including:
  - Intensification of San Dona Olive Groves area north of Mandeville (8 submitters)
  - North of Millfield (121 Wards Road)
  - Dawsons / Ashworths Road area
  - 859 Tram Road, 82 and 83 Ohoka Meadows Drive, 374 Mandeville Road
  - 2 Ashworths Road, “Prosser land” north of Mandeville (substantial submission including supporting documentation)
  - Land bounded by Tram Road, Wards Road, No 10 Road, Two Chain Road
  - 133, 135, 137, 121, 93, 143 Wards Road, 1136 Tram Road, 490 No 10 Road
Officer Recommendation

- Continue to exclude Mandeville as a growth area as this was originally removed from the shortlist of potential locations to consider including in a draft RRDS under a ‘special circumstances’ status as the District Plan has in place the Mandeville Growth Boundary (MGB) which was inserted during Council Plan Change 32 in 2012 in order to address sprawl issues in Mandeville. Given this is relatively recent, there is no argument that the basis for this growth boundary has changed. Also Mandeville is affected by undercurrents / groundwater resurgence (confirmed again by the Mandeville Residents Association in their submission and at the hearing), along with high groundwater levels and overland flows.

- A potential rural residential growth location in the Mandeville vicinity between Wards Road and No 10 Road was already tested through a previous Plan Change process and rejected by the commissioner (to be clarified at the deliberation). Foundation Foods, who operate a factory at 949 No 10 Road, also oppose adjacent rural residential development due to concerns over the creation of reverse sensitivity issues associated with odour and noise. High voltage power lines also run across the sites in question.

- Another potential rural residential growth location at 82 and 83 Ohoka Meadows Drive and neighbouring properties was already tested for inclusion in the MGB and rejected by the Environment Court.

Changes required to RRDS

- None identified

Panel Recommendation

The panel considered requests made by submitters for additional rural residential growth in close proximity to Mandeville but agreed with the overall officer recommendation to continue to exclude Mandeville as a growth location in the final RRDS.

This panel recommendation was informed by the understanding that the basis for the current Mandeville Growth Boundary (MGB) has not changed since its introduction. The MGB was inserted into the District Plan in order to control the sprawl of development at Mandeville and protect the urban form of the settlement and effects on the adjacent rural zone.

The panel considered that the provision for further rural residential development should be concentrated on other parts of the District and recommended that the MGB is carried over into the revised District Plan.

Related to this, the panel recommended that the San Dona area north of Mandeville should continue to remain outside of the MGB and intensification of these lots not enabled through the RRDS. In making this recommendation, the panel reviewed staff advice that outlined practicality and funding issues relating to drainage / flood management and wastewater and water provision that would occur with enabled intensification. The panel recommended that instead, the District Plan Review process consider the feasibility and practicality of the San Dona area as a special area under the revised rural production provisions.
- Rangiora including:
  o West of Lehmans Road (4 submissions), including racecourse land, west of Lehmans Road and north of Oxford Road (including addresses 263, 265, 255b, 311, 315, 305, 285, 271, 261, 257, and 201 Lehmans Road; area south of Johns Road, west of Lehmans Road)
  o 250 Coldstream Road

**Officer Recommendation**

- Continue to exclude the area west of Lehmans Road and the racecourse land at Rangiora as growth areas as these were originally considered but not included in the draft RRDS as they trigger the key preliminary criteria of:
  o being on the direct edges of a main town outside of the Projected Infrastructure Boundary (PIB) thereby foreclosing more intensive long-term urban development, and
- Continue to exclude the lot at 250 Coldstream Road as this does not satisfy an appropriate scale of a growth area and it triggers two key preliminary criteria of:
  o being on the direct edges of a main town outside of the Projected Infrastructure Boundary (PIB) thereby foreclosing more intensive long-term urban development, and
  o not being connected to existing rural residential nodes or small settlements.

**Changes required to RRDS**

- None identified

**Panel Recommendation**

The panel accepted the officer recommendations to exclude areas on the fringes of Rangiora in the final RRDS due to these having the potential to foreclose more intensive long-term urban development of the town.

- Fernside including:
  o 177 Oxford Road
  o 287, 307, 275, 263 Oxford Road and 72, 28 Mount Thomas Road

**Officer Recommendation**

- Continue to exclude Fernside as a growth area as sites in question are:
  o Not connected to existing RR nodes or small settlements (177 Oxford Road)
  o Within Ashley River Breakout hazard – within high flood hazard area (Fernside)
  o Fernside sites are also subject to high voltage transmission lines running across the southern point of site, and are within the versatile soils area

**Changes required to RRDS**

- None identified
Panel Recommendation
The panel accepted the officer recommendations to exclude Fernside in the final RRDS primarily because the sites in question lie within Environment Canterbury’s Ashley River Breakout area and therefore within a high flood hazard.

- Woodend area including:
  - Along Parsonage Road including 110 Parsonage Road
  - 219 and 221 Gladstone Road
  - Land between Woodend and Pegasus
  - Southeast Woodend including 16 Fuller Street

Officer Recommendation
- Continue to exclude these Woodend periphery areas as growth areas as:
  - On edge of main town – foreclosing long-term urban expansion (Parsonage Road)
  - Not connected to existing RR nodes or small settlements (Gladstone Road)
  - 16 Fullers Road is within liquefaction susceptibility area, around half the site has low soil drainage, within two Silent File areas, most of the site is within versatile soils area, most of the site is within medium flood hazard area and only the eastern portion practical to develop.

Changes required to RRDS
- None identified

Panel Recommendation
The panel accepted the officer recommendations to exclude Woodend in the final RRDS as some suggested sites are on the direct edge of Woodend (Parsonage Road), thereby foreclosing long-term urban expansion, or not connected to existing rural residential nodes of small settlements (Gladstone Road). The Fullers Road site was considered too problematic for rural residential development for the reasons provided in the officer recommendations.

- Kaiapoi north west of Lees Road, east of Williams Street

Officer Recommendation
- Continue to exclude this north Kaiapoi as a growth areas as:
  - On edge of main town – foreclosing long-term urban expansion
  - Not connected to existing RR nodes or small settlements
  - Insufficient scale

Changes required to RRDS
- None identified
Some submitters suggest more general areas that lend themselves to (further) rural residential development including:

- Close to already built up areas that provide the necessary services
- Small settlements including Cust, Sefton, West Eyreton, Clarkville and Eyrewell
- Adjacent or close to existing urban greenfield areas on the urban edge, providing lots sized 1000-3000m²
- Island Road from Silverstream to Tram Road or Neeves Road
- Allow current 4ha rural lots to subdivide to 2 or less hectares

Other Comments
A number of ‘other’ comments were made by submitters. These can be viewed in more detail in Appendices A and B. In summary, key general relevant messages include:

- Queries relating to and clarity sought regarding the cost of infrastructure requirements for rezoning land. Some seek more assistance from Council including suggestion that Council proactively rezone land.
- 4 ha lots are not productive and good use of valuable rural land
- Council should allow dwellings on historical titles in the rural zone that are smaller than the 4ha minimum to be a permitted activity
- Changes sought to permitted lot sizes in an existing or future rural residential zone with some seeking higher density (including land north Rangiora, east of Lehmans Road owned by Doncaster Development where submitters are seeking an average density of 2500m²)
- Support for avoiding the Christchurch International Airport noise contour when planning more rural residential development
- Productive rural land should be protected and no residential development should encroach on it, particularly on versatile soils; instead development should be more intensive to avoid further rural subdivision
- More areas for rural residential growth should be identified and planned for as the projected demand is likely to be underestimated
- Growth directions using arrows is too vague to be able to make informed decisions
- More consideration is needed regarding how the Strategy fits within the boarder Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRPS) and the Our Space strategic framework including household allocation and transport network implications
- Need measure to ensure any future development does not impact on the operation, maintenance and upgrade of the Main North Line rail corridor operated by KiwiRail
- Effort needs to be made to protect waterways, wetland, trees and biodiversity in any development
- Support for up-zoning (to urban) the current rural residential zone at northwest Rangiora within the Projected Infrastructure Boundary
- Need to restrict the number of businesses operating in rural residential zones
- Caution not to allow rezoning in areas that may trigger reverse sensitivity impacting on existing businesses operating in the rural zone (e.g. Foundation Foods located outside of Swannanoa).

**Officer Recommendation – General Matters**

- Direct the District Plan Review process to consider appropriate future densities of existing and new rural residential zones and seek comment on these through the Notified District Plan process. For example, appropriate densities might be influenced by such things as character of the area, capacity of the transport network, and opportunities to provide development incentives for the protecting or enhancement of significant indigenous vegetation.
- Direct the District Plan Review process to consider the feasibility of ‘up-zoning’ existing rural residential zones inside of the PIB (at Woodend, Rangiora and Kaiapoi) to accommodate long-term urban growth of these main towns.
- Direct the District Plan Review process to consider the issues relating to historical titles through the Notified District Plan process.
- Consider the suggested demand for large lot urban development (1,000m²-3,000m²) through the residential chapter of the Notified District Plan process.
- Consider the minimum rural lot size as part of the Notified District Plan process.
- Continue to protect the CIA noise contour and the Main North Line rail corridor through land use planning processes.
- Remove the status of primary and secondary growth areas in the final RRDS, recognising that the purpose of these was to assist the consultation process.

**Changes required to RRDS**

- None identified

**Panel Recommendation**

The panel accepted the officers’ recommendations in relation to general matters and recommended adding the following:

- Continue to protect the future designation of the Rangiora Airfield through land use planning processes and ensure that areas which would compromise the operational capacity of the Airfield are avoided for incompatible development.
- Direct the District Plan Review process to address matters relating to reverse sensitivity issues in the Rural Zone in order to provide better protection for more traditional rural activities.
1. **SUMMARY**

1.1 This report asks the Council to agree to my proposal to establish a Committee of Council that effectively functions as a Joint Committee with Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga; to confirm the proposed Terms of Reference (TOR) for this Committee; and to appoint the Council’s representatives - so enabling it to begin functioning once Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga members have been confirmed.

1.2 The main purpose of this Committee would be to prepare recommendations to both the Council and the Rūnanga that continue to develop the relationship in several identified areas. It would be a decision of an incoming Council, upon recommendation from the Committee/the current Council, as to its future in the incoming Council’s triennium after the election in October.

1.3 The Council has previously endorsed in principle Committee establishment but held confirmation of this and the TOR until Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga had signalled their agreement.

**Attachments:**

ii. Ngāi Tūāhuriri Engagement with Waimakariri District Council @ May 2019 (190125007825).
iii. Proposed Jurisdiction of the Mahi Tahi Joint Development Committee (190125007826)

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 190522072219.

(b) **Agrees** to the establishment of the Mahi Tahi (Working Together) Development Committee with terms of reference as set out in the Attachment iii (190125007826).

(c) **Appoints** the Mayor and Councillor……….,and Councillor……….,to be the three Council members on the Committee
3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1 Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga and the Waimakariri District Council have, since 2003 (renewed in 2012), had in place a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) aimed at developing a relationship of mutual benefit based on core values of the parties ([Attachment i](#)). This MOU provides for more Ngāi Tūāhuriri involvement in decision-making than has been utilised to date, including appointments to Committees and Panels.

3.2 Much has been achieved in this time. However, during the last 15 years the statutory framework, within which the Waimakariri District Council operates, has continued to evolve reflecting the developing relationship between Iwi and the Crown. The introduction of provision for Mana Whakahono a Rohe Iwi participation agreements is a case in point. (See [http://www.mfe.govt.nz/rma/manawhakahono](http://www.mfe.govt.nz/rma/manawhakahono).)

3.3 The consistent direction of change in this framework has been towards increasing Iwi involvement in decision-making – not solely as a consultee or ‘stakeholder’ but engaged in the deliberations/decision-making ‘at the table’. Changes to the RMA in 2017 mean Councils: must engage with Iwi authorities on draft district plans prior to notification; must also consider Iwi advice in Section 32 Evaluation Reports; must consult Iwi and consider appointing a Hearings Commissioner with Tikanga Maori understanding; and, enable either Councils or Iwi Authorities to initiate Mana Whakahono a Rohe Agreements in relation to ongoing participation arrangements across a wide range of matters.

3.4 In Greater Christchurch Ngāi Tahu involvement in earthquake recovery planning with the Crown, its membership of the Greater Christchurch Partnership Committee and Environment Canterbury are examples. Locally, Iwi representation on the Waimakariri Water Zone Committee, the Regeneration Steering Group, Te Kōhakao Tūhaitara Trust among others are demonstrations of this ([Attachment ii](#)).

3.5 Ngāi Tūāhuriri has continued to develop its capacity and in the last year it has begun a principles-based redefinition of the way it is organised and progresses its interests into the future, including its basis for working with the Waimakariri District Council. The desire to review the MOU with the Council has been signalled by Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga.

4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1. In light of these changes and developments, through 2018 I as Mayor, along with the Chief Executive, have been engaging with the Ngāi Tūāhuriri Upoko and the acting, and recently confirmed, Rūnanga Executive Chairperson. We have been taking stock and looking out at the future form and function of the partnering relationship between us.

4.2. There is no doubt in my mind that working together - mahi tahi – is the preferred method of engaging and collaborating with Ngāi Tūāhuriri. As can be seen from Attachment ii the Council has a number of existing forum relationships. Ngāi Tūāhuriri wish to see these continue but within an overarching framework that embodies more contemporary understanding and practice than is reflected in the now 15-year old MOU. We need a mechanism to consider the revision and recasting of the current Memorandum of Understanding.

4.3. Provision is made for the establishment of Mahinga Kai areas within the Waimakariri Red Zone Recovery Plan. There is a need to identify co-governance structures and processes to achieve the required results, in relation to Mahinga Kai areas, within the Regeneration Area in Kaiapoi.

4.4. Similarly, the achievement of Ngāi Tūāhuriri’s aspirations for development of Maori Reserve 873, with particular regard to roles and responsibilities under the Resource Management Act 1991, has been identified as a matter requiring attention. There is growing risk of ad-hoc planning and servicing arrangements that are not future-proofed,
underpinned by a clear mutually agreed understanding of how development on the Reserve will unfold, at least in the short term but with an eye to the longer term.

4.5. Our experience through preparation and decision-making on the ZIPA through the Waimakariri Water Zone Committee suggests the particular relationship of Iwi with water, as reflected in the Iwi Management Plan, needs to be better integrated into structures and processes that guide the Council’s responsibilities in relation to water resource management.

4.6. Lastly, but certainly not least and pressing upon us in 2019, is achieving a mechanism to provide Ngāi Tūāhuriri guidance on strategic directions and other identified high priority topics within the scope of the current Waimakariri District Plan Review, drawing among other sources on the commissioned work of Mahaanui Kurataiao Ltd.

4.7. I propose a Council Committee is established under the Local Government Act 2002, with equal participation by both parties, to consider and make recommendations to the Council and Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga. The proposed terms of reference and overall way of working of the Committee are set out in Attachment iii. Recently I received your unanimous support in proposing this Committee and discussing these proposed terms of reference with Ngāi Tūāhuriri before seeking to confirm the Committee through a further report to Council. This is that report. Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga have confirmed their agreement.

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

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. Groups and Organisations

Engagement has occurred with Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga through the Ngāi Tūāhuriri Upoko and the acting, and recently confirmed, Rūnanga Executive Chairperson.

5.2. Wider Community

The views of the wider community have not been sought in the preparation of this report.

6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1. Financial Implications

The costs associated with attendance and administratively supporting this new Committee for the current year can be met through existing budgets. The budget for Rūnanga advice and engagement was recently increased in anticipation of the increasing need to secure iwi input at a formative stage of Council plans and programmes.

This reflects the fact that the continuing calls for Rūnanga involvement in Council Committees and Working Groups occurs against a backdrop of those representatives who do come forward increasingly having ‘day jobs’ and the prospect of forgoing income to participate and secure their expertise. Remuneration for this committees meeting attendance and preparation for that is therefore appropriate.

The advice of the Governance Manager has been sought in this regard, bearing in mind the remuneration rates set by the Remuneration Authority for external participation in panels and such like, and also the annual honorarium paid to members of the Water Zone Committee ($4,000). It is therefore proposed to offer $80 per hour to the Rūnanga representatives, for 1.5 times the hours length of meeting attendance, reflecting the need
for time to be committed to meeting preparation as well. This in total adds to some $3,750 per representative, assuming 10 meetings per annum.

6.2. Community Implications

Developing the relationship with Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga not just to meet statutory requirements, but also to enhance the wellbeing of Ngāi Tūāhuriri people in the District has a range of positive environmental and cultural as well as social benefits for the wider community as well.

6.3. Risk Management

By establishing this Committee to enhance joint working with Ngāi Tūāhuriri the risk of a wide range of negative outcomes is diminished, not the least of which might be negative submissions by Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga in relation to the Reviewed District Plan with attendant costs to resolve.

6.4. Health and Safety

There are no particular health and safety implications associated with this report or its recommendations.

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

S41A (3) of the Local Government Act 2002 empowers Mayors to establish Committees of a local authority. Schedule 7 Clause 30 of that Act provides for members of a Committee that may, but need not be, elected members of the local authority.

7.3. Community Outcomes

7.4. “Effect is given to the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi

• The Council in partnership with Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga continue to build our relationship through mutual understanding and shared responsibilities.”

7.5. Delegations

The Delegations to be exercised by the proposed Committee are set out in Attachment iii.
Memorandum of Understanding

Between

Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga
and
The Waimakariri District Council

December 2012
1. Introduction

On 21 May 1840 Lieutenant Governor Hobson proclaimed British sovereignty over the whole of the North Island by virtue of the Treaty of Waitangi. At the same time the South Island was proclaimed by virtue of discovery, even though Hobson had only visited the South Island once, at Cloudy Bay in 1837.

Major Bunbury, as Hobson’s deputy, collected the signatures for the Crown. Many of the Ngāi Tahu chiefs and their communities never saw the Treaty, however, leaders Iwikau, Tikao, Tuhawaiki and Karetaia were among the few who had been approached to sign the document setting out a constitutional future. Since the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi in 1840 successive governments and occupiers of the new lands have questioned and debated the fundamental tenets of the Treaty.

In August 1989 Paul Temm QC, in his closing address for the Ngāi Tahu claimants, explained how the right of the New Zealand Parliament to make laws depended upon the Treaty of Waitangi. The following constitutional developments show key linkages and events:

1. The Royal Proclamation of Sovereignty (1840) was pronounced on 2 October 1840, as a result of the power given to Queen Victoria through the Treaty of Waitangi.

   This enabled the Parliament of the United Kingdom to make laws over New Zealand.

2. The New Zealand Parliament obtained the right to govern and make laws over New Zealand citizens through the New Zealand Constitution Act (1852) and the Statute of Westminster Act (1947). These were both enacted by the Parliament of the United Kingdom.

Historically, the lack of regard given to Tino Rangatiratanga, acknowledged by Article Two of the Treaty, has resulted in tribal organisations being marginalised and excluded from participating effectively and according to cultural preferences.

The passing of the Treaty of Waitangi Act (1975) was a significant development. The Act sent a clear signal to decision-makers that the absolute power of Parliament was curbed by its obligations to respect the honour of the Crown and the terms of the Treaty to which the Crown had agreed.

This Memorandum is based upon the fundamental articles and principles of the Treaty of Waitangi, and the legislative developments since the signing of the Treaty. In approaching interpretation of the Treaty, Justice Cooke (New Zealand Maori Council and the Attorney General [NZLJ 1987:p663]) stated that the differences between the texts and the shades of meaning do not matter as it is the spirit that matters in interpretation.
2. **Purpose**

The purpose of this Memorandum of Understanding is to develop a relationship of mutual benefit between the Waimakariri District Council and Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga based upon the core values of the parties.

The Memorandum seeks to establish and provide for a clear understanding of the basis and on-going conduct of the partnership relationship between the Waimakariri District Council and Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga.

3. **The Parties**

i. **Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga**

Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga facilitates the collective concerns of tangata whenua belonging to the hapū and whānau of Ngāi Tūāhuriri.

Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu was formed by *Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu Act (1996)* and is recognised as the representative of Ngāi Tahu Whanui.

The hapū and whānau of Ngāi Tūāhuriri are recognised as the tangata whenua, as identified by Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga. As the tangata whenua, the hapū and whānau of Ngāi Tūāhuriri have status as Treaty partner.

ii. **The Waimakariri District Council**

The Waimakariri District Council is a territorial authority constituted as a body of local government in 1989.

The Waimakariri District Council is not the Crown. However, it may exercise functions or provide services in the District for and on behalf of the Crown. Legislation, including the *Resource Management Act (1991)*, empowers the Council to do this.

The purpose of local government is:

(a) to enable democratic local decision-making and action by, and on behalf of communities; and

(b) to meet the current and future needs of communities for good-quality local infrastructure, local public services and performance of regulatory functions in a way that is most cost effective for households and businesses.

In addition, there is specific provision made for local authorities to recognised the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi, and Parts 2 and 6 of the Act require the Council to facilitate participation by Māori in local authority decision-making processes. (Local Government Act 2002)
4. Goal

The Waimakariri District Council and Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga as parties to this Memorandum have the following goal:

To provide formal understanding and operational implementation of the sustainable management of resources for the benefit and environmental, social, cultural and economic well-being of the community, both now and in the future.

In reaching this goal, a requirement, recognised by both parties, is the restoration of relationships. This includes the restoration of relationships with each other and the world around us. It is important that these relationships be guided by our relationship with the core values. In the past these connections have been lost or damaged. This has resulted in loss of community links and harm to the functioning of ecosystems. Before sustainable management can be achieved the web of relationships needs to be rebuilt and relinked.

The goal incorporates the long-term sustenance of life supporting processes, the maintenance of resources to meet human needs, and the promotion of high environmental quality.

In pursuit of this goal the Waimakariri District Council and Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga agree to:

1. Base the relationship on good faith, co-operation and understanding of agreed Principles and Core Values;

2. Work towards deliberate solutions in a reasonable manner and with honesty of purpose;

3. Respect and seek to accommodate different cultural values and ways of working;

4. Take into account, and incorporate in decision-making where appropriate, planning documents recognised by the Iwi authority\(^1\) and other statutory and non-statutory plans or documents.

\(^1\) Note: Relevant planning documents for the Waimakariri District are the Mahaanui Iwi Management Plan 2013 and the Ngai Tahu Freshwater Policy 1999.
5. Principles

The following Principles form the basis of this Memorandum of Understanding:

1. A duty of partnership is bestowed upon the Waimakariri District Council and Te Ngāi Tūhuriri Rūnanga;

2. Parties should at all times act reasonably and in good faith towards each other;

3. The Waimakariri District Council shall, in all its functions where appropriate, give due regard to the mana of Te Ngāi Tūhuriri Rūnanga and the rangatiratanga of the members of Te Ngāi Tūhuriri Rūnanga;

4. The Waimakariri District Council must at all times act in accordance with legislative requirements and shall not be limited by this Memorandum in the fulfilment of its statutory duties;

5. The Waimakariri District Council recognises the need for active protection of the interests of the members of Te Ngāi Tūhuriri Rūnanga;

6. Where the interests of the members of Te Ngāi Tūhuriri Rūnanga are concerned the explicit consent of Te Ngāi Tūhuriri Rūnanga regarding the matter shall be sought, rather than their tacit consent;

7. Both parties recognise the right of tangata whenua who hold mana whenua to use their ancestral lands, waters, and other taonga to the fullest extent practicable.

The above principles are, to some extent, given direction by the following matters:

i. The Treaty of Waitangi, Te Tiriti o Waitangi

Principles of the Treaty of Waitangi, Te Tiriti o Waitangi, have been established by the Waitangi Tribunal and the Court of Appeal. It is recognised that the Waitangi Tribunal, established by the Treaty of Waitangi Act (1975), is the legal body that addresses claims relating to the practical application of the Treaty subject to ongoing support from Parliament.

Observance of the Memorandum Principles and Core Values will help prevent future grievances, through both parties working in harmony to confer benefits to affected parties.

ii. Legislative Requirements of local Government

The Local Government Act 2002, and a wide range of other statutes, set out a variety of obligations and limitations on the functions and activities of the Council.

iii. The Resource Management Act

The Resource Management Act (1991) provides direction through sections 6(e), 7(a) and 8.
Section 6(e)

As a matter of national importance, the relationship of Maori and their culture and traditions with ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu and other taonga, must be recognised and provided for. The recognition and provision for this relationship will be defined by the parties by working with and through the Principles of the Memorandum and Core Values. The relationship referred to in section 6(e) is held and defined by the tangata whenua most directly affected by the decision.

Section 7(a)

The exercise of guardianship of the physical and spiritual well-being of resources has been referred to as kaitiakitanga in the Resource Management Act (1991). The Waimakariri District Council must have particular regard to the exercise of guardianship, particularly, the physical and spiritual well-being of the resource relationship between Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga members and waahi taonga.

The principle of kaitiakitanga as it is defined by the Resource Management Amendment Act (1997) refers to the expression of guardianship as expressed by tangata whenua. The expression of this principle would be according to the customs and traditions of Maori.

The Kai-Tiaki were the keepers and/or caretakers of knowledge relating to such natural resources and the protector of those resources.

Kaitiakitanga is the equivalent of a management plan based around the philosophy that all vegetation, fish and birds must reproduce to provide future sustenance, sustaining the resources for the survival of the people.

Parties agree, there are three levels in kaitiakitanga:

- Kaitiaki Atua or Godly/spiritual
- Kaitiaki Tipuna or Ancestral
- Kaitiaki Tangata or Human

Section 8

In the requirement to take account of the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi, the Resource Management Act (1991) has recognised the central importance of the Treaty of Waitangi to resource management.

Future changes to the Resource Management Act 1991 will be incorporated into this Memorandum.
6. Core Values

Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga

Core values for Ngāi Tūāhuriri have been derived from tikanga Maori and scientific understandings; combining divine belief (the upper or celestial) and earthly values such as our legislation. These values are seen as "stakes in the ground" to guide action and decision-making. The following core value statements aim to guide people to do the right thing at the right time and at the right place for the right people. The Treaty of Waitangi is considered an important junction where the divine and earthly worlds meet.

i. Values: Mauri and Wairua

The infinite flow of Mauri (life force) in the relationship of Maori with ancestral lands, waterways and other taonga.

The infinite flow of Wairua (spirit) in the relationship of Maori with ancestral lands, waterways and other taonga.

ii. Treaty Derived

The frequently recited prayer of Matiaha Tiramorehu provides this understanding of the text of the Treaty of Waitangi, from his petition to the Queen on 23 September 1857:

"That the law be made one, that the commandments be made one, that the white skin be made just equal with the brown skin so that all may enjoy a peaceable life."

The articles of the Treaty of Waitangi as governorship was expressed as:

1. The Crown’s responsibility to make just laws and the citizen’s duty to abide by these laws;

2. The guarantee of Maori customary rights; and the ownership and the control of these resources for Maori by the Crown;

3. The equal rights for all with the principles of good faith and partnership.

The following imperatives pertaining to resource use have evolved:

1. The protection of the beneficial property rights of tangata whenua as expressed by the customary right and authority over land (mana-whenua) and sea (mana-moana);

2. Exercise of resource use and management according to whakapapa (layered genealogies), ahikaa (occupation) and turangawaewae (land tenure);

3. The wise resource use and allocation as an expression of Maori identity through understanding the truth of whakapapa (layered genealogies) of the celestial and terrestrial worlds in the relationship of Maori with ancestral lands, waterways and other taonga;
4. The expression of customs, values and beliefs as a manifestation of identity in the relationship of Maori with ancestral lands, waterways and other taonga;

5. The expression of capabilities through the development of ethics, rituals and institutions pertaining to the relationship of Maori with ancestral lands, waterways and other taonga;

6. The development of clear and precise procedures and processes to guide behaviours in the relationship of Maori with ancestral lands, waterways and other taonga.

iii. Legally Derived from the Resource Management Act (1991) and its Amendments

1. The sustainability of life supporting processes that provide the resources to meet human need in a way that sustains and does not diminish the quality of the environment;

2. The protection of indigenous ecosystems as matters of significant cultural and heritage value;

3. The nature and extent of the relationship of tangata whenua and resources.

Waimakariri District Council

The Waimakariri District Council has identified organisational values.

These Values are:

- Working with our communities and each other
- Keeping people informed
- Doing better every day
- Taking responsibility
- Acting with integrity, honesty and trust.
7. Memorandum Agreements

Agreement 1: Shared Decision Making

Each party will facilitate the active involvement of the respective partner in decision making and will:

- Follow the principle of partnership,
- Recognise the independence and diversity of both parties, and
- Ensure that the statutory obligations and responsibilities of local government are recognised and provided for.

The parties recognise that shared decision making, both within existing frameworks and in processes to be set up by this Memorandum, will involve incorporating the perspectives of the other party and providing mechanisms for their active involvement.

Actions

i. Annual Meeting

An annual meeting between the Waimakariri District Council and Te Ngāi Tūhuriri Rūnanga, acknowledging the meeting of Rangatira with Rangatira. The meeting to be hosted alternately by the Waimakariri District Council and Te Ngāi Tūhuriri Rūnanga

Matters to consider:

1. Reports from the Waimakariri District Council and Ngāi Tūhuriri Monthly Forums (as provided for by Agreement 2).
2. Relevant policy changes.
3. A list of project commitments and priorities for the next year.
4. Minutes of the Annual Hui form part or all of Te Ngāi Tūhuriri Rūnanga's submission to the Annual Plan and Budget.

ii. Representation

As appropriate, there will be Waimakariri District Council representation at Te Ngāi Tūhuriri Rūnanga meetings. These meetings can be used to discuss matters of mutual importance on the Marae or other venue nominated by the Executive Liaison Committee of Te Ngāi Tūhuriri Rūnanga.

A deputation from Te Ngāi Tūhuriri Rūnanga can be heard at any meeting of the Council, or any committee or sub-committee of the Waimakariri District Council, within the framework of the Council's Standing Orders (2.13 Deputations).
iii. Other Measures to Assist in Shared Decision Making

1. Establishment of working parties, by mutual agreement of each party, for specific projects;

2. Use of consultants, although consultants involved in facilitating liaison for the parties are not to act as mandatory representatives of Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga or the Waimakariri District Council;

3. Appointment of members of Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga to a Hearing Panel as appropriate;

4. Appointment of members of Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga to any committee or sub-committee in line with Standing Order 1.11 (4);

5. Transfer of powers to the Iwi authority under section 33 of the Resource Management Act (1991);

6. Preparation of a list of recommended projects which have been agreed upon by the Waimakariri District Council and Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga and for which resourcing has been confirmed.

Agreement 2: Consultation

That each party will actively consult with the other, in a timely manner and in good faith, as is required by the partnership principle.

Actions

i. Recognise Tangata Whenua

The collective concerns of the hapū and whānau of Ngāi Tūāhuriri are facilitated by the Rūnanga structure and through such Rūnanga links are made back to the collective Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu. The Rūnanga of Ngāi Tahu Whanui represents Ngāi Tahu Whanui. Where any enactment requires consultation with any Iwi or with any Iwi authority, that consultation shall, with respect to matters affecting Ngāi Tahu Whanui, be held with Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu (Section 15 (2) Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu Act (1996)). The words Iwi Authority are used in the Resource Management Act (1991), however, the concept of Ngāi Tahu as one tribe does not reflect the traditional social structure of Ngāi Tahu and their component parts.

The Waimakariri District Council recognises the hapū and whānau of Ngāi Tūāhuriri as tangata whenua, as identified by Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga. As tangata whenua the hapū and whānau of Ngāi Tūāhuriri have status as Treaty partner.

Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga will take responsibility for identifying and involving those specific parties who are considered tangata whenua for that area, where an issue involving the management of natural and physical resources is associated with a particular location in the District.
ii. Consultation Processes

1. Both parties will adopt the guidelines for consultation in Appendix 1 as a basis for consultation.

2. The Waimakariri District Council will recognise its statutory duty, including under the Resource Management Act (1991) and the Local Government Act (2002), to consult with Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga.

3. Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga will recognise its reciprocal duty to respond to offers of consultation.

iii. Understanding the Other Party

1. Waimakariri District Council and staff will increase understanding of tikanga Maori, culture and traditions, and develop appropriate skills and knowledge.

2. Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga will increase understanding of the role of a territorial authority, its functions set by statute and its relationship with other statutory organisations.

iv. Resources

1. The resourcing of consultation processes will be regularly reviewed.

2. It is recognised that the allocation and level of resourcing will determine the nature and the extent of the relationship between Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga and the Waimakariri District Council and the ability of each party to carry out their respective duties.

3. Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri is supported by Mahaanui Kurataiao Ltd (MKT) in its evaluation of resource management proposals and to provide support and advice as required. The Waimakariri District Council and MKT will agree on an annual programme of work with a funding contribution provided by the Waimakariri District Council to MKT.

v. To Facilitate Consultation the Waimakariri District Council will:

1. Liaise with Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga through the monthly forums and any appointed liaison person;

2. Have regard to environmental management plans prepared by the Iwi authority and consider the need to support Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga in the preparation of such plans;

3. Ensure the Rūnanga is consulted over resource consents, plan changes and variations subject to the time constraints contained in the Resource Management Act (1991);

4. Ensure that any resource consent applications provide sufficient information on potential impacts on the members of Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga and effects on waahi taonga/waahi tapu and mahinga kai as identified by them;
5. Encourage applicants to consult with the Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga as part of any assessment of effects;

6. Provide a list of all resource consent applications to Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga;

7. Provide for input by the Rūnanga during preparation of the Waimakariri District Council’s Annual Plan and Budget;

8. Provide copies of appropriate Council documents and Plans to Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga.

vi. To Facilitate Consultation Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga will:

1. Liaise with the Waimakariri District Council through the Council staff, the monthly forums and any appointed liaison person;

2. Use the consultation provisions of the *Resource Management Act* (1991) in a positive and proactive way where possible;

3. Endeavour to participate in other consultation processes the Waimakariri District Council uses to meet statutory and non-statutory obligations;

4. Provide, where resources and time allow, clarification on resource management matters of significance to the hapū and whānau of Ngāi Tūāhuriri;

5. Recognise the time constraints that govern the resource consent application process;

6. Assist its members to receive information, disseminate it and ensure that the Waimakariri District Council is kept adequately informed.

vii. Monthly Discussion Forum

The establishment of a Forum for the exchange of information and views between the Rūnanga and the Council.

Membership:

1. Members of Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga Executive Liaison Committee
2. Staff members from the Waimakariri District Council

(Additional Waimakariri District Council and Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga representatives to be present for items as appropriate.)

The function of the Monthly Discussion Forum is to:

1. Share information and views on Resource Management Act processes;
2. Provide advice on proposals and processes;
3. Maintain regular contact between the Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga and the Waimakariri District Council;
4. Report to meetings of the Waimakariri District Council and meetings of the Executive Liaison Committee of Te Ngāi Tūhuriri Rūnanga regarding policy matters;

5. Meet monthly, as required.

Matters for discussion to include, but not be limited to:

1. Issues affecting the beneficiaries of the Rūnanga;
2. Issues affecting the Waimakariri District Council;
3. Monitoring the effectiveness of processes set up by the Memorandum;
4. Waimakariri District Council proposed plans and policies;
5. Resource Consent and Plan Change applications received by the Council;
6. District Plan Variations;
7. Developments in the District;

Agreement 3: Resources

To recognise the limitations and constraints on each party with respect to resources, while supporting those processes set up by this Memorandum.

Resources are seen to include both monetary and non-monetary requirements (i.e. technical advice, information, time and accommodation). Frequently, Te Ngāi Tūhuriri Rūnanga is pressured by the consultation requirements for health, education, employment and training, Iwi development and resource management. Often resources, both financial and human, are severely limited, affecting the Rūnanga’s ability to respond adequately to consultation requirements. The Waimakariri District Council’s resources, derived primarily from ratepayers, are limited. The Waimakariri District Council and Rūnanga must set priorities and demonstrate financial accountability.

The Waimakariri District Council needs resources to facilitate consultation and Te Ngāi Tūhuriri Rūnanga needs resources to meaningfully respond. Both the Waimakariri District Council and Te Ngāi Tūhuriri Rūnanga benefit if the process is as efficient and effective as possible.

Actions

i. Support for Identified Processes

1. The Waimakariri District Council and Te Ngāi Tūhuriri Rūnanga will alternate in hosting the annual meeting established by this Memorandum.

2. The Waimakariri District Council will provide administrative support to the Monthly Discussion Forum including the taking and distribution of minutes.

3. Both parties will endeavour to provide the resources of technical advice, expertise, information, accommodation for meetings, and time that are required to fulfil the processes of decision making and consultation.
ii. Annual Plan and Budget Processes

1. A meeting will be held in November of each year to identify projects raised by the Rūnanga for inclusion within the financial year of the next Annual Plan and take note of comments on key issues and priorities for the forthcoming year.

2. During the preparation of the Annual Plan and Budget the Waimakariri District Council will provide for the processes set up by this Memorandum and consider any additional projects put forward and identified in the list of project commitments (as described in Action i of Agreement 1: Shared Decision Making) to be actioned during the next financial year.

iii. Contracts

1. Where the Waimakariri District Council requests information from Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga in the form of a specific contract, any costs incurred will be met by the Waimakariri District Council to the extent provided for in that contract.

2. In some circumstances, the Waimakariri District Council and Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga may see contracting as appropriate. The normal rules of contract and performance criteria would apply. In the case of a dispute, a group made up of two Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga and two Waimakariri District Council nominees plus an independent Chairperson will seek a resolution. Parties should avoid resorting to legal processes to resolve conflict.

iv. Capacity Building

The Waimakariri District Council will, as part of the Annual Plan process make resources available so that Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga has the capacity to participate effectively in the processes identified in this Memorandum.

v. Use of the Marae

The parties agree that the Marae at Tuahiwi may be used for:

a) Community meetings at reasonable rates
b) As an emergency management welfare centre
c) Waimakariri District Council meetings where appropriate at no consideration

Agreement 4: Transfer of Powers

To use the legal provision: “Transfer of Powers” in a manner which is appropriate and recognises the principles and core values of this Memorandum.

The Waimakariri District Council is able to transfer some powers under section 33 of the Resource Management Act (1991) to other statutory authorities. But, the Waimakariri District Council retains responsibility for the function(s) or power(s) transferred. In these circumstances the agreements set in this Memorandum with respect to Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga are also transferred, and the authorised organisation must meet those responsibilities.
Actions

i. Consideration

In the course of preparing, withdrawing, changing or reviewing plans, the Waimakariri District Council will actively consider, in assessing possible methods of plan implementation, the option of transfer of powers.

ii. Monitoring

Where any functions or powers under the Resource Management Act (1991) are transferred, the Waimakariri District Council will monitor the effectiveness of the authority to whom power is transferred in regard to meeting obligations to Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga set in this Memorandum.

iii. Transfer to the Iwi Authority

Where Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga requests the transfer of powers to the Iwi Authority, the Waimakariri District Council will take into account (along with all other relevant matters):

2. The need to assess applications on the grounds of the appropriate community of interest, efficiency and capability (section 33(4)(c) of the Resource Management Act (1991)).
3. The wish of the parties to investigate opportunities for expression of the partnership principle through joint management of resources.

In considering the use of the provision in the Resource Management Act (1991) section 33, to transfer power to Iwi Authorities, the Waimakariri District Council recognises that this is one mechanism available to the parties to recognise rangatiratanga and kaitiakitanga.

Agreement 5: Protection of Sensitive Information

To recognise that both parties hold and produce sensitive information and the wishes of the other party must be respected.

Actions

i. Information Provided to the Waimakariri District Council

When members of Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga provide the Waimakariri District Council with sensitive and/or confidential information concerning waahi taonga, sites of significance, or aspects of tikanga Maori, the Waimakariri District Council will undertake to protect such information in its care and restrict access to it, in accordance with the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act (1987) (section 7) and the Resource Management Act (1991) (section 42(1)(a)).
The Waimakariri District Council will give due respect and recognition to “silent files” or plans held by Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga and Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu.

ii. Information Provided to Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga

Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga will undertake to protect any sensitive or confidential information, including restriction of access to it, that it may receive from the Waimakariri District Council.

Agreement 6: Hearings and Pre-Hearing Meetings

To acknowledge tangata whenua in hearings and pre-hearing meetings.

A hearing is a quasi-judicial process that operates under certain constraints. The Resource Management Act (1991) makes special provision for hearings in regard to Maori (section 39 (2)(b)). Hearings are also held in regard to submissions on the Annual Plan and other processes.

Actions

i. Use of Pre-hearing Meetings

1. The Waimakariri District Council will encourage pre-hearing meetings with Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga before resource consent and plan change / variation hearings.

2. Both parties acknowledge the value of using pre-hearing meetings to address issues of concern to the Tangata Whenua, and the use of venues, such as the Marae, which provide for tikanga Maori.

ii. Hearing Procedures

1. The Waimakariri District Council will ensure the following are provided for in hearings:
   - Recognition and provision for tikanga Maori and te reo Maori, where appropriate;
   - Protection of information provided to hearings that is considered sensitive and confidential by the Tangata Whenua. The information to be protected may go beyond that presented at the hearing.

2. The Waimakariri District Council may appoint members of Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga as members of a hearings panel or as Hearing Commissioners, where appropriate and where there is no conflict of interest.
Agreement 7: Conflict Resolution

To endeavour to reconcile differences, through dialogue, mediation and negotiation.

There may be situations where the application of powers and interpretation of responsibilities conflict between the parties. In such instances, the parties should endeavour to use other means rather than judicial proceedings.

Actions

i. Mediation

In the event that an independent mediator is required, the parties will select a candidate from a maintained list of appropriately qualified, acceptable mediators.

ii. Litigation

Litigation is viewed by both parties as a last resort.

Agreement 8: Review of the Memorandum

To provide an opportunity to regularly review the wording and agreements contained in the Memorandum of Understanding.

Actions

i. Internal Review

Review the Memorandum of Understanding through the Monthly Discussion Forum from time to time.
8. **Contract Between Parties**

This Memorandum is freely entered into by Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga Inc. and the Waimakariri District Council in a spirit of goodwill and in accordance with the principles, core values, goals and agreements above. The parties recognise the benefits of the Memorandum to themselves, and to the Waimakariri community, both urban and rural. This Memorandum is a statement of good intention.

Accordingly, Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga and the Waimakariri District Council intend that this Memorandum should not create legally binding rights and obligations. The Memorandum is intended to form the basis of a meaningful long-term relationship and may be amended or expanded by mutual agreement of the parties.

Signed for and on behalf of Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga Inc.

Clare Marie Williams  
Chairperson

Hanaa Mare Burgman  
Secretary

Signed for and on behalf of the Waimakariri District Council

Mayor - David Ayers

Chief Executive - Jim Palmer

Dated: 19 September 2013
Appendix 1
GUIDELINES FOR CONSULTATION

1. CONSULTATION IS:
   - Two-way communication;
   - A value-adding process;
   - Both imparting and receiving information;
   - Part of accountable and transparent decision-making;
   - A way of increasing trust and public confidence in decision-makers;
   - Part of making better decisions.

2. CONSULTATION INVOLVES:
   - A statement of a proposal not yet finally decided upon;
   - Listening to what others have to say;
   - Considering their responses;
   - And then deciding what will be done.

3. GOOD CONSULTATION PRACTICE REQUIRES THE PARTIES TO:
   - Have an open mind;
   - Be prepared to make concessions;
   - Clarify the expectations of the parties involved;
   - Make resources available;
   - Provide appropriate and clear information;
   - Make clear the context (legal etc.) for why consultation is occurring;
   - Allow time for parties to respond effectively;
   - Report/feedback-follow-up;
   - Keep the momentum of consultation going.

4. WHEN EMBARKING ON CONSULTATION THE PARTIES SHOULD AGREE ON WHETHER IT IS REQUIRED FOR:
   - Informing the parties;
   - Seeking information from the parties;
   - Seeking a mandate for action from the parties;
   - Promoting understanding and seeking acceptance;
   - Fulfilling minimum statutory requirements;
   - 'Brainstorming';
   - Facilitating goal setting or issue definition;
   - Raising awareness of issues;
   - Building trust and confidence;
   - Building spirit;
   - Monitoring changes in the community and the environment.
5. THE PARTIES ACKNOWLEDGE THAT CONSULTATION WITH TANGATA WHENUA:

- Is required by legislation;
- Involves more than notifying tangata whenua - it is not enough to merely send the local iwi a copy of applications or proposals;
- Should take place at the earliest stages of a process;
- Requires the Council to make sure it is properly informed of what the interests of tangata whenua are;
- Requires that it "...shall take into account the Treaty of Waitangi..." (s.8 Resource Management Act 1991) in performing its functions.

6. THE PARTIES AGREE CONSULTATION IS NOT:

- Simply a notification of intention;
- A means of avoiding, buying off or reducing the level of submissions likely to be received on any particular issue: as consultation raises the community's level of awareness of an issue, it may have the opposite effect;
- Simply a public relations exercise;
- A matter of counting all the submissions for a proposal and all the submissions against, and making a decision on the basis of a 'voting' exercise;
- A mechanism that will necessarily produce clear answers to contentious issues;
- A mechanism that will make decisions.
### Appendix 2

**WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COMMUNITY OUTCOMES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>There is a safe environment for all</th>
<th>Transport is accessible, convenient, reliable, affordable and sustainable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Harm to people from natural and manmade hazards is minimised, and the District has the capacity and resilience to respond to natural disasters</td>
<td>The standard of our District's roads is keeping pace with increasing traffic numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Crime, injury and road accidents are minimised</td>
<td>• Christchurch is readily accessible by cycle, car, truck, bus or train, and the communities in the District are well linked with each other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Our District is well served by emergency services and volunteers are encouraged</td>
<td>• The District is well served by public transport</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>There is sufficient clean water to meet the needs of communities and ecosystems</th>
<th>Businesses in the District are diverse, adaptable, and growing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The demand for water is kept to a sustainable level</td>
<td>• There are growing numbers of business and employment opportunities in the District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Harm to the environment from the spread of contaminants into ground and surface water is minimised</td>
<td>• There are sufficient and appropriate places where new businesses are able to set up in our District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• There are opportunities for our young people to enter employment and gain skills in our District</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core utility services are provided in a timely, sustainable and affordable manner</th>
<th>The community's needs for health and social services are met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Energy and telecommunications services have sufficient capacity</td>
<td>• Our people are supported by a wide range of health services that are available and accessible in our District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Solid waste is minimised and residues do not cause harm to the environment</td>
<td>• Participation in community-based support services is acknowledged and encouraged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Water supplies to communities are of a high quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Housing is affordable and available to meet the needs of an ageing population, responses to natural disasters, and population growth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The air is clean</th>
<th>The land is healthy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Reliance on open fires and older style burners for home heating in Kaiapoi and Rangiora is reduced</td>
<td>• Soils are protected from inappropriate farming practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The smells from farming activities are usually only short term and/or seasonal</td>
<td>• The loss of topsoil by wind erosion is minimised</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>There are areas of significant indigenous vegetation and habitats for indigenous fauna</th>
<th>The community's cultures, arts and heritage are conserved and celebrated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Conservation of significant areas of vegetation and/or habitats is encouraged</td>
<td>• Heritage buildings and sites are protected and the cultural heritage link with our past is preserved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Different cultures are acknowledged and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public spaces and facilities are plentiful, accessible and high quality</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• People enjoy clean water at our beaches and rivers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There is a wide variety of public places and spaces to meet people’s needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There are wide ranging opportunities for people to enjoy the outdoors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The range of community and recreation facilities meets the changing needs of our community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>The distinctive character of our towns, villages and rural areas is maintained</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The centres of our main towns are safe, convenient and attractive places to visit and do business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Our rural land is mainly used for farming</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>People have wide ranging opportunities for learning and being informed</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Our learning institutions are well resourced, have the capacity to cope with population growth, and the capacity to meet the needs of tertiary students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Our people are easily able to get the information they need</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>People are friendly and caring, creating a strong sense of community in our District</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• There are wide ranging opportunities for people of different ages to participate in community and recreational activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The particular recreational needs of children and young people are met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Public effect is given to the spirit of the Treaty of Waitangi</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The Council and Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga through the Memorandum of Understanding continue to build their relationship</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>There are wide ranging opportunities for people to contribute to the decision-making by local, regional and national organisations that affects our District</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Local, regional and national organisations make information about their plans and activities readily available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Local, regional and national organisations make every effort to accommodate the views of people who contribute to consultations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Glossary

hapū
an alliance of families of inter-related members that descend from an agreed ancestor; sometimes referred to as sub-tribe, clan, section of a large tribe (also adj.=pregnant).

Iwi authority
the mandated group to represent its members. Statutorily the Waimakariri District Council is obliged to consult with Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu.

Rangatiratanga
see tino rangatiratanga

tangata whenua
the people be they organised as Iwi, or hapū, that has present and future occupation of land or sea resources. This occupation may be shared or sole in respect to any land area. Loosely translated as “people of the land”, meaning the people who hold the turangawaewae in an area, according to tribal and hapū custom.

Manawhenua
a specific group of tangata whenua that manage the resources according to occupation and the expression of rights to resources and practices such as mahinga kai. Historically, the prestige of the manawhenua was gauged by the strength of their fire - they are the fire holders.

taonga
valued resources that are treasured possessions. Both tangible and intangible; for example the Waimakariri River and Maori language.

tikanga Maori
Maori traditions, customs, lore or law, and accepted protocols.

tino rangatiratanga
full Chieftainship and authority, including the right to permit or deny others. The basis of sovereignty.

waahi tapu
places (waahi) of sacred and extreme importance where revered people and relatives have been buried; or significant events or practices had occurred.

whānau
extended family groups within the hapū.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Current Participant(s)</th>
<th>Future Intentions</th>
<th>Time Commitment/Comment</th>
<th>Remuneration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rūnanga/Council Liaison Meeting</strong></td>
<td>Bi-monthly (3rd Thursday at 10am-12 noon)</td>
<td>To provide governance oversight to the relationship and ensure all key and emerging issues are considered</td>
<td>Clare Williams and Hoana Burgman and MKT Representative(s)</td>
<td>Continuing with bi-monthly meetings, with annual Hui every March</td>
<td>2 hours every two months with prep time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Waimakariri Water Zone Committee</strong></td>
<td>Monthly meeting, and fortnightly workshop in between (on Monday afternoons)</td>
<td>A joint Committee with ECan (with community representatives) to oversee implementation of the Cant Water Management Strategy</td>
<td>Provision for Two members - Arapata Reuben - John Cooke</td>
<td>The Committee is ongoing; the work programme for the foreseeable future is oversight of implementation of the Zone Implementation Plan Addendum and Solutions Package recommendations to ECan and WDC.</td>
<td>Over the next year the Committee could generate quite a workload and includes workshops and other meetings. Probably averages about 4-8 hours per month commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kaiapoi River Rehabilitation Working Party</strong></td>
<td>Generally Quarterly meeting</td>
<td>To provide input to rehabilitation of the Kaiapoi River</td>
<td>tbc Amy Beran, MKT also attends</td>
<td>WP likely to continue for the next two years, at least</td>
<td>Two hours per quarter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kaiapoi Regeneration Steering Group</strong></td>
<td>1st Monday of every month</td>
<td>To provide input and governance over Kaiapoi Regeneration areas</td>
<td>Arapata Reuben</td>
<td>Group likely to continue for at least two years.</td>
<td>2 hours plus preparation per month. We also need to develop co-governance arrangements for the Mahinga Kai areas in South Kaiapoi. This has yet to be determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cam River Working Party</strong></td>
<td>Generally Quarterly</td>
<td>To provide input to the enhancement of the Cam River system</td>
<td>Arapata Reuben</td>
<td>Likely to continue for next two years</td>
<td>2 hours per quarter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northern Pegasus Bay By-Law Implementation Plan Advisory Group</strong></td>
<td>Minimum of six-monthly</td>
<td>To ensure effective implementation of the Plan.</td>
<td>Gaye Stanley</td>
<td>Likely to continue until December 2019. Maybe monthly</td>
<td>Initially 2 hours a month, then possibly 2 hours per quarter.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Ngāi Tūāhuriri Engagement with Waimakariri District Council @ May 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Lead Team and Responsibilities</th>
<th>Ongoing</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>To provide governance over the activities of the Trust</td>
<td>3 Ngāi Tūāhuriri Trustees (Joseph Hullen, Hoana Burgman, Nukuroa Tirikatene-Nash - tbc)</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Min 2 hours a month plus preparation, Any fees paid by Ngāi Tūāhuriri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Development of MR 873</td>
<td>No formal relationship exists at present</td>
<td>To consider planning and infrastructure requirements to support residential development</td>
<td>Landowners and their representatives/Te Maire Tau is key contact</td>
<td>Possibly need additional support for landowners and Rūnanga/Council co-ordination</td>
<td>As required, Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Jurisdiction of the Mahi Tahi Joint Development Committee

Pursuant to Clause 30, Schedule 7 of the Local Government Act 2002, the Mahi Tahi Joint Development Committee is established as an expression of partnership with Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga to further develop the working together relationship between the Council and Ngāi Tūāhuriri (the parties).

Scope of Activity

The Mahi Tahi Joint Development Committee shall be responsible for preparing recommendations to the Council and Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga that:

- In light of current engagement mechanisms between these two parties and the principles-based redefinition by Ngāi Tūāhuriri of its structure(s), propose forms of engagement and supporting arrangements between the parties to provide input to the revision and recasting of their current memorandum of understanding – and following that to give effect to that MOU;
- Propose co-governance structures and processes to achieve the required results in relation to Mahinga Kai areas(s), particularly within the Regeneration Area in Kaiapoi; and, the achievement of Ngāi Tūāhuriri aspirations for development of Maori Reserve 873 among other Reserves with particular regard to roles and responsibilities under the Resource Management Act 1991.
- Consider how the particular relationship of iwi with water as reflected in the Iwi Management Plan may best be integrated into structures and processes that guide the Council’s responsibilities in relation to water resource management.
- Provide guidance on strategic directions and other identified high priority topics within the scope of the current Waimakariri District Plan Review, drawing among other sources on the commissioned work of Mahaanui Kurataiao Ltd

Specific Committee Structure and Process

The Mahi Tahi Joint Development Committee shall consist of the Mayor and two Councillors and three representatives nominated by Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga.

It will determine its own meeting arrangements while complying in all other respects with the requirements of Council’s Standing Orders and the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987. It is expected that the Committee will meet at least monthly but at such other frequency and purpose as it determines.

The meeting quorum shall be two members from each of the Council and Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga. The Mayor and a nominated Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga member of the Committee shall co-chair meetings.
Jurisdiction of the Mahi Tahi Joint Development Committee

Meetings shall be public unless there are compelling reasons under the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act to exclude the public.

From time to time and specifically to the 1 October 2019 final ordinary meeting of the 2016-19 triennium of the Council it shall report on activities and make recommendations to the Council and Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga.

The latter report shall include recommendations to the incoming Council regarding the future form and function of the Committee or other such structures and processes that guide the new Council thereafter in setting its way of working that embraces the spirit and intent of the Memorandum of Understanding that exists between the parties, or other such mutually agreed successor document.
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT FOR DECISION

FILE NO and TRIM NO:  RDG-10 / 190522072233

REPORT TO:  Council

DATE OF MEETING:  4 June 2019

FROM:  Joanne McBride – Roading & Transport Manager

SUBJECT:  North Eyre Road and Browns Road Sealing Statement of Proposal for Special Consultative Procedure for Targeted Rate and appointment of Hearing Panel

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

Department Manager

Chief Executive

1. SUMMARY

1.1 This report is to seek Council approval of the Statement of Proposal for the Special Consultative Procedure (SCP) for the targeted rate for the sealing of North Eyre Road and Browns Road and to seek appointment of three Councillors to the Hearing Panel.

1.2 It is recommended that Councillor Meyer as the Roading Portfolio Holder be appointed the chair of the Hearing Panel with the other two members decided at the Council meeting.

1.3 The proposed timeline for the SCP is as follows

- Submissions – opens on 5 July 2019 and closes on 2 August 2019
- Hearings and deliberations – Thursday 8 August 2019
- Council decision – Tuesday 3 September 2019

1.4 Subject to the outcome of the Special Consultative Procedure the sealing of North Eyre Road and Browns Road will be undertaken in September / October 2019.

Attachments:

i. Statement of Proposal (Doc 190522072232).
ii. Map of Sealing Area (Appendix 1 included below).

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 190522072233;

(b) Approves the attached Statement of Proposal for a Targeted Rate for North Eyre Road and Browns Road property owners for their contribution for sealing North Eyre Road and Browns Road adjacent to their properties (Doc 19041505924);

(c) Appoints Councillors Meyer (Chair) and ..................... and ..................... to the North Eyre Road and Browns Road Sealing Targeted Rate Hearing Panel;
Notes that the targeted rate will take effect for 1 July 2020;

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

3. BACKGROUND

3.1 In August 2018 the Utilities and Roading Committee approved the sealing of North Eyre Road and Browns Road on the condition the property owners pay a contribution of 50% as required by the Private Funding of Seal Extensions Policy.

3.2 Staff have been working with the spokesperson for the property owners and have provided information around costings and options for payment.

3.3 Staff have been advised that it is the groups’ preference to have a targeted rate levied on the properties to allow the sealing costs to be paid off over time and that the preferred period is a 25 year term.

3.4 In April 2019 a workshop was held with the Utilities and Roading Committee to further discuss the seal extension request and the rating term which had been requested by the residents.

4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

4.1. The following options are available to Council:

4.2. Option One – Approve consultation being undertaken on a Targeted Rate.

The attached Statement of Proposal for the SCP details the properties which would be included in the targeted rate area, the targeted rate amount, the sections of road to be sealed and the proposed timeline.

4.3. The proposal gives property owners the option of paying their share by a lump sum payment or by a targeted rate on their property.

4.4. The proposed timeline is as follows

- Submissions – open on 21st June 2019 and close on 22nd July 2019
- Hearings and deliberations – Thursday 8th August 2019
- Council decision – Tuesday 3rd September 2019

4.5. Option Two – Decline the option of a Targeted Rate

This would very likely result in the sealing not being considered affordable for the affected property owners and as such sealing would be unlikely to proceed. This would continue to have a negative impact on property owners.

3.5 Not all property owners within the area have agreed to fund the sealing however a group of six have indicated they are prepared to do this. If it was decided that all properties adjoining these sections of road that would benefit from the sealing should contribute to the cost of the works then there would be eleven properties that could contribute. It is noted that there are approximately five properties which have houses located a reasonable distance from the road and as such dust is unlikely to be considered an issue for them.

4.6. The Management Team have reviewed this report and support the recommendations.
5. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

5.1. **Groups and Organisations**

5.2. The property owners adjacent to the road have requested the sealing and the spokesperson for the group has been working with Council staff on this issue.

5.3. **Wider Community**

5.4. No specific wider community views have been sought.

6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**

6.2. The estimated cost of sealing North Eyre Road (Browns Rd intersection to the western boundary of no. 943 North Eyre Rd) and Browns Road (North Eyre Road to no. 746 Browns Road), a total length of 1.925 km, is $343,684.00 (excluding GST).

6.3. The Council share of the sealing is 50% of the cost is $171,842.00 (excluding GST).

6.4. There is sufficient funding available in the Roading Subdivision Contribution Budget to fund the Council’s share of the work.

6.5. The property owners share is, therefore, $171,842.00 (excluding GST) spread over six (6) properties. This equates to $28,640.33 (excluding GST) or $32,936.38 including GST per property.

6.6. The targeted rate will be $2,221.20 (including GST) per year / per property over a twenty five year period at an interest rate of 4.5%.

6.7. The Council has received one price of $343,684.00 excluding GST for the sealing work to date.

6.8. **Community Implications**

6.9. The sealing of Browns Road (North Eyre Rd to No. 746 Browns Road) and North Eyre Rd (Browns Rd intersection to the western boundary of no. 943 North Eyre Rd) has been specifically requested by the property owners adjacent to the road and staff have been working with the spokesperson to consider options.

6.10. **Risk Management**

6.11. A risk to the Council if the targeted rate is approved is the property owners who do not support the targeted rate do not pay the rate and challenge the Council in court. This risk can be mitigated by ensuring the reason for the targeted rate is clearly stated and that the payment by the property owners is a contribution to enable the sealing to happen for their benefit.

6.12. **Health and Safety**

6.13. Normal construction Health & Safety risks will apply. This will be mitigated by ensuring the physical works contractor is Sitewise registered and has an appropriate Site Specific Safety Plan.
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**
Under Section 83 of the Local Government Act a Special Consultative Procedure is required because there is a change being made to the rating regime for these properties from that which is shown in the Long Term Plan and a new targeted rate is being set.

7.3. **Community Outcomes**

   **h. The distinctive character of our takiwā - towns, villages and rural areas is maintained**
   - Our rural areas retain their amenity and character. 3,4

7.4. **Delegations**
Council has the authority to request a Special Consultative Process be undertaken. There is no appropriate delegation to a committee.
Summary of Information

Proposed Targeted Rate for North Eyre Road and Browns Road property owners for their contribution for sealing North Eyre Road and Browns Road adjacent to their properties

The Council proposes to put in place a Targeted Rate on those properties as shown on the attached map to enable the property owners to pay, through their rates, for their share of the cost of sealing the sections of North Eyre Road and Browns Road adjacent to their properties as shown on the attached map.

Property owners will have the option of paying their share by one separate lump sum payment or a targeted rate over 25 years to repay a loan.

Council have received a request from residents in this area for the road to be sealed.

The Council policy for sealing unsealed roads is that traffic volumes need to be around 300 to 400 vehicles per day before NZTA subsidy can be claimed and as such these two sections of road do not meet this funding criteria.

The alternative is that residents help fund the sealing under the “Private Funding of Seal Extensions Policy” which allows roads to be seal upon approval from Council if the residents are prepared to fund a 50% share of the cost of sealing.

The cost of sealing the section of North Eyre Road and Browns Road as shown on the attached map is $343,684.00 (excluding GST). Therefore for the sealing to progress the residents would need to fund 50% of the cost being $171,842.00 (excluding GST) and Council would need to fund the other 50%.

Over the past few years property owners along Browns Road and North Eyre Road have regularly requested the Council to seal the road because the dust from the roads has a very negative impact on their quality of life and the road surface is often rough. The Council has previously agreed to fund the remaining 50% cost of the sealing as required by the policy on the condition the property owners pay the balance of $171,842.00 plus GST. This amounts to $32,936.38 (including GST) per property. The property owners have requested that the rating period for the sealing be taken over 25 years. Including interest this would result in a yearly cost of $2,221.20 per property including GST.

The Councils 50% share of the sealing is included in the Councils Annual Plan budget in the 2019/20 year.

The Council has been working with a spokesperson for the property owners on their willingness to pay this share and on their preferred method of payment with the options being either by lump sum payment or through a targeted rate. The preference of property owners is generally to pay through a targeted rate.

It is on the basis of this feedback that this proposal is being put forward in order to formalise the targeted rate.

The lump sum payment option would be $32,936.38 (including GST) per property and payable by 31 May 2020.

The targeted rate option will be $2,221.20 per property / per year (including GST) for a period of 25 years per property. This amount includes interest of 4.5% on the loan the Council will need
to take out to fund the work. The targeted rate will apply from 1 July 2020 and will end on 30 June 2045.

Copies of the Proposal

Copies of the Statement of Proposal for the proposed targeted rate can be picked up or viewed at any Council Service Centre or Library during ordinary office hours, or downloaded from the Council’s website: waimakariri.govt.nz, during the consultation period.

Submissions

Submissions on this proposal can be made to the Council between **21 June 2019** and **22 July 2019**. Please include a name and address. Anonymous feedback will be considered at the Council’s discretion.

The submissions will be heard by a Council Hearing Panel on 8 August 2019 at 6:00pm at the Council building in Rangiora. Please state if you wish to speak to your submission at the Hearing. Submissions on this proposal can be made either:

**Email:** office@wmk.govt.nz

**Post:** North Eyre Road & Browns Road Submissions
    Freepost 1667
    Waimakariri District Council
    Private Bag 1005
    Rangiora

**Hand deliver:** The Council building at 215 High Street, Rangiora or any Library branch or Service Centre.

For more Information:

**Contact:**
Joanne McBride – Roading & Transport Manager
Phone - 0800 965 468 Ex 8634

**Email:** joanne.mcbride@wmk.govt.nz
Statement of Proposal

Statement of Proposal for a Targeted Rate for North Eyre Road and Browns Road property owners for their contribution for sealing North Eyre Road and Browns Road adjacent to their properties

Introduction

This Statement of Proposal is prepared to formalise the funding arrangement for the sealing of North Eyre Road and Browns Road as shown on the attached Draft Rating Policy map and is made under Section 83 of the Local Government Act 2002.

The documents relating to this proposal are attached to this Statement of Proposal. Copies of the Statement of Proposal are also available on the Council’s website at waimakariri.govt.nz and at all Council Service Centre’s and Libraries during the consultation period which runs from 21 June 2019 to 22 July 2019.

Nature of Proposal

The Council proposes to introduce a Targeted Rate for inclusion in the 2020/21 Draft Annual Plan under Sections 16-18 of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 to fund the property owners’ share of the cost of sealing the sections of Barkers Road as shown on the attached map.

The Targeted Rate will be a fixed amount on each rating unit situated within the North Eyre Road and Browns Road Rating Area, illustrated on the attached map, where a lump sum contribution was not received prior to 31 May 2020. Confirmation of take up of the targeted rate or the lump sum will be required by 20 December 2019.

The proposed rate will take effect from 1 July 2020 for a period of 25 years, ending on 30 June 2045.

The amount of the targeted rate will be $2,221.20 per property / per year (including GST). This amount includes 4.5% interest on the loan the Council will need to take out to fund the work.

Property owners will have the option of paying a one-off lump sum of $32,936.38 (including GST) by 31 May 2020, instead of having a targeted rate applied to their property.

Any future subdivisions within the new rating area will be required to contribute towards the outstanding balance of the rating area account.

As part of this targeted rate process the Council invites the affected property owners to comment on the proposal.

Reason for this Proposal

Background

In recent years a small number of subdivisions were developed on North Eyre Road and Browns Road. These subdivisions have not been enough to collect sufficient contributions to trigger the seal extension policy and traffic volumes are not high enough to attract NZTA subsidy for sealing.

Since that time the Council has received complaints from property owners on North Eyre Road and Browns Road about the dust from the road and the road condition.
A report was taken to the Utilities & Roading Committee in August 2018 seeking approval for the sealing of North Eyre Road and Browns Road subject to the property owners agreeing to fund 50% of the cost of sealing in accordance with the Private Funding of Seal Extensions Policy. A further update was taken to Council in November 2018.

**Council Policy for Private Funding of Seal Extensions**

The Council policy for sealing unsealed roads using the Private Funding of Seal Extensions Policy states that “The Council will seal roads where the adjoining property owner is willing to fund 50% of the cost of the sealing.”

The cost of sealing the sections of Barkers Road as shown on the attached map is $343,684.00 (excluding GST). As such the private contribution share for sealing would need to be at least $171,771 (excluding GST) in order for the sealing to take place.

**Council Decisions and Long Term Plan Provisions**

In August 2018 the Utilities and Roading Committee approved the sealing of North Eyre Road (Browns Rd intersection to the western boundary of no. 943 North Eyre Rd) and Browns Road (North Eyre Road to no. 746 Browns Road) under the Private Funding of Seal Extensions Policy subject to the adjoining property owners agreeing to pay the amount required to reach 50% of the cost of the sealing.

In June 2019 the Council approved the commencement of a Special Consultative Procedure for a targeted rate for the sealing of North Eyre Road (Browns Rd intersection to the western boundary of no. 943 North Eyre Rd) and Browns Road (North Eyre Road to no. 746 Browns Road). The Council also approved budget of $190,000 for Council’s share of the sealing work, subject to the property owners agreeing to fund their share. Further prices will be sought to ensure this is good value for money however having the price gives an accurate indication of the amount to be paid by the property owners.

There is funding available in the Roading Subdivision Contribution Budget in the 2019/20 year for the Council’s share of the sealing.

**North Eyre Road and Browns Road**

Staff have been working with the spokesperson for the North Eyre Road and Browns Road residents and have been provided written confirmation from a number of property owners that they would be prepared to contribute to the cost of sealing these sections of road.

It is on the basis of this feedback that this proposal is being put forward in order to formalise the targeted rate.

**Options Available to the Council**

The following options are available to the Council

1. **Put in place a targeted rate as per this proposal.**

   This option meets the wishes of the property owners who are willing to pay a share of the sealing but prefer the targeted rate to make it affordable to them. This option would require all property owners within the Proposed Target Rate Area to contribute to the cost, including those who are opposed. This is likely to be the only option that would guarantee the road being sealed.

2. **Do not put in place a targeted rate and request the property owners pay their share by lump sum**

   This option would most likely result in the road not being sealed as the lump sum may not be affordable for property owners. If the road is not sealed the property owners will continue to be negatively impacted by the dust and road condition.
3. Do not seal the roads now and wait for further development (more financial contributions to be taken)

This option is unlikely to result in sealing being undertaken for a significant length of time.

Community Outcomes
The sealing of North Eyre Road and Browns Road will contribute to the following community outcomes:

- There is a safe environment for all
  - Crime, injury and road accidents are minimised.
  - Harm to people from natural and man-made hazards is minimised and our district has the capacity and resilience to respond to natural disasters.

- Transport is accessible, convenient, reliable, affordable and sustainable
  - The standard of our District's roads is keeping pace with increasing traffic numbers.

Related Documents
The following documents are attached to this Statement of Proposal and form part of the Statement of Proposal:

- Summary of Information
- Draft Rating Policy map

Joanne McBride
Roading and Transport Manager
Appendix One

North Eyre Rd / Browns Road Area of Sealing shown in Red

Properties for rating Area shown in green
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT FOR INFORMATION

FILE NO and TRIM NO: RDG-34 / 190523072402

REPORT TO: Council

DATE OF MEETING: 4 June 2019

FROM: Joanne McBride – Roading & Transport Manager
Gerard Cleary – Manager, Utilities & Roading

SUBJECT: Funding for Park and Ride Facilities

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

Department Manager
Chief Executive

1. SUMMARY

1.1 This report is to request Council give consideration to passing a resolution to bring forward funding for Park and Ride facilities within the district.

1.2 Staff have been working with the Greater Christchurch partners on a package of Travel Demand Management measures which will help support the new Northern Corridor.

1.3 The Travel Demand Management package is likely to include:
   • Marketing and Communications at road opening
   • Park & Ride facilities
   • “Mobility as a Service” (MaaS) Ride Share software (to encourage and facilitate car sharing)
   • Express Bus Services
   • Customer Insight Research (to inform decision making)
   • Education campaigns
   • Travel Planning

1.4 Park & Ride facilities will be required in key strategic locations in order to provide a safe and convenient place for commuters to park their vehicles and then connect with either public transport or with other commuters for car sharing.

1.5 NZTA have submitted a request for funding for these TDM measures including two Park and Ride facilities to be located within Waimakariri District, each able to accommodate approximately 100-120 vehicles (location to be confirmed).

1.6 It has been acknowledged by the partners that local share of funding to support travel demand measures across the partners sit out in future years and to bring this forward will require changes to be made as part of Annual Plan or Long Term Plan processes.

1.7 To assist NZTA are proposing to fund the local share up front with an expectation that Council share will be brought forward and repaid in the 2020/21 financial year.

1.8 As this funding is currently within the Long Term Plan, bring the funding forward could be agreed by resolution from Council.
2. **RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 190523072402;

(b) **Commits** to funding Park & Ride facilities required as part of Travel Demand Management Measures during the 2020/21 financial year and up to a maximum value of $4 million as allowed for in the Long Term Plan, subject to NZTA confirmation of a 51% Funding Assistance Rate;

(c) **Advises** NZTA that if they front fund the project then Council will repay the local share in 2020/21;

(d) **Notes** that funding of $4 million for Park & Ride currently sits in 2025/26 and 2026/27 and that this resolution will commit Council to bringing forward funding into the 2020/21 financial year;

(e) **Notes** that the current high level estimate for these facilities is $3,420,000 (including $600,000 of operational capex);

(f) **Notes** that $100,000 of funding has been brought forward to 2019/20 for investigation;

(g) **Notes** that further work is needed to refine costs, confirm locations of the facilities and consider options around staging of the delivery of these sites before funding is brought forward;

(h) **Notes** that staff will continue to work in conjunction with the Greater Christchurch Partners to confirm the scope of Travel Demand Management required and report back to Council;

3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1 In 2009 Council agreed to adopt the Greater Christchurch Travel Demand Management (TDM) Strategy and Action Plan. This document sets the travel demand management policy direction, targets and actions to achieve a more sustainable transport system in the UDS area.

3.2 Christchurch has one of the highest usage rates of private cars for commuting in New Zealand with around 85% of vehicles being single occupancy vehicles.

3.3 The Christchurch Investment Story and other regional planning initiatives set the aspiration for moving from this heavily single occupancy private vehicle based travel mode to a more sustainable transport system that has greater choice for the travelling public.

3.4 Within the wider context, there is an increasing demand for travel south across the Waimakariri River between Waimakariri District and Christchurch City, particularly in the morning peak.

3.5 Construction of the Northern Arterial Project began in 2016 and provides the following:

- A four lane motorway (two lanes each way) between Cranford Street and the existing motorway immediately south of Chaneys Off-ramp. This project is due to be completed by mid-2020.
- A shared path / cycleway between Cranford Street and Chaneys Off-ramp.
- A 3rd northbound lane across the Waimakariri River Bridge, and up to the Tram Road off ramp.
3.6 Subsequent to construction starting on the Northern Arterial Project, consent has been granted to construct a 3rd southbound lane, and a “clip on” cycleway across the Waimakariri River Bridge. One of the conditions of this consent is that this 3rd southbound lane is to be a High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lane.

3.7 A single stage business case (Waimakariri Connections) was completed in late 2018, which recommended the construction of an HOV lane on part of the CNC. This was endorsed by the Transport Agency, and a funding request is due to be considered shortly to enable implementation of the HOV lane to coincide with the CNC opening.

3.8 The stage business case highlighted the need for a series of supporting travel demand management measures (TDM) to ensure and maximise the success of the HOV lane to help achieve key government outcomes signalled in the Government Policy Statement for Land Transport, such as mode shift. Further, a common thread in international best practise TDM literature is that successful TDM investment hinges on coherent packaging of interventions. Certain TDM interventions will need to be in place at the time that the HOV lane opens, otherwise the success of the HOV lane would most likely be compromised.

3.9 Staff have been involved in discussions with the Greater Christchurch partners on the package of Travel Demand Management measures.

3.10 For the HOV lane the Travel Demand Management package is likely to include:
- Marketing and Communications at road opening
- Park & Ride facilities (detailed in the section below)
- “Mobility as a Service” (MaaS) Ride Share software (to encourage and facilitate car sharing)
- Express Bus Services
- Customer Insight Research (to inform decision making)
- Education campaigns
- Travel Planning

3.11 Park & Ride facilities will be required in key strategic locations in order to provide a safe and convenient place for commuters to park their vehicles and then connect with either public transport or with other commuters for car sharing.

3.12 Abley’s are currently undertaking work for Council on Park and Ride. As part of this work consideration is being given to the district holistically and where facilities would be best located. It may be that a larger number of smaller Park and Ride facilities initially would provide the best coverage however it is noted that there needs to be the ability to scale these in the future as and when demand grows. This needs to be confirmed.

3.13 It is noted that $4 million of funding for Park & Ride facilities is currently sitting in the 2025/26 and 2026/27 years.

3.14 Further updates will be brought to Council as this work progresses.

4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

4.1. The Council is a partner to initiatives through the Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy. In 2009 Council agreed to adopt the Greater Christchurch Travel Demand Management (TDM) Strategy and Action Plan.

4.2. The Christchurch Investment Story and other regional planning frameworks set the aspiration for moving from this heavily single occupancy private vehicle based travel mode to a more sustainable transport system that has greater choice for the travelling public.
The focus is to increase the people carrying capacity of the transport system rather than vehicle capacity, to cope with forecast growth in the region. This means a shift towards car sharing and the use of mass transport systems such as buses.

4.3. The current Roading Activity Management Plan and 2018-28 Long Term Plan makes reference to travel demand management as a key means of managing future growth. There is funding for passenger transport infrastructure in the Long Term Plan, including park and ride.

4.4. That local share of funding to support Park and Ride sits out in future years and to bring this forward will require changes to be made at the 2020/21 Annual Plan round.

4.5. NZTA are proposing to fund the local share of travel demand management measures, including Park and Ride, up front with a commitment from Council that the local share will be brought forward and repaid in 2020/21.

4.6. As such a resolution would need to be passed by Council committing to the funding being brought forward as part of the 2021 Annual Plan process.

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

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. Groups and Organisations

5.2. No specific feedback has been sought on this issue.

5.3. Wider Community

5.4. Feedback has been sought through the current Annual Plan process on bringing forward funding for the investigation of Park and Ride. There were two options put forward in the consultation document:

- Option One – Council’s preference – A portion of the allocated budget ($100,000) be brought forward to the 2018/19 and 2019/20 years (split over two years) to allow for public transport infrastructure investigation to begin.
- Option Two – Status quo – Funding remains allocated for 2025 to 2027 years and investigation work is put off until then.

5.5. In total 61 submissions were received. Of these 42 were in favour of bringing the funding forward (69%) and 19 preferred to keep the status quo (31%).

6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1. Financial Implications

6.2. There is currently $4 million of funding shown in the 2018-28 Long Term Plan for Park & Ride facilities in Kaiapoi and Rangiora. This funding is shown across the 2025/26 and 2026/27 financial years. It is assumed NZTA funding share will be available for this project (meaning Council contribution is $1.96 million).

6.3. The funding application to NZTA for Travel demand Management measures indicates the likely cost to provide Park & Ride in Waimakariri District is around $3.4 million (including $600,000 of pre-implementation Capex). There has been limited information provided to staff to date, and more work needs to be done to confirm these costs, possible staging of facilities and the timing of the works. Council share at 49% would be approximately $1.66 million.
6.4. Assuming the current NZTA funding share rate of 51%, this would be covered by future budget levels, however it is noted that as and when demand grows that expansion of parking facilities may be required. This would be addressed in future Long Term Plans.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding in 2018-28 LTP for Park &amp; Ride (2025/26 &amp;26/27)</th>
<th>$4M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Made up of:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZTA Share (51%)</td>
<td>$2.04M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Share (49%)</td>
<td>$1.96M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Park &amp; Ride cost from HOV Business Case (initial stage)</th>
<th>$3.4M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assuming 51% Financial Assistance Rate from NZTA:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZTA Share (51%)</td>
<td>$1.74M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Share (49%)</td>
<td>$1.66M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.5. There are also likely to be ongoing operational costs associated with Travel demand measures such as education, software, research, travel planning and operational maintenance of Park & Ride areas. At this stage the very high level estimate of these costs to Council is around $300,000 per annum total costs (excluding any NZTA subsidy).

6.6. $100,000 of funding has been requested to be brought forward in 2018/19 and 2019/20 as part of the Annual Plan process to allow for investigation to begin.

6.7. Park & Ride funding which currently sits in the future years (2025/26 and 2026/27) will need to be brought forward as part of the 2020/21 Annual Plan process, to allow for these facilities to be developed. The exact level of funding is to be confirmed however it is anticipated that this would be within the budget level already included in the Long Term Plan.

6.8. **Community Implications**

6.9. NZTA have been through a consultation process as part of the Northern Arterial Project and a public hearing has been held for the 3rd southbound lane on the Waimakariri River Bridge.

6.10. Further consultation, communications and education will be required around Travel Demand Management.

6.11. **Risk Management**

6.12. There is a risk of negative reaction to the introduction of Park & Ride facilities in the district. This risk will be managed by the education and publicity around travel demand management and sustainable travel options.

6.13. **Health and Safety**

6.14. There are no specific Health & Safety considerations to be considered as part of this report.

7. **CONTEXT**

7.1. **Policy**

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

The Land Transport Management Act is the relevant legislation in this matter.

7.3. **Community Outcomes**

This report consider the following outcomes:

*There is a safe environment for all*
- Harm to people from natural and man-made hazards is minimised.
- Our district has the capacity and resilience to quickly recover from natural disasters and adapt to the effects of climate change.
- Crime, injury and harm from road crashes, gambling, and alcohol abuse are minimised.

*Transport is accessible, convenient, reliable and sustainable*
- The standard of our District’s roads is keeping pace with increasing traffic numbers.
- Communities in our District are well linked with each other and Christchurch is readily accessible by a range of transport modes.
- Public transport serves our District effectively.

7.4. **Delegations**

Council has the authority to receive information and consider all relevant facts.
1. SUMMARY

1.1. This report is to seek support for the draft terms of reference for the Town Centre Feature Lighting & Decorations Working Group.

1.2. The steering group will be responsible for overseeing the development of an implementation plan for feature lighting and decorations in both Rangiora and Kaiapoi town centres.

1.3. Membership of the working group is to include representation from the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi and Rangiora-Ashley Community Boards as well as two members from Council.

1.4. The appointed membership from the two Boards is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board</th>
<th>Rangiora Ashley Community Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chris Greengrass</td>
<td>Chris Prickett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip Redmond</td>
<td>Keith Galloway</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.5. This report requests that two representatives from Council be appointed to the working group and that the formation of the working group be endorsed by Council.

Attachments:

i. Draft Terms of Reference for the Town Centre Feature Lighting and Decorations Working Group (Trim 190328045690)
2. **RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 190519070361;

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

(c) **Approves** the Terms of Reference for the working group;

(d) **Approves** the formation of the Working Group with the representatives as recommended by the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi and Rangiora-Ashley Community Boards.

3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1 A report was taken to Council in January 2019 as part of the Annual Plan process to update Council on town centre decorations and lighting installation carried out in Rangiora and Kaiapoi.

3.2 As part of this process it was agreed a working group would be set up to consider future lighting and decoration requirements in Rangiora and Kaiapoi town centres, oversee the development of an implementation plan and have an overview of the implementation process.

3.3 The working party is to meet on a monthly basis and will have a Project Manager from within the Project delivery Unit to support the group.

3.4 Reports were taking to the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi and Rangiora-Ashley Community Boards with the draft terms of reference and it was requested that the Boards appoint two members each to the working group.

4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1. A draft terms of reference has been prepared for the working group which sets clear objectives for the group.

4.2. The process of deciding the level of feature lighting and decorations in the town centres will require specialist input and consultation particularly in the area of lighting. This is likely to include preparation of a brief, options assessment and undertaking trials before further progressing the design.

4.3. In respect to decorations, consideration will need to be given to the requirement and possible scope of decorations required.

4.4. Budget provision in 2019/20 of $50,000 has been requested as part of the Annual Plan process to allow for specialist lighting designs to be undertaken.

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

5.1. Groups and Organisations

5.2. No specific feedback has been sought to date however consultation will be undertaken with the Promotions Associations and town centre business on these issues as part of the wider project.

5.3. Wider Community

5.4. Community views on town centre lighting and decorations have not been sought, however it is considered that there is a community expectation that the lights and decorations will continue to be installed as they have been in previous years.

6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1. Financial Implications

6.2. As detailed in 4.4, budget provision in 2019/20 of $50,000 has been requested as part of the Annual Plan process to allow for specialist lighting designs to be undertaken.

6.3. No other budget is currently allocated for additional lighting or decorations.

6.4. Community Implications

6.5. The working party will provide feedback to Community Boards and Council as work progresses.

6.6. Risk Management

6.7. There is a risk of not meeting Community expectation. This risk can be mitigated by carrying out reviews, consultation and securing specialist services in this knowledge area.

6.8. Health and Safety

6.9. There are no specific Health & Safety considerations to be considered as part of this report.

7. CONTEXT

7.1. Policy

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

7.2. Legislation

There is no relevant legislation in this matter.

7.3. Community Outcomes

This report consider the following outcomes:

Public spaces and facilities are plentiful, accessible and high quality
- There is a wide variety of public places and spaces to meet people’s needs.

The distinctive character of our takiwā - towns, villages and rural areas is maintained
- The centres of our towns are safe, convenient and attractive places to visit and do business.
7.4. **Delegations**

The Council has the authority to receive information, consider requests for representation and endorse the formation of the working group.
WAIMAKARIRI
DISTRICT COUNCIL

TERMS OF REFERENCE
COUNCIL AND COMMITTEES

TOWN CENTRES DECORATIONS & LIGHTING WORKING GROUP

Membership

Two Council representatives (one to be the Town Centres Portfolio holder), two Rangiora-Ashley Community Board Representatives, two Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board Representatives, Manager of Utilities and Roading, Manager of Community & Recreation, Green Space Manager, Business and Centres Manager, Roading & Transportation Manager, plus a Project Manager.

1 Terms of Reference

The Working Group will be responsible for overseeing the development of an implementation plan for both Rangiora Town Centre and Kaiapoi Town Centre by XX 2019 as well as delivery of the plan, with reference to the following areas:

1.1 Consideration of future decoration requirements for the town centres,
1.2 Consideration of future lighting requirements (decorative, pedestrian and feature lighting) for the town centres,
1.3 Approve a programme of consultation and investigations necessary to develop the Implementation Plan,
1.4 Oversee the development of implementation plans for both Rangiora and Kaiapoi town centres,
1.5 Recommend adoption of the Implementation Plans for each town centre to both Boards and Council,
1.6 Provide regular update reports to the Council, the Rangiora-Ashley and Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Boards,
1.7 Oversee the implementation of the approved plans.

2 Objectives

2.1 To review the current levels of decorations and lighting in Rangiora and Kaiapoi Town Centres,
2.2 To resolve any outstanding issues with the current lighting feature installations as required,
2.3 To identify the opportunities for improvement in relation to decorations, feature lighting, pedestrian lighting and street lighting in Rangiora and Kaiapoi Town Centres,
2.4 To consider possible future enhancement of existing public spaces with regards to feature lighting and decorations,

2.5 To develop a comprehensive implementation plan which clearly defines the objectives and sought outcomes with regards to decorations and lighting,

2.6 To identify the roles of the Council and other stakeholders in the implementation plan, including making recommendations of key steps and actions,

2.7 To make a financial recommendation on capital and maintenance costs associated with feature lighting and decorations to Council.

3 Meeting Frequency

Monthly

4 Staff Support

Management Team and Council staff as required.

A Project Manager is being provided by the Project Delivery Unit.
1. SUMMARY

1.1 The purpose of this report is to seek approval to establish a working group for governance of environmental projects within Waimakariri District Council (WDC), such as the work programme of the Zone Implementation Programme Addendum (ZIPA).

1.2 The proposed name of the working group is the ‘Land and Water Working Group’, to align with the ‘Waimakariri Land and Water Solutions Programme’ – an alternative name adopted by the Waimakariri Water Zone Committee for the ZIPA workstream.

1.3 The Land and Water Working Group would receive reports, and recommendations would be referred to Council for decision-making. Examples of similar-functioning governance structures are the Solid and Hazardous Waste Working Party and the Regeneration Steering Group.

1.4 A Project Action Group (PAG), comprising of staff, will also be established for operational oversight of the ZIPA work programme and other environmental projects, with managerial oversight.

1.5 Similarly aligned environmental projects, such as Arohatia te Awa – Cherish the River, and wider biodiversity operations of the Biodiversity Officer would also sit under the Land and Water Working Group, under the proposed Terms of Reference.

1.6 Potentially existing Governance groups, for example the Cam River Enhancement Fund Subcommittee and the Kaiapoi River Rehabilitation Working Party, could be amalgamated with the Land and Water Working Group in the future.

1.7 Representation of the Land and Water Working Group is recommended to consist of members appointed by Council. The Working Group could be administered through a business support role provided by Utilities and Roading. Members are recommended to be selected from the following roles:

- Councillor with the Canterbury Water Management Strategy portfolio
- A Councillor from the Utilities and Roading Committee
- A Councillor from the Community and Recreation Committee
1.8 The new governance structure of a working group is proposed because environmental projects, such as for ZIPA, sit across multiple Council departments and committees. This structure also aims to establish a clearer relationship and line of communication with external relationships, such as with Environment Canterbury.

1.9 Land and Water Working Group meetings are recommended to be open to the public, i.e. with an invitation extended to the public as prescribed in the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act (1987).

1.10 Public consultation has been carried out on ZIPA implementation within Waimakariri District Council, with proposed WDC projects and funding in the Annual Plan 2019-20 consultation document. The majority of submissions supported Preferred Option A; for WDC to take on a coordinator, as well as advisor and educator role at $305,000 per annum for 2019-20 and 2020-21.

Attachments:
   i. Terms of Reference for the Land and Water Working Group (190305026331)

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 190215017783.

(b) **Approves** the establishment of a Land and Water Working Group, with direct reporting to Council.

(c) **Approves** the Terms of Reference for the Land and Water Working Group. (TRIM 190305026331)

(d) **Appoints** the following representatives to the ‘Land and Water’ Working Group:
   - Councillor with the Canterbury Water Management Strategy portfolio- Cr. Sandra Stewart
   - A Councillor from the Utilities and Roading Committee - To be confirmed
   - A Councillor from the Community and Recreation Committee- To be confirmed
   - A Councillor from the District Planning and Regulation Committee - To be confirmed
   - A Councillor-- To be confirmed
   - Manager of Utilities and Roading- Gerard Cleary
   - Manager of Community and Recreation – Chris Brown
Notes the Land and Water Project Action Group, comprising of staff will be established to draft and implement a work programme.

Notes that the Land and Water Working Group could be expanded to govern aligned Waimakariri District Council projects, such as the proposed ‘Arohatia te Awa’, and non-ZIPA biodiversity operations by the Biodiversity Officer role, subject to Council approval.

Notes that the Land and Water Working Group could be expanded to include the work of the Cam River Enhancement Fund Subcommittee and Kaiapoi River Rehabilitation Working Party, if so decided by a future Council.

Circulates this report to Community Boards and the Waimakariri Water Zone Committee.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1. The Canterbury Water Management Strategy (CWMS) Waimakariri Zone Committee developed a Zone Implementation Programme in 2011, and has now, after both extensive consideration of the best available science and extensive consultation with the public, developed an addendum (ZIPA). This ZIPA, or alternatively named the ‘Waimakariri Land and Water Solutions Programme’, with both statutory and non-statutory recommendations for action, is aimed at setting water quantity and water quality limits to improve the condition of fresh water resources in the Zone.

3.2. The Waimakariri Water Zone Committee approved the final ZIPA on the 19 November 2018. WDC Council approved the ZIPA on the 4 December 2018, and Environment Canterbury (Canterbury Regional Council) approved the ZIPA on the 13 December 2018.

3.3. This report follows on from a report regarding the Council adoption of the ZIPA and its implementation (TRIM 181217148924[v1]), which proposed freshwater and biodiversity projects, a Biodiversity Officer role and requested $305,000 per annum funding for 2019/20 and 2020/21.

3.4. The ZIPA Recommendations are divided into five chapters:

- Improving Stream Health;
- Protecting and Enhancing Indigenous Biodiversity;
- Reducing Nitrates;
- Managing Surface water – Flows and Allocations;
- Managing Groundwater – Allocations.

3.5. For this report, the 3 Waters team has led internal WDC discussions with the Greenspace team (Chris Brown and Grant MacLeod) regarding the organisational structure and governance of ZIPA, biodiversity operations and ‘Arohatia te Awa’ projects.

4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

Structure, membership and review

4.1. The role of the Land and Water Working Group is to:

- Govern delegated environmental work programmes;
- Be a primary link to Environment Canterbury regarding ZIPA Implementation;
- Make recommendations to Council or Council Committees, and oversee the implementation of Board, Council or Council Committee decisions;
- Lead and support community engagement;
• Give strategic level recommendations and guidance, for Council decision-making;
• Make recommendations to Council regarding the division of the overall budget for specific projects;
• Recommend approval of any changes to the environmental work programme;
• Review and monitor overall progress, including budget tracking;
• Provide a regular project overview to the Council, or relevant Council Committee, and reporting on WDC ZIPA recommendations, programme, budget, issues, risk, and health and safety;
• Provide recommendations on key documents where necessary, including but not limited reports or briefings to Council, Council Committees or Community Boards;
• Participate in planning workshops.

4.2. It is proposed that the Land and Water Working Group will meet bi-monthly, starting in July 2019.

4.3. At the first meeting of the Working Group a Chair will be elected, and a media spokesperson nominated.

4.4. A proposed governance structure for the implementation of ZIPA projects is outlined in Figure 1.

![Image of proposed governance and operational structure for the Land and Water Working Group and Project Action Group.]

**Figure 1**: Proposed governance and operational structure for the Land and Water Working Group and Project Action Group.

4.5. The Terms of Reference, attached to this report, are proposed for establishment of the Land and Water Working Group to confirm purpose, membership, frequency of meetings and administration/coordination support.

4.6. Land and Water Working Group membership will be reviewed in November 2019, post-Council elections. Another review is recommended at the end of the 2020/21, for effectiveness of the Working Group Terms of Reference. This is in-line with a review of ZIPA funding and projects at the same date.

Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga representation
4.7. Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga would provide an advisory role to the Land and Water Working Group through the existing monthly Rūnanga-WDC Meetings.

**Role of the Waimakariri Water Zone Committee**

4.8. The Waimakariri Water Zone Committee (WWZC) will continue with its advisory role to WDC, and will likely benefit from one cross-departmental governance structure and operational structure for ZIPA Implementation. As stated in the WWZC Terms of Reference, the WWZC will continue to:

4.8.1. Facilitate community involvement in the development, implementation, review and updating of a Zone Implementation Programme.

4.8.2. Monitor progress of the implementation of the Zone Implementation Programme.

4.8.3. Oversee the delivery of the Zone Implementation Programme.

4.8.4. Review the ZIP on a three yearly cycle and recommend any changes to the respective Councils.

4.8.5. Monitor the performance of Environment Canterbury and Waimakariri District Council and other agencies in relation to the implementation.

**Reporting on ZIPA Recommendations**

4.9. Reporting to Environment Canterbury from WDC, to collate progress on ZIPA recommendations, will be formatted in order to be fed easily into ‘In Zone’ software formatting used by Environment Canterbury reports. Reporting within WDC will be based on the ZIPA work programme objectives and timeframes.

4.10. The operational Project Action Group will consist of WDC staff members, as per determined by WDC Management Team. It could be coordinated by the Biodiversity Officer or Water Environment Advisor role. The PAG will have membership adapting to changing roles and responsibilities, but is recommended to include:

- Water Environment Advisor - 3 Waters
- Biodiversity Officer - Greenspace
- 3 Waters Manager
- Greenspace Manager
- Drainage Asset Manager
- A Communications team member
- A Development Planning Unit member

**Work programme**

4.11. WDC staff, through the Project Action Group will produce a work programme linked to the ZIPA recommendations, which records projects, milestones, objectives, and KPIs (if developed). This will be a living document that is continuously updated, and a basis for reporting to the Working Group, Waimakariri Water Zone Committee and Environment Canterbury.

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

5. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

5.1. **Groups and Organisations**
5.1.1. Te Rūnanga Ngāi Tūāhuriri will be consulted on this proposal at a joint Council - Ngāi Tūāhuriri meeting on 19 June 2019.

5.1.2. The WWZC has been consulted on the proposed Land and Water Working Group and Project Action Group for ZIPA implementation (8 April 2019 WWZC Meeting). The WWZC has expressed the need for a clear system to report against ZIPA recommendations, such as proposed by the structure of the ZIPA work programme, and to collaborate with Environment Canterbury on this respect.

5.2. **Wider Community**

5.2.1. Public consultation in the draft Annual Plan consultation document on the Waimakariri Water Zone – ZIPA in March-April 2019 showed support by two thirds (66%) of submitters for Option A. This option was for the Council to play a coordination role in implementing the ZIPA, in addition to a role as educator and advisor. This expansion of the role of the Council supports the recommendation to establish the Land and Water Working Group.

5.2.2. There has been no wider public consultation on the Land and Water Working Group proposal.

6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**

6.1.1. There are limited financial implications resulting from the recommendations within this report for the creation of a Working group. Staff and Councillor resourcing is proposed to be accommodated within existing workloads and budgets.

6.2. **Community Implications**

6.2.1. There will be a greater benefit to our District’s water environment and biodiversity if project decisions and operations is undertaken in a timely and efficient way, due to an effective governance and operational structure.

6.3. **Risk Management**

6.3.1. In order to minimise project risks it is important to ensure that there is a range of relevant skills and knowledge among members of the Land and Water Working Group and Project Action Group, so that representation is well-balanced.

6.4. **Health and Safety**

6.4.1. There are no relevant health and safety considerations for the recommendations within this report.

7. **CONTEXT**

7.1. **Policy**

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

7.2. **Legislation**

7.2.2. Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act (1987). Part 7 in relation to public meetings, such as would apply to the Land and Water Working Group.

7.3. Community Outcomes

There is a healthy and sustainable environment for all

7.3.1. Harm to the environment from the impacts of land use, use of water resources and air emissions is minimised.

7.3.2. Cultural values relating to water are acknowledged and respected.

7.3.3. The demand for water is kept to a sustainable level.

7.3.4. Harm to the environment from the spread of contaminants into ground water and surface water is minimised.

There are areas of significant indigenous vegetation and habitats for indigenous fauna

7.3.5. Conservation and restoration of significant areas of vegetation and/or habitats is encouraged.

Public spaces and facilities are plentiful, accessible and high quality

7.3.6. People enjoy clean water at our beaches, rivers and lakes.

7.3.7. There is a wide variety of public places and spaces to meet people’s needs.

7.3.8. There are wide-ranging opportunities for people to enjoy the outdoors.

7.4. Delegations

7.4.1. The Council has authority to establish a working group. No decision-making powers are proposed to be delegated by establishing this group.
1. **PURPOSE**

The purpose of the Land and Water Working Group (LWWG) is to provide project oversight and recommendations to the Waimakariri District Council (WDC) on workstreams with an environmental theme, such as for the Waimakariri Water Zone - Zone Implementation Programme Addendum (ZIPA) and District Plan biodiversity functions.

2. **MEMBERSHIP**

- Councillor with the Canterbury Water Management Strategy portfolio
- A Councillor from the Utilities and Roading Committee
- A Councillor from the Community and Recreation Committee
- A Councillor from the District Planning and Regulation Committee
- A Councillor
- Manager of Utilities and Roading
- Manager of Community and Recreation
- Chair of the Land and Water Project Action Group (LWPAG)

3. **ROLE**

The members of the LWWG will engage in a positive and collaborative manner to enable the efficient and effective implementation of WDC work programmes with an environmental theme. This includes (but is not limited to) the following roles:

- Govern delegated environmental work programmes;
- Make recommendations to Council or Council Committees, and oversee the implementation of Board, Council or Council Committee decisions;
- Lead and support community engagement;
- Give strategic level recommendations and guidance, for Council decision-making;
- Make recommendations to Council regarding the division of the overall budget for specific projects;
LAND AND WATER WORKING GROUP

- Recommend approval of any changes to the environmental work programme;
- Review and monitor overall progress, including budget tracking;
- Provide a regular project overview to the Council, or relevant Council Committee, and reporting on milestones, programme, budget, issues, risk, and health and safety;
- Provide recommendations on key documents where necessary, including but not limited reports or briefings to Council, Council Committees or Community Boards;
- Participate in planning workshops.

Members have a key role to ensure the effective flow of information between external organisations and the LWWG.

4. MEETING FREQUENCY

The LWWG shall meet bi-monthly or when requested to do so for urgent matters, or matters relating to the purpose of the LWWG. Meetings will be public, as prescribed by the Local Government Official Information and Meeting Act (1987).

A quorum is considered to be 50 percent of members.

5. ADMINISTRATION

The agenda and minutes for LWWG meetings will be prepared by Utilities and Roading Business Support. The agenda and minutes will be filed in TRIM and distributed to all members. The agenda for the meeting shall generally be as follows:

1. Introductions / Apologies
2. Previous Minutes
3. Deputations
4. Staff Reports (milestones, programme, issues, budget, risk, health and safety)
5. Community engagement and media
6. Reports to Council, Committee or Community Board
7. General Business

6. DURATION

The LWWG is intended to function until 30 June 2021, where upon it will be reviewed and a decision made on whether to extend its duration. These Terms of Reference and membership of the group will be reviewed bi-annually thereafter. It is noted that duration and membership will also be reviewed following Council elections in October 2019 and subsequent elections.
1. SUMMARY

1.1 This report seeks retrospective approval for a submission on the Waimakariri Bus Service Review that was lodged by the due date of 26 May 2019. The timing of the period for submission was such that a Council submission could not be confirmed in time but the matter was discussed at the Council briefing on 14 May and a draft of the submission was circulated by email for comment in the week of 20 May 2019.

1.2 The submission notes some communities, developers and households are concerned about some proposed route and service level changes. We know those concerned will through their own submissions to you be advocating for their local community. The Council asked in its submission that ECan this local feedback carefully.

1.3 In its submission the Council focused on the district wide issues the Review has highlighted. Among other things it sought a faster pace of change in the coverage, frequency and flexibility of bus services to meet the needs of a growing and changing district, and signalled its support for a further conversation with the district community about the service level and financial implications of a step change in these regards.

Attachments:
   i. WDC Submission on the Waimakariri Bus Service Review (190527073769)

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 190527073770

(b) Approves the Submission attached to this report as the WDC Submission on the Waimakariri Bus Service Review (Trim doc. 190527073769).

3. BACKGROUND

3.1 The Canterbury Regional Public Transport Plan (CRPTP) for the 2018-28 period was confirmed by ECan on advice from the Public Transport Joint Committee established by the Greater Christchurch Councils in 2016. While that triennial update of the regional plan
looks specifically at the next ten years it also looks out strategically to the longer term public transport (PT) needs of Greater Christchurch.

3.2 PT has experienced significant patronage loss post-quakes, but remains an important component of meeting the transport needs of residents and visitors; assist managing congestion and responding to new challenges such as minimising greenhouse gas emissions. For a number of reasons set out in the regional plan PT is at a turning point and in order for it to meaningfully contribute to the above objectives, a step change in investment, service levels and technologies was signalled.

3.3 That said a shorter term review of service levels to and within the Waimakariri District was signalled in the Plan for early 2019. That had been undertaken and number of changes to routes and schedules have been proposed. It is important to note that Review was undertaken within the framework of the existing serviced area and funding parameters.

3.4 Environment Canterbury PT planners briefed a recent All Boards meeting on Draft Review proposals and Community Boards have prepared submissions on it in their own right.

4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

4.1. The CRPTP in 2018 foreshadowed better intra-district services between Key Activity Centres connecting to commuter services with Christchurch. That Plan noted that service reviews, to be undertaken in the first half of 2019, would be the first opportunity to respond to this strategic direction and would provide opportunities for communities to participate more specifically in route and service planning.

4.2. The Council in its submission noted this Review is modest in scope and pace of change. While supporting in general proposals to enhance intra-district connectivity, it signalled a desire for a wider and deeper conversation with ECAN and the community about service development and its financial implications. In particular it sought trialling and promoting demand responsive services, using new technology to assist patronage growth.

4.3. This responds to the needs of smaller and more dispersed communities and to the ‘aging in place’ characteristics of an overall growing, but aging population. To support that is an expressed desire for a closer working relationship with ECAN in integrated land use and transport planning and a willingness expressed for WDC staff to collaborate in that regard.

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

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. Groups and Organisations

No engagement with groups and organisations has been undertaken in preparing the submission, although Councillors are aware of matters raised with and by Community Boards in relation to localised service level issues. Points made in the submission about enhanced and more flexible services reflect sentiments obtained through previous community consultation on transport related matters.

5.2. Wider Community

As for 5.1
6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1. Financial Implications

There are no direct financial implications of this report. However, in seeking enhanced service levels there are financial implications for district rating by Environment Canterbury to be considered through specific implementation plans and proposals.

6.2. Community Implications

Improved PT service levels can and do deliver higher community benefits in enhanced accessibility and lower cost travel to users as well as benefits accruing to all road users in lowering congestion, in turn giving rise to economic benefits. Environmental benefits of lower emissions are widespread. Community costs through rating subsidies are an ongoing feature of PT but when direct and indirect benefits of PT are considered, overall the net community gains are considered positive.

6.3. Risk Management

There are no specific direct risk implications of this report.

6.4. Health and Safety

There are no specific direct health and safety implications of this report. Reduced congestion and private car use does have net safety benefits.

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

Provision for Regional Public Transport Plans and their implementation is made under Part 5 of the Land Transport Management Act 2003.

7.3. Community Outcomes

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

- The Council makes known its views on significant proposals by others affecting the District’s wellbeing.

Transport is accessible, convenient, reliable and sustainable

- Communities in our District are well linked with each other and Christchurch is readily accessible by a range of transport modes.
- Public transport serves our District effectively.

7.4 Delegations

Not applicable. This is submission by the Council.
In the Matter of

The
Waimakariri Bus Service Review

Submission by
Waimakariri District Council

May 2019

Person for Contact: Geoff Meadows (Policy Manager)
1. Introduction

The Waimakariri District Council (WDC) welcomes this opportunity to comment on the Waimakariri Bus Service Review. We know that through the recently reviewed Canterbury Regional Public Transport Plan (CRPTP) there is a larger and longer range plan for transforming public transport (PT) in Greater Christchurch. We also acknowledge that this current Review is a shorter term consideration of services within the District’s already serviced area and that it is constrained by the current budget and funding formula.

In our submission on the CRPTP we said that a step change in many aspects of PT planning and delivery is needed as part of a strategy to ‘turn the curve’ on increasing congestion, while also better serving the transport needs of a rapidly changing community, and, responding to disruptive change in transport technologies.

WDC strongly supports the direction of that Plan and are keen to participate in progressing the business case that would be needed to advance such a step change. We appreciate that this current proposed network adjustment is only a first phase of that change, but are very pleased to see the response made to our previous submissions seeking more coverage and better connections between townships.

However, we would like to further improve services within as well as to/from our District and think this is moving too slowly in relation to our growing population. We would be interested in trialling more flexible and demand responsive services and welcome a more open-ended conversation between ECan, WDC and the Waimakariri community about options, including any financial implications.

WDC enjoys positive working relationships with Environment Canterbury among elected members and staff on a wide range of issues of concern to both organisations. This includes public transport services, and we look forward to working closely with ECan in further developing PT services within and connecting to the District.

2. Key points of submission

Proposed changes by route

As indicated, the Bus Service Review proposes more coverage and better connections between Waimakariri townships. In general, Council supports this increased connectivity and appreciates ECan has acknowledged ongoing submissions on this topic from Waimakariri residents.

We know however, some communities, developers and households are concerned about some proposed route and service level changes. They are free to register those concerns in their own right to ECan and have also done so to Community Boards in the District.

We know those Boards concerned will through their own submissions to you be advocating for their local community. The Council asks that you consider the Board's views and that local feedback carefully.
As you know the Waimakariri District is continuing to grow steadily and so new roads are a frequent addition to our main towns. We understand the way the contracts are written for operators now allow more flexibility, but we previously have had issues with a minor change that was wanted that proved quite challenging, even though it was safety related.

We note that while major changes to routes are not expected, we do seek flexibility of contracts to vary routes to provide additional coverage where new links are provided, and where appropriate, is anticipated. For example we are soon to start construction of a major new sports facility in north-east Rangiora. It would be unfortunate to have to wait for a whole new network review to make sensible, minor routing changes.

**Service Innovation & Changing Communities**

The CRPTP signalled we are on the cusp of significant change in transport technologies with profound implications for the way we travel and the corresponding demand for public transport services. At the same time Greater Christchurch communities are not just growing but changing significantly in composition as structural aging sets in and as ‘super diversity’ grows.

That document also indicates preparedness to invest in innovative, demand responsive services using differing vehicle sizes and types and frame flexible schedules and services assisted by online and social media applications.

WDC would like to see a much wider and deeper conversation between ECan, WDC and the District community on trialing new types of technologies, services and schedules. Collectively we are probably not being ambitious enough in preparing for and responding to step change and we encourage ECan to be prepared to move farther and faster in this regard.

For our part we would support and participate with an open mind in a community conversation about making an additional local funding contribution towards providing new, different or expanded services in the District.

**Joined Up Planning and Delivery**

WDC believes there needs to be a closer working relationship between those responsible for land use planning and those focused on PT service planning. Too often, still, area and structure planning, subdivisional design and consenting processes are not joined up in these regards. We would value consideration of how this situation might be improved, and encourage ECan to seek for the Greater Christchurch Partnership to more closely align land use and transport planning processes in these respects with corresponding delivery alignment.
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FILE NO and TRIM NO: GOV-26-11-06 / 190412055415
REPORT TO: Council
DATE OF MEETING: 4 June 2019
FROM: Jim Gerard QSO – Chairperson Rangiora-Ashley Community Board
SUBJECT: Chairperson’s Report for the Period December 2016 to December 2018

SIGNED BY: Chairperson’s Report for the Period December 2016 to December 2018

1. SUMMARY
The purpose of this report is to inform the Council of the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board’s activities for the period December 2016 to December 2018 in accordance with the Board’s Terms of Reference.

2. RECOMMENDATION
THAT the Council:
(a) Receives report No. 190412055415.
(b) Circulates a copy of this report to all the Community Boards.

3. BACKGROUND
3.1 It is customary for Community Board Chairpersons to report the Board’s progress and achievements to Council. Due to circumstances a report was not presented to Council in 2017 or 2018 therefore this report covers that time period. A further report will be presented to Council with the information for the 2019 year at a later date.

4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS
4.1 The Board has twelve members consisting of four ward Councillors and eight elected board members. The Board noted the sad loss of Councillor Peter Allen in August 2017 resulting in a by-election and appointment of Councillor Kirstyn Barnett to the Board in January 2018.

4.2 Two members were present for all meetings with ten members tendering apologies for one or two meetings.

4.3 The Board had twenty three meetings which are usually scheduled for the second Wednesday of the month. Of these one was held at Loburn and another at Cust.

4.4 A total of 92 reports were referred to the Board for consideration during this period.

4.5 The Board also attended numerous workshops and briefings which considered a range of matters including:

4.6. The Board made a range of submissions during the period in relation to:
   i. Long Term and Annual Plans
   ii. District Development Strategy
   iii. Water Zone Matters
   iv. Public Transport
   v. Three laning of the Waimakariri Bridge
   vi. Objection to a Liquor Licence: Blackbull Liquor Rangiora

4.7. Twenty seven deputations were heard and progressed, of which topics included:

4.8. There were a number of significant issues for the Board including.
   a) Cones Road Walkway
   b) Walking and Cycling Strategy
   c) Rangiora Feature Lighting
   d) Town Entrances – Lineside and Flaxton Roads
   e) Good Street Improvements
   f) Garrymere Water Supply Scheme

4.9. The Board approved a range of grants to community organisations.

In summary the Board received 46 applications for funding, during the period December 2016 to December 2018, of which three were declined and one could not be considered due to a lack of financial information.

4.10. The financial year runs from 1 July to 30 June.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Available Funds</th>
<th>Declined applications</th>
<th>Balance Remaining</th>
<th>Balance Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016/17</td>
<td>$5,456</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$3,554</td>
<td>Unspent funds returned to WDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/18</td>
<td>$10,347</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1,917</td>
<td>Funds Carried Forward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018/19</td>
<td>$5,977</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$5,536</td>
<td>Ongoing until July 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$21,280</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total grant allocated over this period was: $21,280.

4.11. The Board supported extensive landscaping at the Lineside Road town entrance from its General Landscaping Budget - $52,000. This project was combined with a re-alignment of the kerb and other roading improvements.
4.12. Support for the Loburn War Memorial of $10,619 was also given.

4.13. Funding was set aside for town entrance development from the General Landscaping Budget for $30,000.

4.14. Board members attended a number of public meetings and drop-in sessions which included; Long Term Plan, Annual Plan, Garrymere Water Supply, ZIPA, District Plan, Community BBQ’s.

4.15. The Board’s performance expectations link directly into the Council’s Community Outcomes. The four key performance expectations are:

1) Develop and promote the Community Board as a vehicle for local residents to seek assistance and advocacy in accessing council services and consultation processes.

2) Develop closer links and relationships with key settlements and groups in the Rangiora Ward, as well as with significant district wide organisations.

3) Develop strategies for the Board to become an effective, cohesive voice in representing the community viewpoint at meetings and policy hearings.

4) To actively participate in council business and the annual budget process to ensure equitable spending across the District whilst being mindful of rates affordability.

4.16. By reviewing the staff reports and decisions against the above listed community outcomes staff believe the following table fairly represents the performance outcomes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Expectations</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Reports</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A total of 92 reports were referred to the Board for consideration between December 2016 and December 2018.

4.17. The Board’s Road and Reserves Naming Committee met on five occasions as required basis to consider new road names in the ward. The Committee approved 33 new road names, one reserve name and corrected/confirmed the spelling of a road name.

4.18. Chair’s comment:

4.19. Overall the Board has worked well together dealing with challenging issues such as Cones Road and the festive lighting project. However more pleasing was the positive outcomes of beautification of the town entrances which is an ongoing project currently being undertaken.

4.20. The Board has appreciated the assistance provided by our support staff, who draw our submissions together on our behalf. Our Councillors who keep us informed of larger, more far reaching issues in the district.

4.21. The Management Team has reviewed this report.
5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. Groups and Organisations

Board members are formally appointed to a variety of groups and organisations and also attend a range of meetings and community activities.

5.2. Wider Community

Community views are sought from members on matters of concern for residents of the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board’s community area. Board members regularly attend community meetings and events and take opportunities to gather feedback during these opportunities.

6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1. 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 affects our District.

People have wide ranging opportunities for being informed.

7.4. Delegations

Not applicable.

Jim Gerard QSO
Chairperson
Rangiora-Ashley Community Board
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1. SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is to inform the Council of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board’s activities for the period December 2016 to December 2018 in accordance with the Board’s Terms of Reference.

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives report No. 190501061834.
(b) Circulates a copy of this report to all the Community Boards.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1 It is customary for Community Board Chairpersons to report the Board’s progress and achievements to Council. Due to circumstances a report was not presented to Council in 2017 or 2018 therefore this report covers that time period. A further report will be presented to Council with the information for the 2019 year at a later date.

4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

4.1. The Board has seven members consisting of two ward Councillors and five elected board members.

4.2. All members tendered apologies when unable to attend meetings. The Board had twenty five ordinary meetings which are usually scheduled for the third Monday of the month. All meetings were held in Meeting Room 1, Ruataniwha Kaiapoi Civic Centre.

4.3. A total of 93 reports were referred to the Board for consideration during this period.

4.4. The Board also attended numerous workshops and briefings which considered a range of matters including:

Christmas Lights, Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan Review, Kaiapoi River Project, Kaiapoi South East Regeneration, General Landscaping Budget, Roading and Parking Matters, Road Safety and Maintenance, Speed Limits, Road and Reserves naming, Walk ways and cycle ways, Public Space Policy, Waste Management, public transport and signage.
4.5. The Board made a range of submissions during the period in relation to:
   
   i. Long Term and Annual Plans
   ii. District Development Strategy
   iii. Draft Waste and Minimisation Management Plan
   iv. Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw Implementation Plan
   v. Public Transport
   vi. Three laning of the Waimakariri Bridge
   vii. Draft Zone Implementation Programme Addendum
   viii. Draft Accessibility Strategy
   ix. Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan 2028
   x. Bottle O Silverstream liquor application

4.6. Twenty nine deputations were heard and progressed, of which topics included:

   Road safety, cycleways, tree removals, public transport, Silverstream ground levels, Connectivity between Silverstream and Kaiapoi, Cactus Programme, Beautification of Kaiapoi, Kayak and Paddleboat service, Parks and playgrounds management plans, Miss Lilly Angel Trust, Smith/Williams Street upgrade, Annaliese Haven Rest Home tanker hazard, Access Group, Youth Council – Skate Park Bowl Art, Maintenance on Kaiapoi River and surrounds.

4.7. There were a number of significant issues for the Board including.

   a) Various tree removals
   b) Feature lighting
   c) Water quality of Kaiapoi River
   d) Regeneration of North East Kaiapoi

4.8. The Board approved a range of grants to community organisations.

4.9. In summary the Board received 35 applications for funding, during the period December 2016 to December 2018, of which six were declined.

4.10. The financial year runs from 1 July to 30 June.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount Allocated</th>
<th>Approved</th>
<th>Declined</th>
<th>Balance Remaining</th>
<th>Balance Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016/17</td>
<td>$4,850</td>
<td>$4,850</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Funds spent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/18</td>
<td>$4,960</td>
<td>$3,799</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,161</td>
<td>Funds Carried Forward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018/19</td>
<td>$6,000 (plus carryforward)</td>
<td>$2,887</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$4,273</td>
<td>Ongoing until 30 June 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>$15,810</td>
<td>$11,536</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total funding allocated over this period was: $11,536.
4.11. The Board supported Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi general landscaping, Town entrance development, Kaiapoi Flag Poles, Camellia tree removal, Interpretive Signs and planter boxes - $119,420.

4.12. Board members attended a number of public meetings and Drop In’s which included:
Long Term Plan, Annual Plan, ZIPA, District Plan, Community BBQ’s.

4.13. The Board’s performance expectations link directly into the Council’s Community Outcomes. The four key performance expectations are:

1) Develop and promote the Community Board as a vehicle for local residents to seek assistance and advocacy in accessing council services and consultation processes.
2) Develop closer links and relationships with key settlements and groups in the Rangiora Ward, as well as with significant district wide organisations.
3) Develop strategies for the Board to become an effective, cohesive voice in representing the community viewpoint at meetings and policy hearings.
4) To actively participate in council business and the annual budget process to ensure equitable spending across the District whilst being mindful of rates affordability.

4.14. By reviewing the staff reports and decisions against the above listed community outcomes we believe the following table fairly represents the performance outcomes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Expectations</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Reports</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A total of 93 reports were referred to the Board for consideration between December 2016 and December 2018.

Chair’s comment:

4.15. During 2017 and 2018 the Board dealt with a wide variety of issues aimed at continuing the on-going post-quake work of redeveloping Kaiapoi’s town centre. Slowly, new buildings are replacing the empty sites, bringing a modernity to the town and the Board has enjoyed being party to the decision making required to ensure a vibrant town centre and a place that residents are proud of.

4.16. Planning for the change of use for the former red zone is making steady progress and points to an exciting future and new start for the north east.

4.17. The town of Kaiapoi is undergoing huge change post-quake and members of the board have been diligent in their considerations of all manner of decisions with the eventual goal of improving the lifestyles of residents of Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi. It is particularly pleasing to see new initiatives such as the Passchendaele cycleway and the new Pines Beach hall become a reality.

4.18. I thank Board members for their considered responses to matters raised at board meetings and their conscientious attitude to attending the many engagements and extra meetings required.

4.19. With the improved transport links to Christchurch and more to come, Kaiapoi’s geographical location in North Canterbury offers many opportunities for further growth and managing that growth effectively is important to ensure we continue to enjoy the standard of living we have chosen by living here.

4.20. The Board has also welcomed the opportunity to contribute to decision making of the many applications for funding from the community, and to support community ventures.
4.21. The Management Team has reviewed this report.

5. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

5.1. **Groups and Organisations**

Board members are formally appointed to a variety of groups and organisations and also attend a range of meetings and community activities.

5.2. **Wider Community**

Community views are sought from members on matters of concern for residents of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board’s community area. Board members regularly attend community meetings and events and take opportunities to gather feedback during these opportunities.

6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. 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 affects our District.

People have wide ranging opportunities for being informed.

7.4. **Delegations**

Not applicable.

Jackie Watson
Chairperson
Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board
1. **SUMMARY**

The purpose of this report is to inform the Council of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board’s activities for the period December 2016 to December 2018 in accordance with the Board’s Terms of Reference.

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 190501061797.

(b) Circulates a copy of this report to all the Community Boards.

3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1 It is customary for Community Board Chairpersons to report the Board’s progress and achievements to Council. Due to circumstances a report was not presented to Council in 2017 or 2018 therefore this report covers that time period. A further report will be presented to Council with the information for the 2019 year at a later date.

4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1. The Board has eight members consisting of two ward Councillors and six elected board members.

4.2. Three members were present for all meetings with five members tendering apologies for meetings.

4.3. The Board had twenty three ordinary meetings and an extraordinary meeting. Ordinary meetings are usually scheduled for the first Thursday after the Council meeting is held. The venue for meetings is rotated around the ward and includes West Eyreton Hall, Oxford Town Hall, Ohoka Hall and Mandeville Sports Centre.

4.4. A total of 90 reports were referred to the Board for consideration during this period.
4.5. The Board also attended numerous workshops and briefings which considered a range of matters including:

- Mandeville Speed Limit Review
- Waste Minimisation Plan
- Oxford Town Centre Strategy
- Public Spaces Policy
- Long Term Plan
- Canterbury Landscape Supplies Resource Consent
- The Bulletin
- Annual Plan
- Rural Residential Strategy
- Water Quality
- ZIPA
- Public Transport
- Walking and Cycling Strategy
- General Landscaping Budget
- Footpath Matters
- Roading Matters
- Parking Matters
- Drainage Matters
- Speed Limits
- Rural Water Schemes
- RMA processes

4.6. The Board made a range of submissions during the period in relation to:

i. Long Term and Annual Plans
ii. District Plan Review
iii. Draft Waste and Minimisation Management Plan
iv. Accessibility Strategy
v. Public Transport
vi. Three laning of the Waimakariri Bridge
vii. Canterbury Landscape Supplies Resource Consent
viii. Waimakariri Zone Committee – Zone Implementation Programme Addendum

4.7. Twenty five deputations were heard and progressed, of which topics included:

- Isaac Road Quarry
- Urban cycleways project
- Ohoka Gatekeepers Lodge
- Ohoka Domain
- Canterbury Landscape Supplies Ltd consent
- Flooding and drainage
- Cust rural recycling project
- Multi-use sports facility
- Neighbourhood Support
- Footpath renewal
- Oxford Commercial area parking
- Multi-use sports facility
- Neighbourhood Support
- Footpath renewal
- Oxford Community Trust
- Water supply concerns
- Water quality concerns
- Mandeville Village carparking

4.8. There were a number of significant issues for the Board including:

a) Isaac Road Quarry
b) Canterbury Landscape Supplies Ltd resource consent
c) Ohoka Domain Master Plan
d) Mandeville Village Parking
e) Mandeville flood works
f) Tram Road speed limit review
g) Car parking Oxford Town Centre

4.9. The Board approved a range of grants to community organisations.

In summary the Board received 25 applications for funding, during the period December 2016 to December 2018, of which one was declined.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount Allocated</th>
<th>Approved</th>
<th>Declined</th>
<th>Balance Remaining</th>
<th>Balance Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016/17</td>
<td>$4,310</td>
<td>$3,677</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$633</td>
<td>Funds returned to WDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/18</td>
<td>$5,400</td>
<td>$4,950</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$450</td>
<td>Funds Carried Forward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018/19</td>
<td>$6,070</td>
<td>$4,793</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,727</td>
<td>Ongoing until July 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$450</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>$16,230</td>
<td>$13,420</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total funding allocated was: $13,420.

4.11. Board members attended a number of public meetings and Drop In’s which included the Long Term Plan, Annual Plan, ZIPA, District Plan and Oxford A&P show.

4.12. The Board’s performance expectations link directly into the Council’s Community Outcomes. The four key performance expectations are:

1) Develop and promote the Community Board as a vehicle for local residents to seek assistance and advocacy in accessing council services and consultation processes.
2) Develop closer links and relationships with key settlements and groups in the Rangiora Ward, as well as with significant district wide organisations.
3) Develop strategies for the Board to become an effective, cohesive voice in representing the community viewpoint at meetings and policy hearings.
4) To actively participate in council business and the annual budget process to ensure equitable spending across the District whilst being mindful of rates affordability.

4.13. By reviewing the staff reports and decisions against the above listed community outcomes we believe the following table fairly represents the performance outcomes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Expectations</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Reports</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A total of 90 reports were referred to the Board for consideration between December 2016 and December 2018.

4.14. Chair’s comment:

As can be seen in the report, this Board has had some controversial situations to contend with. For a Board made up of one member with some Community Board experience, two members with twelve years each of Advisory Board experience, three members with no board experience and two Councillors with vast experience, backed by very helpful staff we have achieved some good outcomes. I believe we, as a Board, have been very effective and have handled difficult situations professionally.

With this being an election year, I hope we can carry on the good work in the future.

4.15. The Management Team has reviewed this report.

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. Groups and Organisations

Board members are formally appointed to a variety of groups and organisations and also attend a range of meetings and community activities.

5.2. Wider Community

Community views are sought from members on matters of concern for residents of the Oxford Ohoka Community Board’s community area. Board members regularly attend
community meetings and events and take opportunities to gather feedback during these opportunities.

6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. 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 affects our District.

People have wide ranging opportunities for being informed.

7.4. **Delegations**

Not applicable.

---

Doug Nicholl  
Chairperson  
Oxford-Ohoka Community Board
1. SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is to inform the Council of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board’s activities for the period December 2016 to December 2018 in accordance with the Board’s Terms of Reference.

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 190501061717.

(b) Circulates a copy of this report to all the Community Boards.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1 It is customary for Community Board Chairpersons to report the Board’s progress and achievements to Council. Due to circumstances a report was not presented to Council in 2017 or 2018 therefore this report covers that time period. A further report will be presented to Council with the information for the 2019 year at a later date.

4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

4.1. The Board has seven members consisting of two ward Councillors and five elected board members. The Board noted the sad loss of member Karen Eastwood who resigned in November 2016 resulting in a by election and appointment of Andrea Allen to the Board in March 2017.

4.2. Two members were present for all meetings with five members tendering apologies for meetings.

4.3. The Board had twenty five ordinary meetings and one extraordinary meeting. Ordinary meetings are usually scheduled for the second Monday of the month. The venue for meetings is rotated around the communities and include Pegasus Community Centre, Woodend Community Centre and Waikuku Beach Hall.

4.4. A total of 73 reports were referred to the Board for consideration during this period.
4.5. The Board also attended numerous workshops and briefings which considered a range of matters including:


4.6. The Board made a range of submissions during the period in relation to:

i. Long Term and Annual Plans
ii. District Development Strategy
iii. Draft Waste and Minimisation Management Plan
iv. Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw Implementation Plan
v. Public Transport – Draft Regional Transport Plan for Greater Christchurch
vi. Three laning of the Waimakariri Bridge
vii. Draft Waimakariri Accessibility Strategy
viii. NZTA Safe Roads Project – Ashley to Belfast SH1 safety improvements
x. NZTA – Woodend Safety Improvements

4.7. Twenty four deputations were heard and progressed, of which topics included:

Road safety, urban cycleways project, public transport, state highway improvement plans, speed outside schools, creation of a war memorial in Woodend, road naming for Ravenswood, parks and playgrounds management plans, forestry matters, multi stadium, Pegasus Lake tree removals, community facilities investigations/update, Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust matters.

4.8. There were a number of significant issues for the Board including.

a) Coastal forestry harvest
b) Connecting the townships of Woodend, Pegasus, Ravenswood, Pegasus and Waikuku Beach
c) Advocating to NZTA for safety improvements in Woodend and between Ashley and Belfast
d) Community Facilities for Pegasus and Ravenswood
e) Speed limit reviews
f) Town Entrances especially Pegasus Town
g) Water supply and electricity outages in Waikuku
h) Emergency exit for Pegasus
i) Advocating for the Woodend Bypass

4.9. The Board approved a range of grants to community organisations.

In summary the Board received 16 applications for funding, during the period December 2016 to December 2018, of which 2 were declined.
4.1. The financial year runs from 1 July to 30 June.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount Allocated</th>
<th>Approved</th>
<th>Declined</th>
<th>Balance Remaining</th>
<th>Balance Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016/17</td>
<td>$2,910</td>
<td>$2,690</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$220</td>
<td>Funds returned to WDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/18</td>
<td>$3,170</td>
<td>$2,034</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,136</td>
<td>Funds Carried Forward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018/19</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$1,373</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$3,377</td>
<td>Ongoing until July 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total funding allocated was: $6,097.

4.2. The Board supported Woodend/Sefton general landscaping, Taranaki Reserve, Sefton Domain planting, seating and signage, Waikuku Beach Sign and Western Ridge seat from its General Landscaping Budget - $22,660. Support for the Woodend War Memorial of $5,000 was also given.

4.3. Board members attended a number of public meetings and Drop In's which included the Long Term Plan, Annual Plan, ZIPA, District Plan, NZTA – Woodend Safety Improvements and the SH1 Safer Roads Project, speed limit reviews, Waimakariri Water Zone Committee, Age-friendly workshops, Community BBQ's.

4.4. The Board’s performance expectations link directly into the Council’s Community Outcomes. The four key performance expectations are:

1) Develop and promote the Community Board as a vehicle for local residents to seek assistance and advocacy in accessing council services and consultation processes.
2) Develop closer links and relationships with key settlements and groups in the Woodend-Sefton Ward, as well as with significant district wide organisations.
3) Develop strategies for the Board to become an effective, cohesive voice in representing the community viewpoint at meetings and policy hearings.
4) To actively participate in council business and the annual budget process to ensure equitable spending across the District whilst being mindful of rates affordability.

4.5. By reviewing the staff reports and decisions against the above listed community outcomes we believe the following table fairly represents the performance outcomes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Expectations</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Reports</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A total of 73 reports were referred to the Board for consideration between December 2016 and December 2018.
4.6. Chair’s comment:

A major focus of the Board has been ensuring that our communities are connected by walkways and cycleways. The opening of the Jill Creamer Trail in 2017, led by the Woodend Community, was an important step. This was followed by the opening of the Rangiora Woodend and Passchendaele Memorial Paths in 2018 and the upgrade of the path between Waikuku Beach and Pegasus. Work will be starting on the Gladstone Road cycle/walkway which will provide safe passage between Woodend and Gladstone Park and Pegasus. There is still work to be done to join up some of the paths and this be a focus going forward. Connectivity also includes an effective public transport system which the Board has been advocating for and will continue to do so, in particular a link service including Rangiora, Kaiapoi and our communities.

The Board, after holding a workshop, decided that one of the ways to help communicate with residents and to keep them informed was through the use of social media and the Woodend-Sefton Community Board Facebook page was launched. This has been used to provide updates on things like upcoming consultations, coastal forestry harvest, board meetings, discretionary funding grants, and landscape budget projects. Details of events around the district are posted along with follow-up when Board members have attended. Board members enjoy this involvement in the community and taking part in events, as many of the pictures show. Sharing progress on projects is a favourite and this has included the acoustic panel installation in Waikuku Beach Hall, Gladstone Park upgrade, the youth development grant project, the widening of the path alongside Tiritiri Moana Drive, the linking Woodend and Pegasus water supplies, Rangiora Woodend Path, signage upgrades at Sefton Domain, and the toilet block installation at Pegasus Beach.

As an indication of the growth in our area and the changes happening, in 2018 the first residents moved into Ravenswood, the first businesses in the Ravenswood Commercial area were opened and it was the 10th anniversary of the first residents moving into Pegasus. Of the new building consents issued in the District in 2018, 25% were in Woodend and Pegasus. Planning for the future growth of our communities has been of paramount importance to the Board and will continue to be so. This includes the need for, and importance of planning for future community facilities, a focus on safety improvements needed on SH1, particularly through Woodend, public transport needs, and town centre planning.

The Board looks forward to continuing the work we have started through to the end of the term.

4.7. The Management Team has reviewed this report.

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. Groups and Organisations

Board members are formally appointed to a variety of groups and organisations and also attend a range of meetings and community activities.

5.2. Wider Community

Community views are sought from members on matters of concern for residents of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board’s community area. Board members regularly attend community meetings and events and take opportunities to gather feedback during these opportunities.

6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1. 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 affects our District.

People have wide ranging opportunities for being informed.

7.4. **Delegations**

Not applicable.

Shona Powell
Chairperson
Woodend-SEfton Community Board
1. **SUMMARY**

1.1. The purpose of this report is to update the Council on Health and Safety matters for the month of April.

**Attachments:**

i. Discharging Officer Health and Safety Duties

ii. May 2019 Health and Safety Dashboard Report

**RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No 190521071448

(b) **Notes** that there are no significant Health and Safety issues at this time, and that WDC is, so far as is reasonably practicable, compliant with the PCBU duties of the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015.

2. **BACKGROUND**

2.1. The Health and Safety at Work Act 2015 requires that Officers must exercise due diligence to make sure that the organisation complies with its health and safety duties. Discharging Officer Health and Safety Duties for WDC is outlined in Appendix 1.

2.2. An officer under the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015 is a person who occupies a specified position or who occupies a position that allows them to exercise a significant influence over the management of the business or undertaking. Councillors and Chief Executive are considered to be the Officers of WDC.

3. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

3.1. There are 3 new work-related incidents in this report, none of which require further investigation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Occurrence</th>
<th>Event description</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/04/2019</td>
<td>Near Miss</td>
<td>When worker was leaving work out of the back stairway from the Farmers building, he was nearly hit by a vehicle travelling up.</td>
<td>Roading Team and Property Unit are investigating the possibility of such things as a speed bump being put in.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2. The results of the Health & Safety Risk Register Review have been reported to the Audit and Risk Committee, including update on Risk Register Action Plan.

3.3. Training over the past month has included StopViolence (personal safety and conflict de-escalation) training for all public-facing staff, and Drug and Alcohol Awareness Training for Managers and Team Leaders. Upcoming training will include Anti-Skid Driver Safety Training for staff that are regularly driving vehicles for work purposes. All training records are now being kept in the Promapp Training Module (see projects update below).

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

4. COMMUNITY VIEWS

4.1. Groups and Organisations

4.1.1. The above reporting is shared with Management Team and the Health and Safety Committee in particular, for their review and comment.

4.2. Wider Community

4.2.1. The community has not been consulted with regard to this matter, as this is internal compliance reporting, relating to Health and Safety at Work.

5. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

5.1. Financial Implications

5.1.1. All financial implications for the upcoming year’s health and safety activities have been accounted for within approved project costs (such as Promapp implementation), or via departmental budgets already allocated to health and safety.

5.2. Community Implications
5.2.1. Community implications have not been included in this report as this is internal compliance reporting, relating to Health and Safety at Work.

5.3. **Risk Management**

5.3.1. Risk Management is one of the key performance requirements of a functioning Health and Safety system, therefore an updated version of the Health and Safety Register Action Plan is a key aspect of this monthly report (see Attachment 2).

5.4. **Health and Safety**

5.4.1. Continuous improvement, monitoring, and reporting of Health and Safety activities are a key focus of the health and safety management system. Attachment 1 indicates the health and safety monitoring and improvement activities that are in progress at WDC.

6. **CONTEXT**

6.1. **Policy**

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

6.2. **Legislation**

6.2.1. The key legislation is the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015.

6.2.2. The Council has a number of Human Resources policies, including those related to Health and Safety at Work.

6.2.3. The Council has an obligation under the Local Government Act to be a good employer.

6.3. **Community Outcomes**

6.3.1. There is a safe environment for all

The Health, Safety and Wellbeing of the organisation, its employees and volunteers ensures that Community Outcomes are delivered in a manner which is legislatively compliant and culturally aligned to our organisational principles: ta mātou mauri.

6.4. **Delegations**

6.4.1. An officer under the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015 is a person who occupies a specified position or who occupies a position that allows them to exercise a significant influence over the management of the business or undertaking. Councillors and Chief Executive are considered to be the Officers of WDC.
### Discharging Officer Health and Safety Duties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OFFICER DUTIES</th>
<th>EXAMPLES OF ACTIVITIES TO SUPPORT DISCHARGE OF DUTIES</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>KNOW</strong></td>
<td>• Updates on new activities/major contracts</td>
<td>Various Committee reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Council reports to include Health and Safety advice as relevant</td>
<td>Monthly, as required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Audit Committee to receive minutes of Health and Safety Committee meetings</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Update on legislation and best practice changes to Audit Committee</td>
<td>As required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>KNOW</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(To acquire, and keep up to date, knowledge of work health and safety matters)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNDERSTAND</strong></td>
<td>• Induction of new Council through tour of District and ongoing site visits.</td>
<td>Start of each new term and as required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• H&amp;S Risk register to Audit Committee</td>
<td>Six monthly, or where major change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Training on H&amp;S legislation and best practices updates</td>
<td>At least annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• CCO activities reported to the Audit Committee</td>
<td>At least annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>UNDERSTAND</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(To gain an understanding of the nature of the operations of the business or undertaking of the PCBU and generally of the hazards and risks associated with those operations)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RESOURCES</strong></td>
<td>• LTP or Annual Plan to have a specific report on H&amp;S resources</td>
<td>Annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reports to Committees will outline H&amp;S issues and resourcing, as appropriate</td>
<td>As required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>RESOURCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(To ensure that the PCBU has available for use, and uses, appropriate resources and processes to eliminate or minimise risks to health and safety from work carried out as part of the conduct of the business or undertaking)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MONITOR</strong></td>
<td>• Report to every Council meeting – standing agenda item to include Dashboard Update and any major developments</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Risk register review by Audit Committee</td>
<td>Six monthly, or where major change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>MONITOR</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(To ensure that the PCBU has appropriate processes for receiving and considering information regarding incidents, hazards, and risks and for responding in a timely way to that information)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMPLY</strong></td>
<td>• Programme of H&amp;S internal work received by Audit Committee</td>
<td>Annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Internal Audit reports to Audit Committee</td>
<td>As completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Incident Investigations reported Audit Committee</td>
<td>As required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Worksafe review of incidents/accidents reported to Audit Committee</td>
<td>As required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>COMPLY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(To ensure that the PCBU has, and implements, processes for complying with any duty or obligation of the PCBU under this Act)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VERIFY</strong></td>
<td>• Receive any external audit results and remedial actions (if any) reported to Audit Committee</td>
<td>Two yearly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Worksafe audits, if undertaken</td>
<td>As completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Self-assessment against Canterbury Safety Charter and/or SafePlus reported to the Audit Committee</td>
<td>As completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VERIFY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(To verify the provision and use of the resources and processes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Major Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 1: Improve Health and Safety systems, to align with organisational objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action 1</strong>: Re-develop Safety Management System to ensure that all Policies align with SafePlus framework (see TRIM 180315027921), and all critical risk procedures are captured in Promapp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Progress</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action 2</strong>: Implement Promapp training module to improve the management of all Health and Safety training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Objective 2: Maintain a fit-for-purpose internal health and safety auditing system to ensure that WDC is compliant with health and safety policies, procedures and legal requirements.

| **Action 3**: Review and re-develop internal health and safety auditing system, aligned with SafePlus. (see TRIM 180315027921). | **AS PER LAST MONTH** |
|---|
| **The SafePlus Online Self-Assessment tool from WorkSafe has been issued. From there the team will complete the following actions:** |
| | **Assess the suitability of the tool (and determine any changes in approach – if required)** COMPLETE |
| | **Confirm audit timing and approach (report to Management Team)** COMPLETE |
| | **Arrange audit** COMPLETE |
| | **Complete audit and submit findings to Management Team** COMPLETE |
| | **Develop action plan and monitoring schedule** IN PROGRESS |
| | **Review process and adjust if required** |
Objective 3: Ensure that all contractors are managed according to health and safety procedural requirements, and improve staff knowledge of those requirements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action 4: Contractor management process improvement project (carry-over).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMPLETE</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Contract Management training is complete as of 12th November. Training delivered to 55 contract managers from across the Council, and notes sent out to a total of 90 (including the staff that attended training). Timing of the training was determined by the Promapp rollout project (access to the system).

Additionally:
- Health and Safety Manager provides a H&S Contract Management overview to all new staff at their induction.
- Health and Safety Manager also provided an overview of current procedures to U&R, Water Unit, Greenspace and Regeneration teams at a June workshop.
- A 6-monthly reminder email was sent to staff on 24/08 to inform them of H&S processes and tools to manage contractors.
- A ‘deep-dive’ audit of adherence to H&S aspects of contract management has been completed as part of SafePlus assessment (see above).

Objective 4: Improve the Health and Wellbeing of staff, and create measures to ensure success.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action 5: Wellbeing strategy development and implementation project (carry-over).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMPLETE</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| A Wellbeing Committee has been established, the wellbeing strategy is complete, and has been submitted to Management Team for their approval in early August. Additionally, the Management Team approved:
- Wellbeing calendar of events
- Wellbeing presence on intranet
- Wellbeing branding
- Wellbeing communications plan.

The Wellbeing Committee has now issued the strategy and communications to all staff (September 2018), and will coordinate and communicate all wellbeing activities going forward.

In addition to the above workplan, there will be a particular focus on working with volunteers to manage their health and safety. This will include creating written agreements with high risk volunteers, and proactively engaging with all volunteers to ensure that health and safety expectations are aligned with all parties.
Incidents/Injuries – May 2019 (*as at 20 May 2019)

May 2018 to Current: Worker/Volunteer Incident Reporting

- Graph showing incident reporting from May 2018 to the current date, broken down by quarter and incident type.
Incidents/Injuries - May 2019 (*as at 20 May 2019)

May 2018 to Current: Worker/Volunteer Incident Reporting

- Illness/Medical Incident: 4 (5%)
- Property or Vehicle Damage: 11 (15%)
- Near Miss: 18 (25%)
- Injury: 40 (55%)

Incident Type:
- Illness/Medical Incident
- Injury
- Near Miss
- Property or Vehicle Damage
Lost Time Injuries:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Injuries</th>
<th>Total Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017/18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>340.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018/19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>187.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEAD INDICATORS**

**Safety Inspections Completed (Workplace Walkarounds)**
- Q1 2019: 13 out of 15 Workplace Walkarounds completed for Q1 2019 (March). Hazards raised for any non-compliances.

**Training Delivered**
- 2017/18: People Trained: 454

**Contractor Database (drawn from SiteWise Database)**

[Graphs and charts showing contractor assessment scores]

- Your contractors: 83%
- All contractors: 72%
Hazards Reported (last 12 months)

Risk Register Action Plan Tracking April 2019
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Action Owner</th>
<th>Action Lead</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Consequence</td>
<td>Airfield operations</td>
<td>*Require audits of hangars to ensure that they are in compliance with Building Act and tenancy requirements (including the requirement that hazardous substances are prohibited from hangars).</td>
<td>Grant MacLeod</td>
<td>Chris Brown</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>Not started</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Consequence</td>
<td>Armed Hold-up/Violent or Abusive Customers (on Council Sites) &amp; Site Security</td>
<td>*Develop and implement action plans based on Site Security Reviews.</td>
<td>Rob Hawthorne</td>
<td>Liz Ashton</td>
<td>Review early 2020 (revised)</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Consequence</td>
<td>Boat Operations</td>
<td>*Practise rescue plan drills on regular basis *SOPs have been recently reviewed and require re-training.</td>
<td>Richard Cookson</td>
<td>Jeff Millward</td>
<td>31/05/2019 (revised)</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Consequence</td>
<td>Confined space entry</td>
<td>*Review procedures for any work on Ocean Outfall Pipeline/drop-structure to ensure they are adequate.</td>
<td>Richard Cookson/Kalley Simpson</td>
<td>Gerard Cleary</td>
<td>30/06/2019 (revised)</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Contractor Health and Safety Management</td>
<td>*Contract Management refresher training at least every 2 years (to provide opportunity to review processes to keep up with industry practice).</td>
<td>Charlotte Browne</td>
<td>Gerard Cleary</td>
<td>31/07/2019</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Contractor Health and Safety Management</td>
<td>*PDU to create an internal contract management auditing programme which will include H&amp;S requirements.</td>
<td>Kelly La Valley</td>
<td>Gerard Cleary</td>
<td>30/06/2019</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Consequence</td>
<td>Corporate Accommodation</td>
<td>*Ensure that comprehensive planning for any large-scale staff relocations has been completed, which includes workstation ergonomic assessments (may need contractor based on volume of assessments).</td>
<td>Rob Hawthorne</td>
<td>Liz Ashton</td>
<td>Review early 2020 (revised)</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Consequence</td>
<td>Driver Safety</td>
<td>*Encourage staff to find alternatives to driving: e.g. video conferencing, skype etc.</td>
<td>Rob Hawthorne</td>
<td>Jeff Millward/Liz Ashton</td>
<td>Review early 2020</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Consequence</td>
<td>Electricity (proximity to overhead/underground lines)</td>
<td>*Ensure that emergency response procedures (i.e. what do to in the event of incident/interaction with underground or overhead power lines) is available, and that all relevant staff are trained, in procedure. *Same as above for Gas (Pegasus)</td>
<td>Richard Cookson</td>
<td>Jeff Millward</td>
<td>30/04/2019 (revised)</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Consequence</td>
<td>Electricity (proximity to overhead/underground lines)</td>
<td>*Retrain all Water Unit staff in use of cable locators.</td>
<td>Richard Cookson</td>
<td>Jeff Millward</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>Not started</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Consequence</td>
<td>Electricity (proximity to overhead/underground lines)</td>
<td>*Engagement with Mainpower to improve Before-U-Dig response times (create MOU?). *Engagement with Pegasus Gas to improve Before-U-Dig processes</td>
<td>Kalley Simpson</td>
<td>Gerard Cleary</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Consequence</td>
<td>Emergency Management (Workers responding to Civil Emergency events)</td>
<td>*Ensure that all of the current control measures are captured in Standard Operating Procedures which are clearly communicated to all relevant workers.</td>
<td>Brennan Wiremu</td>
<td>Nick Harrison</td>
<td>Review early 2020</td>
<td>Not started</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Consequence</td>
<td>Emergency response (internal)</td>
<td>*Earthquake seismic sensors to be installed in key buildings to measure potential damage (decision-making as to whether to evacuate or remain in building in earthquake event).</td>
<td>Greig Wilson</td>
<td>Nick Harrison</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Consequence</td>
<td>Emergency response (internal)</td>
<td>*Ear Protection needs to be considered in Emergency Procedures i.e. every person should have access to ear plugs or muffs in case of being trapped or required to stay in the building.</td>
<td>Health &amp; Safety</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>Not started</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Consequence</td>
<td>Excavations</td>
<td>*Develop/review standard operating procedures and retrain staff in new SOP. *Create and implement Water Unit competency register to ensure ongoing excavator operator competence.</td>
<td>Richard Cookson</td>
<td>Jeff Millward</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>Not started</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Consequence</td>
<td>Hazardous Substances - BAU Handling &amp; Storage</td>
<td>*Ensure non-compliances and improvements from 2019 audit have been completed.</td>
<td>Health &amp; Safety</td>
<td>Managers &amp; Team Leaders</td>
<td>31/10/2019</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Consequence</td>
<td>Mobile plant and machinery</td>
<td>*Check maintenance records and maintenance schedules are in place to ensure safety of equipment.</td>
<td>Health &amp; Safety</td>
<td>Managers &amp; Team Leaders</td>
<td>31/10/2019</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Consequence</td>
<td>Mobile plant and machinery</td>
<td>*Improve competency records to include a schedule of levels of competency for each staff member/each piece of mobile plant. *Develop/review standard operating procedures and retrain staff in new SOP.</td>
<td>Richard Cookson</td>
<td>Jeff Millward</td>
<td>31/05/2019 (revised)</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Consequence/High Risk</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Review and action of 3-Waters Sides Hazard Review (Dan McNally) and Water Unit Observation Report (Impac)</td>
<td>Richard Cookson / Kalley Simpson</td>
<td>Gerard Cleary / Jeff Millward</td>
<td>31/05/2019 (revised)</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Site Security WWTP</td>
<td>*Site security review to consider any points of access or vulnerabilities to sabotage (in particular pump stations, treatment plants or pipelines).</td>
<td>Kalley Simpson</td>
<td>Gerard Cleary</td>
<td>30/06/2020</td>
<td>Not started</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Consequence</td>
<td>Traffic management</td>
<td>*Review Traffic Management requirements for Greenspace Team, given that the Greenspaces team will be carrying inspections of street trees / street gardens as well as supervision and checking of the contractor working within the road corridor.</td>
<td>Grant MacLeod</td>
<td>Chris Brown</td>
<td>30/06/2019</td>
<td>Not started</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Consequence</td>
<td>Violent or Abusive members of public (in the field)</td>
<td>*Consider use of body cameras for enforcement staff</td>
<td>Health &amp; Safety</td>
<td>Nick Harrison</td>
<td>30/06/2019</td>
<td>Not started</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Consequence</td>
<td>Violent or Abusive members of public (in the field)</td>
<td>*Enforce mandatory StopViolence training for all staff that interact with public face-to-face (needs analysis by role).</td>
<td>Charlotte Browne</td>
<td>Liz Ashton</td>
<td>30/06/2019</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Consequence</td>
<td>Violent or Abusive members of public (in the field)</td>
<td>*Develop 'key client' staff relationships to ensure that only certain staff deal with identified difficult customers</td>
<td>Managers &amp; Team Leaders</td>
<td>Nick Harrison</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### High Risk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Responsible Persons</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Volunteers conducting hazardous activities</td>
<td><em>Undertake a review of operations to ensure that all activity and training is being carried out as per internal H&amp;S processes.</em></td>
<td>Brennan Wiremu</td>
<td>Liz Ashton</td>
<td>30/06/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Risk Water Safety (Public) Beaches/Natural Environment</strong></td>
<td><em>Review of risk and required control measures (based on what is ‘reasonably practicable’)</em></td>
<td>Grant MacLeod</td>
<td>Chris Brown</td>
<td>Review early 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Risk Water Safety (Public) Stormwater/Stock Races</strong></td>
<td><em>Review of risk and required control measures (based on what is ‘reasonably practicable’)</em></td>
<td>Kalley Simpson</td>
<td>Gerard Cleary</td>
<td>Review early 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Risk Water Safety (Public) WWTP</strong></td>
<td><em>Require review of security fencing of all Waste Water Treatment Plant sites (internal review - test against other organisations). Review Stormwater site security (internal review - test against other organisations).</em></td>
<td>Kalley Simpson</td>
<td>Gerard Cleary</td>
<td>30/06/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Consequence Water Safety (Public) Working at heights</strong></td>
<td><em>Review of all structures which require work at heights to determine the adequacy of the fall protection (in particular the harness systems) and any further procedure/training required to ensure safe use of systems.</em></td>
<td>Richard Cookson / Kalley Simpson / Jeff Millward</td>
<td></td>
<td>30/06/2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All actions are new since the April 2019 Risk Register review.*
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT FOR DECISION

FILE NO and TRIM NO: 190424059175
REPORT TO: Oxford-Ohoka Community Board
DATE OF MEETING: 9th May 2018
FROM: Grant MacLeod – Greenspace Manager
SUBJECT: Mandeville Village car parking concern

SIGNED BY: (for Reports to Council, Committees or Boards)
Department Manager
Chief Executive

1. SUMMARY

1.1 This report intends to inform the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board (the Board) to recommend to Council either purchase of additional land for car park development or to change the purpose of the plantation reserve in Mandeville to local purpose reserve for the purpose of installing a car park.

1.2 The neighbouring development known commonly as Mandeville Village has created pressure on the surrounding environment due to the need for further provision of car parking to support its commercial activity. The development has proven popular for nearby residents and those travelling on Tram Road. Mandeville Village has no further space provision to develop its own car parking. This has created pressure on the adjacent block of land, 975 Tram Road a Council owned plantation reserve that is now being utilised as an informal car park.

1.3 A preliminary plan demonstrating an allowance of 50 car parking spaces is provided in attachment i. The 50 car park option would allow noted demand levels to be met (car park analysis provided in attachment ii) and still allow the Council to meet its levels of service for provision of open space within this community. The proposed car park extension will address a shortage of on-site parking space at Mandeville Village and help reduce undesirable overflow parking around the site, particularly along Mandeville Road. It will improve on-site capacity and accessibility for reserve users, while mitigating the negative impacts of informal car parking on both the reserve and the road berms.

1.4 Car parking provision is inconsistent with the purpose of a plantation reserve, but acceptable within a community purpose reserve. A change in status of the land through the Reserves Act 1977 (RA77) would be required should car parking provision be supported at the reserve.

1.5 The Mandeville Residents Association on several occasions have approached the Council to address the car parking issue at Mandeville Village. Mandeville Village’s activity is consented, as such it does not require under the Resource Management Act (RMA) to develop further car parking. Further provision of car parking has become a community concern, placing the Council as the key mechanism for solving the issue.

1.6 Council has been approached by the neighbouring land owner (474 Mandeville Road) to express a willingness to discuss land purchase of their property This land would be suitable for mitigation of the current concern should Council wish to pursue this option.
1.7 Addressing the issue has a cost implication for the Council and as such further work is required to identify the most appropriate mechanism to achieve a cost effective solution.

**Attachments:**

i. Mandeville plantation reserve car park plan (modelled on 50 car parks) (190424059178)

ii. Developer supplied car park analysis (190424059177)

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board recommends to Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 190424059175

(b) **Supports** a change in Local Purpose classification of the Council-owned reserve at 975 Tram Road, from Local Purpose (Plantation) Reserve, to Local Purpose (Community Purposes) Reserve.

(c) **Supports** staff to prepare a resource consent based on the 50-space car park concept noting that no development can occur for a formalised car park unless a change of purpose and the process for that is completed. The status of the reserve at present does not legally support a formalised car park.

(d) **Notes** that the proposed change in the type of Local Purpose Reserve requires public consultation and Council approval. Approval by the Minister of Conservation is not required.

(e) **Notes** that Council’s Property Unit no longer has an interest in the reserve for plantation purposes and supports the proposed change. The current purpose is no longer appropriate given the reserves location, site characteristics and competing options for future use.

(f) **Notes** that the proposed Community Purposes sub-classification will allow greater flexibility in providing for community needs within the reserve.

(g) **Notes** that a key driver for a change of reserve purpose is to consider an allowance of a portion of the reserve to be available for formed car park.

(h) **Notes** that funding would need to be sought from a future Annual Plan or Long Term Plan to support the creation of a car park.

(i) **Notes** that sufficient open space for community recreation purposes would exist within the reserve should a 50-space car park be installed.

(j) **Notes** that staff will come back to the Community Board and Council with a report on the feedback and results of the change of purpose process. Staff will also be preparing resource consent for the car park based on the 50-space concept.

3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1 Property 975 Tram Road Reserve (975) shares a boundary with property 468 Mandeville road (468) which has a commercial development. The development includes a supermarket, restaurants and other convenience choices for the local population and those travelling through the district on Tram road. The commercial development has proven popular to the point that 975 has become an informal car park area.

3.2 The property at 468 does have a consented car park located onsite. Demand has meant that the public is now parking on Mandeville road, within the reserve and occasionally on Tram Road.
3.3 Staff presented options to the Oxford Ohoka Community Board in November 2018 at which time the board outlined a preference for short-term acceptance of parking only at 975 with further information requested on a resolution to the issue. The board stated that leasing the land to the developer is only a last resort if all other avenues were exhausted and it did not support the idea of selling the land.

3.4 Staff undertook a briefing with the Board on 7 March 2019 to discuss the potential of land purchase at 474 Mandeville Road. The Board then requested that staff prepare a report to present options for development of the reserve space and or purchase of the adjacent land to make an informed decision on future car parking provision to support Mandeville Village.

4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

4.1. Resource consent was granted to the development on 28th February 2018, which included the development of car parking to support the centre.

4.2. Waimakariri District Council (WDC) is the landowner of the property directly to the north of the development, this being 975 Mandeville Road. This land at 975 is held as reserve and is now being used informally as a car park with most parkers then moving over to utilise the shopping centre.

4.3. Staff has been working with the developer to see if a partnership could be reached on development of this land to support car parking. In latest correspondence, it would appear that the developer now sees WDC as the funder of the parking given they are consented for their activity. At the time consent was granted, the developer provided WDC with projected traffic volumes and these were accepted through the consenting process. This has been implemented and the consent given effect to. The planning unit has confirmed that with these conditions having been met the developer of Mandeville Village has no responsibility for further car parking provision.

Options

There are number of options open to Community Board and Council for discussion and to consider in relation to addressing the concern that has been raised in regards to car parking provision at Mandeville Village.

It is also worth noting that WDC has in the past provided car parking for commercial or retail activity, for example the Blake Street car park in central Rangiora or Kaiapoi Ruataniwha which supports the town centre and areas of parking within Oxford.

4.4. Option 1: Do nothing.

There is currently identified shortfall of approximately 50 car park spaces at Mandeville Village. The Mandeville Residents Association (MRA) and the wider community are concerned about the use of Mandeville and Tram Road and the plantation reserve to support car parking demand for use of Mandeville Village. If Council chooses to do nothing, the MRA will continue to be unsatisfied with use of the area. It would be expected that they continue to seek solution to the concern from the Council given the issue is around safe use of the area. The demand for car parking itself is an indication of how well utilised Mandeville Village is for both local residents and those travelling along Tram Road.

Estimated timeframe is not applicable as this concern would be ongoing until a solution is agreed.

Staff do not recommend this option as it does not address the current safety concern or feedback from MRA/community.
4.5. **Option 2: Purchase of 474 Mandeville Road.**

This option would address the concern at greater expense. Staff have been approached by the landowner who has indicated a willingness to discuss the opportunity for Council to purchase the property.

The land area would be suitable to build a car park, which would cater for shortfall and appropriate access.

**Estimated timeframe** for this option could be 3-6 months (budget dependant) for purchase with design to follow.

*Staff do not recommend this option due to the high expense of the solution. While it would mitigate the concern, it involves land purchase, demolition of existing dwelling, and then installation of car park. This will come at a much greater cost than other options tabled.*

4.6. **Option 3: Change status of plantation reserve to utilise for car park.**

The reserve is currently being utilised as a car park and has been for the past several months, during this time Greenspace has not received complaints about the use, only that the concern needs a formal solution. The public have demonstrated, much like a desire line pathway, that they are keen to use the reserve for car parking. To change the status will require an RA77 process as discussed in the legislation section of this report. Attachment i indicates the preferred car park layout, which would retain the level of service requirement that Council has for open space within neighbourhood reserves. Mandeville Domain is easily accessible along Mandeville Road and supports this catchment in regards to open space provision.

A resource consent will be required with this option, as it will be considered a retail activity on rural land even though it will have benefit for the reserve use itself. Open space value will be retained and through formalising the car park, current assets will have protection from inappropriate car use. Greenspace would not actively encourage this reserve for active recreation given the boundaries with Tram Road and the proximity of Mandeville Domain. Greenspace expect low impact recreation use and passive activities to occur within the reserve hence the change in status would be appropriate to its intended use.

**Estimated timeframe** for this option could take up to 10 months, this being dependant on challenge through public consultation i.e. hearing process under the RA77.

*Staff recommend this option as it is the most cost effective solution to the concern raised. The reserve would not be unduly compromised and the community would have access to both the reserve area in a controlled manner, which does not further degrade current assets, and to the adjacent Mandeville Village.*

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

5. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

5.1. **Groups and Organisations**

Staff have been in liaison with the commercial developer about this issue to speak to them on behalf of the users of the facilities at 468. Onsite anecdotal analysis plus the commercial developers own analysis has highlighted the area is being used by the public for car parking.
No specific groups or organisations have been consulted on the subject of this report. The views and support of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board are being sought prior to progression of this proposal.

There have been a number of deputations from various groups and organisations regarding the need and options for additional car parking.

5.2. **Wider Community**

Greenspace have not undertaken wider community consultation.

If the recommendations in this report are approved, staff will look to publicly notify the proposed change of reserve purpose if a decision in principle is made to support the proposal by both the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board and Council. This notice will specify the reasons for the proposal and all responses will be formally considered.

6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**

6.1.1. Budget will need to be sought from a future Annual Plan or Long Term Plan process if Council supports either Option 2 or Option 3.

6.1.2. A formal change in reserve purpose will incur minor administrative costs related to public notification and a gazette notice to Land Information New Zealand.

6.2. **Community Implications**

The community has demonstrated its concern with the safety of people parking along the road corridors versus a controlled, risk-mitigated solution within the reserve or private land. The reserve can still function as a place of passive recreation should a change in purpose be achieved.

6.3. **Risk Management**

6.3.1. Declining a change of purpose for the reserve will restrict options for future facility development, including the possibility of a car park. Significant community-focussed development will remain incompatible with the reserve’s current primary purpose.

6.3.2. Current car parking provision in the commercial area has been based on a resource consent imposed lower limit. To determine the number of additional car parks now required the developers have used the resource consent upper limit. With the developer supplied car park analysis (attachment ii) a design based on 50 spaces would be considered optimal for current and future provision. This would ensure that any risk to the reserve is mitigated and levels of service targets are met.

6.4. **Health and Safety**

6.4.1. A formal change in reserve purpose should have no discernible impact on reserve site safety. Any future development associated with the reserve is subject to Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) assessment. Remnant tree hazards associated with historical plantation use have already been addressed via remedial pruning and tree removal.

6.4.2. An extension of car park facilities to increase overall capacity at Mandeville Village will have safety benefits for reserve users. The scope to park safely within the
reserve will be increased. Uncontrolled and undesirable roadside parking should reduce, making roadside access to and from the reserve near the Mandeville-McHughs Road intersection less hazardous.

6.4.3. Increased reserve use is likely to require the installation of suitable perimeter fencing to control user access and activity along exposed roadside boundaries.

7. CONTEXT

7.1. Policy

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

7.3. Legislation (Reserves Act 1977)

7.3.1. A council (if a territorial authority) has a delegated power under Section 24A of the Reserves Act to change the purpose of a reserve vested in it which has been classified as local purpose reserve. That power is to subsequently change the type of the reserve within the local purpose class.

7.3.2. Council is required under Section 24A(2) of the Reserves Act to publicly notify the proposed change of purpose, specifying the reasons for the proposal.

7.3.3. Local Purpose Reserve is the most flexible classification available under the Reserves Act. The administering body has the authority to develop and manage a Local Purpose Reserve almost as it sees fit (consistent with the primary purpose of the land) without referring to the Minister of Conservation for approval.

7.3.4. For each Local Purpose Reserve, a sub-classification (type) is applied which specifies the primary purpose of the reserve. The Reserves Act does not specifically restrict the types of local purpose, but they should be consistent with the general purposes of the Act. A sub-classification of ‘Community Purposes’ is an established primary purpose focussing on community value. Other values inherent in a reserve, such as scenic, historic, or natural features are managed to the extent compatible with the primary purpose of the reserve.

7.4. Community Outcomes

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

- There are wide-ranging opportunities for people of different ages, abilities and cultures to participate in community life and recreational activities.

There is a healthy and sustainable environment for all

- Harm to the environment from the impacts of land use, use of water resources and air emissions is minimised.
- Crime, injury and harm from road crashes, gambling, and alcohol abuse are minimised.

7.5. Delegations

Council has the delegated authority to approve any change of sub-classification for local purpose reserves vested in Council.
NOTES:

1. ALL PARKING SPACES 5.0m X 2.5m AS PER WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT PLAN, ALLOWING FOR A 6.2m MANOEUVRING LANE BETWEEN PARKING LANES.

2. EXISTING FOOTPATH CONNECTING MCHUGHES ROAD AND MANDERVILLE VILLAGE NOT SHOWN.

3. TOTAL CAR-PARK AREA: 1125m2

4. TOTAL RESERVE AREA (EX CAR-PARK): 2775m2

5. CAR-PARK DESIGN RETAINS LARGE ESTABLISHED TREES WHERE POSSIBLE. REQUIRES TWO LARGE TREES TO BE REMOVED. AERIAL PHOTOGRAPH SHOWS MANY TREES THAT HAVE PREVIOUSLY BEEN REMOVED.

6. ASSUMED THAT CAR-PARK WILL BE CONSTRUCTED WITH UNSALTED SURFACE, AND BOLLARD & WIRE PERIMETER FENCE.

7. CAR-PARK PAVEMENT ASSUMED TO BE 150mm RIVER RUN, AND 100mm M4AP40, SUBJECT TO CONFIRMATION
## CAR PARK SURVEY – MANDEVILLE VILLAGE

### WEEK 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time (peak)</th>
<th>Weather</th>
<th>Tenancies Open (Units Open)</th>
<th>Tenancies Closed (Units Closed)</th>
<th>Vehicles (Village)</th>
<th>Vehicles (Mandeville Rd)</th>
<th>Vehicles (Reserve)</th>
<th>Vehicles (Tram Rd)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>25 Oct 2018</td>
<td>5.16pm</td>
<td>Mild</td>
<td>NPD, 1, 2, 4, 5, 6 and 7</td>
<td>Unit 3</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>26 Oct 2018</td>
<td>6.03pm</td>
<td>Mild</td>
<td>NPD, 1, 2, 4, 5, 6 and 7</td>
<td>Unit 3</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>27 Oct 2018</td>
<td>4.06pm</td>
<td>Mild</td>
<td>NPD, 1, 4, 5, 6 and 7</td>
<td>Unit 3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>28 Oct 2018</td>
<td>2.18pm</td>
<td>Mild</td>
<td>NPD, 1, 5, 6 and 7</td>
<td>Unit 3</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WEEK 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time (peak)</th>
<th>Weather</th>
<th>Tenancies Open (Units Open)</th>
<th>Tenancies Closed (Units Closed)</th>
<th>Vehicles (Village)</th>
<th>Vehicles (Mandeville Rd)</th>
<th>Vehicles (Reserve)</th>
<th>Vehicles (Tram Rd)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>1 Nov 2018</td>
<td>5.11pm</td>
<td>Cool</td>
<td>NPD, 1, 2, 4, 5, 6 and 7</td>
<td>Unit 3</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>2 Nov 2018</td>
<td>6.09pm</td>
<td>Cool</td>
<td>NPD, 1, 2, 4, 5, 6 and 7</td>
<td>Unit 3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>3 Nov 2018</td>
<td>4.03pm</td>
<td>Warm</td>
<td>NPD, 1, 4, 5, 6 and 7</td>
<td>Unit 3</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>4 Nov 2018</td>
<td>2.12pm</td>
<td>Warm</td>
<td>NPD, 1, 5, 6 and 7</td>
<td>Unit 3</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WEEK 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time (peak)</th>
<th>Weather</th>
<th>Tenancies Open (Units Open)</th>
<th>Tenancies Closed (Units Closed)</th>
<th>Vehicles (Village)</th>
<th>Vehicles (Mandeville Rd)</th>
<th>Vehicles (Reserve)</th>
<th>Vehicles (Tram Rd)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>8 Nov 2018</td>
<td>5.21pm</td>
<td>Very Hot</td>
<td>NPD, 1, 2, 4, 5, 6 and 7</td>
<td>Unit 3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>9 Nov 2018</td>
<td>6.06pm</td>
<td>Cool</td>
<td>NPD, 1, 2, 4, 5, 6 and 7</td>
<td>Unit 3</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>10 Nov 2018</td>
<td>4.09pm</td>
<td>Cool</td>
<td>NPD, 1, 4, 5, 6 and 7</td>
<td>Unit 3</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>11 Nov 2018</td>
<td>2.23pm</td>
<td>Mild</td>
<td>NPD, 1, 5, 6 and 7</td>
<td>Unit 3</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WEEK 4
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time (peak)</th>
<th>Weather</th>
<th>Tenancies Open (Units Open)</th>
<th>Tenancies Closed (Units Closed)</th>
<th>Vehicles (Village)</th>
<th>Vehicles (Mandeville Rd)</th>
<th>Vehicles (Reserve)</th>
<th>Vehicles (Tram Rd)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>15 Nov 2018</td>
<td>5.22pm</td>
<td>Hot</td>
<td>NPD, 1, 2, 4, 5, 6 and 7</td>
<td>Unit 3</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>16 Nov 2018</td>
<td>6.28pm</td>
<td>Hot</td>
<td>NPD, 1, 2, 4, 5, 6 and 7</td>
<td>Unit 3</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>17 Nov 2018</td>
<td>4.18pm</td>
<td>Mild</td>
<td>NPD, 1, 4, 5, 6 and 7</td>
<td>Unit 3</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>18 Nov 2018</td>
<td>2.36pm</td>
<td>Warm</td>
<td>NPD, 1, 5, 6 and 7</td>
<td>Unit 3</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. SUMMARY

1.1. This report is to seek support for the draft terms of reference for the Town Centre Feature Lighting & Decorations Working Group.

1.2. The steering group will be responsible for overseeing the development of an implementation plan for feature lighting and decorations in both Rangiora and Kaiapoi town centres.

1.3. Membership of the working group is to include representation from the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board. This report requests that two representatives from the Board be appointed to the working group.

Attachments:

i. Draft Terms of Reference for the Town Centre Feature Lighting and Decorations Working Group (Trim 190328045690)

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 190424059105;

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

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

AND

THAT the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board recommends:

THAT the Council:

(c) Receives report No. 190424059105;
(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.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1 A report was taken to Council in January 2019 as part of the Annual Plan process to update Council on town centre decorations and lighting installation carried out in Rangiora and Kaiapoi.

3.2 As part of this process it was agreed a working group would be set up to consider future lighting and decoration requirements in Rangiora and Kaiapoi town centres, oversee the development of an implementation plan and have an overview of the implementation process.

3.3 The working party is to meet on a monthly basis and will have a Project Manager from within the Project delivery Unit to support the group.

4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

4.1. A draft terms of reference has been prepared for the working group which sets clear objectives for the group.

4.2. The process of deciding the level of feature lighting and decorations in the town centres will require specialist input and consultation particularly in the area of lighting. This is likely to include preparation of a brief, options assessment and undertaking trials before further progressing the design.

4.3. In respect to decorations, consideration will need to be given to the requirement and possible scope of decorations required.

4.4. Budget provision in 2019/20 of $50,000 has been requested as part of the Annual Plan process to allow for specialist lighting designs to be undertaken.

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

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. Groups and Organisations

5.2. No specific feedback has been sought to date however consultation will be undertaken with the Promotions Associations and town centre business on these issues as part of the wider project.

5.3. Wider Community

5.4. Community views on town centre lighting and decorations have not been sought, however it is considered that there is a community expectation that the lights and decorations will continue to be installed as they have been in previous years.

6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1. Financial Implications

6.2. As detailed in 4.4, budget provision in 2019/20 of $50,000 has been requested as part of the Annual Plan process to allow for specialist lighting designs to be undertaken.
6.3. No other budget is currently allocated for additional lighting or decorations.

6.4. **Community Implications**

6.5. The working party will provide feedback to Community Boards and Council as work progresses.

6.6. **Risk Management**

6.7. There is a risk on not meeting Community expectation. This risk can be mitigated by carrying out reviews, consultation and securing specialist services in this knowledge area.

6.8. **Health and Safety**

6.9. There are no specific Health & Safety considerations to be considered as part of this report.

7. **CONTEXT**

7.1. **Policy**

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

7.2. **Legislation**

There is no relevant legislation in this matter.

7.3. **Community Outcomes**

This report consider the following outcomes:

- **Public spaces and facilities are plentiful, accessible and high quality**
  - There is a wide variety of public places and spaces to meet people’s needs.

- **The distinctive character of our takiwā - towns, villages and rural areas is maintained**
  - The centres of our towns are safe, convenient and attractive places to visit and do business.

7.4. **Delegations**

The Rangiora-Ashley Community Board has the authority to receive information and consider requests for representation.
Membership

Two Council representatives (one to be the Town Centres Portfolio holder), two Rangiora-Ashley Community Board Representatives, two Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board Representatives, Manager of Utilities and Roading, Manager of Community & Recreation, Business and Centres Manager, Roading & Transportation Manager, plus a Project Manager.

1 Terms of Reference

The Working Group will be responsible for overseeing the development of an implementation plan for both Rangiora Town Centre and Kaiapoi Town Centre by XX 2019 as well as delivery of the plan, with reference to the following areas:

1.1 Consideration of future decoration requirements for the town centres,
1.2 Consideration of future lighting requirements (decorative, pedestrian and feature lighting) for the town centres,
1.3 Approve a programme of consultation and investigations necessary to develop the Implementation Plan,
1.4 Oversee the development of implementation plans for both Rangiora and Kaiapoi town centres,
1.5 Recommend adoption of the Implementation Plans for each town centre to both Boards and Council,
1.6 Provide regular update reports to the Council, the Rangiora-Ashley and Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Boards,
1.7 Oversee the implementation of the approved plans.

2 Objectives

2.1 To review the current levels of decorations and lighting in Rangiora and Kaiapoi Town Centres,
2.2 To resolve any outstanding issues with the current lighting feature installations as required,
2.3 To identify the opportunities for improvement in relation to decorations, feature lighting, pedestrian lighting and street lighting in Rangiora and Kaiapoi Town Centres,
2.4 To consider possible future enhancement of existing public spaces with regards to feature lighting and decorations,

2.5 To develop a comprehensive implementation plan which clearly defines the objectives and sought outcomes with regards to decorations and lighting,

2.6 To identify the roles of the Council and other stakeholders in the implementation plan, including making recommendations of key steps and actions,

2.7 To make a financial recommendation on capital and maintenance costs associated with feature lighting and decorations to Council.

3 Meeting Frequency

Monthly

4 Staff Support

Management Team and Council staff as required.

A Project Manager is being provided by the Project Delivery Unit.
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE UTILITIES AND ROADING COMMITTEE HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA ON TUESDAY 16 APRIL 2019 COMMENCING AT 4.00PM

PRESENT

Councillor P Williams (Chairperson), Mayor D Ayers, Deputy Mayor K Felstead, Councillors R Brine (until 6.17pm), J Meyer and S Stewart.

IN ATTENDANCE

Councillors D Gordon, N Atkinson, W Doody, A Blackie, K Barnett, J Palmer, (Chief Executive), G Cleary (Manager Utilities and Roading), K Simpson (3 Waters Manager), B Rice (Senior Transport Engineer), J McBride (Roading and Transport Manager), G Hutchison (Wastewater Asset Manager), S Allen (Water Environment Advisor), and A Smith (Governance Coordinator)

1 APOLOGIES

An apology for departure at 6.15pm was received and sustained from Councillor Brine.

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

There were no conflicts of interest recorded.

3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

3.1 Minutes of a meeting of the Utilities and Roading Committee held on Tuesday 19 March 2019

Moved Councillor Brine Seconded Councillor Meyer

THAT the Utilities and Roading Committee:

(a) Confirms, as a true and correct record, the minutes of a meeting of the Utilities and Roading Committee held on Tuesday 19 March 2019.

CARRIED

4 MATTERS ARISING

There were no matters arising.

5 DEPUTATION

5.1 Mandeville Residents Association

Present on behalf of the Mandeville Residents Association were James Ensor, Tom McBrearty, Rosina Rouse and other supporters of the Association. T McBrearty and R Rouse spoke on the Flooding and drainage sites in Mandeville, Eyreton and Swannanoa that had been identified with Council drainage staff. The feedback from Council staff had been appreciated by the
Association members T McBrearty spoke on the issues, noting that there needs to be a holistic approach and if there is to be any long term expansion plan of developing their properties or getting more domestic properties in to the area, the flooding issue has to be addressed.

R Rouse noted that about 31 sites had been visited by WDC Staff members, K Simpson, O Davies and several members Mandeville Residents Association (MRA). Information on the issues at these sites has all been documented, and included with this, is possible options, the Associations recommendations and suggested timeframe, the Council’s response to the recommendation, and final recommendation from the MRA Drainage Group. R Rouse and T McBrearty highlighted the drainage issues at these site. T McBrearty suggested that the undercurrent level is rising and suggested that if there is another 2014 rain event, there will be a lot of angry residents. It was noted that there have been discussions with Council staff on some of these matters. T McBrearty said when they brought into this area, they did not expect to have lakes forming around their house, when there is heavy rain during the winter. Residents would like a continuation of the work that Council is doing, and also for funding to be available to bring more of the work forward. D Lines noted that the 2014 rain event was significant, but there were bigger events in the late 1980s. This was prior to the subdivisions, and now the problem has become greater.

Councillor Gordon noted the significant amount of work that the residents had put into preparing the report which has only just been completed. G Cleary confirmed that this is a submission to the Council’s Annual Plan process, a staff report will come to Council in response to this with staff advice.

Councillors Blackie referred to comments that there may be alterations to drains which is impacting on water flow. The Council has a Drainage Bylaw which was reviewed in 2018, though it does not have the staff resources to monitor all drains. The best way for members of the public to advise the Council is through the Service Request system.

Councillor Stewart asked if the members of the Residents Association would be supportive of bringing forward the Council reviewing a district wide drainage rate. This is currently scheduled for 2020/21. Members agreed with this suggestion.

There was discussion on testing of water in private water supplies. G Cleary advised that there has been no previous discussion regarding the Council providing free testing of private water supplies. The Council has an allocation of $10,000 in the draft annual plan to carry out some monitoring of private water supplies. This comes under the ZIPA funding.

J Ensor confirmed the MRA will be submitting and speaking at the annual plan process and thanked the Council staff who have assisted the group.

6 REPORTS

6.1 High Occupancy Vehicle Lane and Shared Use Path Waimakariri River to Tram Road – Bill Rice (Senior Transport Engineer)

J McBride and B Rice presented this report, seeking approval from the committee to construct a High occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lane and a Shared User Path (SUP) between the Christchurch Northern Motorway and the Main North Road/Tram Road intersection. NZTA are currently working on a business case and the application for funding will go to their Board on the 1st May. The HOV and SUP will both connect with similar proposals on the Christchurch Northern Arterial.
J McBride spoke to a PowerPoint presentation and provided background information on this NZTA project, with construction underway. The opening of the Christchurch Northern Corridor is due on 20 June 2020 and it is intended to have a High Occupancy Vehicle lane on this corridor feeding into Christchurch. Information on the process to date was provided, including options for a cycleway connecting with the Passchendaele Path. Several options were considered for this and each was assessed and scored considered on road safety, CPTED, directness and coherence, connectivity to other destinations, local business impacts, resident/wider community impact, operational and network impacts, ease of construction and costs and risk to the project. Explanation of the proposed layout at the Main North Road intersection and the Tram Road intersection were provided. B Rice pointed out that with all the plans these are still subject to safety audit and not yet final plans. There has been discussion with the owner of the property that is bound by the Main North Road, Tram Road and the motorway. Staff have also spoken with all the tenants who are likely to be affected. The property owner has advised that they are generally supportive of the proposed works and would like to be involved in the detailed design of the proposed works. The business tenants response has been similar, general support but all wishing to have input into the details of the layout at their accessways. All were supportive of traffic signals at the Tram Road/Main North Road intersection and also for a reduction in the speed limit, which will possibly be 60kmh.

Following a question from Councillor Atkinson, B Rice advised that the discussions had not been held with business owners who operate further down Wrights road from the intersection.

J McBride noted that the detail of the cycleway along the Main North Road and through Kaiapoi is still to be determined. There will be further workshops with the Boards and this committee on how the cycleway will link with existing connections.

Following a question from Councillor Gordon on costings, B Rice noted that there would be significant costs involved in widening the bridge at Tram Road over the Motorway and NZTA would not have considered this. Crs Gordon and Blackie both noted minimal use by pedestrians of the footpath over the bridge and suggested there could be space available for a slip lane. B Rice said this possibility would be suggested to NZTA. Mayor Ayers noted that there are footpaths on both sides of the bridge, and that the path on the south side could be narrowed to allow wider space for vehicles.

Councillor Atkinson also noted the need to accommodate the volume of traffic from Woodford Glen events, and B Rice noted that this is also being taken into account.

Councillor Barnett also noted the need to accommodate cyclists coming from the direction of Oxford on Tram Road and going into Christchurch.
Moved Councillor Meyer seconded Councillor Brine

THAT the Utilities and Roading Committee:

(a) Receives report No. 190403049793.

(b) Approves the construction of the proposed shared User path and roading changes within Council’s network, as shown in concept on the attached drawings (Trim 190403049854)

(c) Notes that these layouts are subject to review and safety audit, and therefore details may change

(d) Notes that, NZTA proposes to fully fund the construction of these works, and that there is no funding obligation on Council

(e) Notes that speed limits on Main North Road and Tram Road will be reviewed in conjunction with these works

(f) Notes that staff will update the Committee, all Community Boards and Council on progress of these works.

CARRIED

Councillor Meyer believes this is good progress and noted that there is potential for an increase in cyclists on the roads in this district and nationwide. Councillor Meyer also agrees with the introduction of traffic lights and this will make it safer for all road users. Councillor Meyer noted his concerns with the traffic count on Peraki Street.

Councillor Atkinson has concerns with cycle lanes being located right beside traffic lanes, and noted the potential traffic movements of trucks, and traffic from the service station. The cycleway needs to be away from the road where possible, and Councillor Atkinson suggests the Council should look at using the railway corridor for the shared path and that this would be a safer option. Councillor Atkinson would like this matter to come back to the Council for further discussion.

Councillor Blackie also would strongly advocate for the cycleway to be off the road.

Councillor Barnett supports this report and the progress is a step forward for the district. A positive aspect is this being an NZTA fully funded cycleway with no impact on the ratepayers. Councillor Barnett does have concerns with the traffic lights and the amount of straight through traffic. This is a gateway for the entire district and Councillor Barnett applauds the staff and everyone involved in the project.

Mayor Ayers noted the need for a decent flow of traffic onto the motorway during peak hours.

Councillor Williams also believes the cycle lane needs to be put on the other side of the road and supports the comments of Councillor Atkinson. Commented on the timber yard with traffic entering and exiting there, there needs to be thought given to the safety aspect of this.

Councillor Gordon would like to see a further lane included for safety reasons. This is a positive move for the district and Councillor Gordon thanked the staff for all the work that has gone on behind the scenes and this is a positive move forward.
Councillor Meyer, acknowledged the comments of Councillor Atkinson. He noted some concerns with the shared pathway along the Main North Road, but is confident that the finished product will be safe. The Council has a responsibility for this safety aspect to be accounted for. This cycleway is adding to the existing cycle ways and tracks in the district.

At this time, the deputation from the Mandeville Residents Association was taken. Refer to Item 5.1 in the minutes, which are taken in order of the agenda.

6.2 Kaiapoi River – Implications of Increasing Saline Intrusions – Sophie Allen (Water Environment Advisor)

S Allen (Water Environment Advisory) and K Simpson (3 Waters Manager) presented this report. Referred to the report of Adrian Meredith from Environment Canterbury titled “Assessment of the state of a tidal waterway – the Lower Kaiapoi River (March 2018). This report in response to this, looks at the implications for our Council and our community, or increasing saline incursions. It was noted that implications are wide ranging, including ecological, social and economical.

Although these current increasing saline incursions are not as a result of sea level rises, information on strategies from the Ministry for the Environment was included with the report on possible future impacts of this. MfE guidance has a range of strategies to respond to coastal hazards. It is suggested that there needs to be the start of community discussion.

Councillor Atkinson expressed concern that there was nothing definitive in the report. S Allen noted that there needed to be some monitoring data from ECAN and also some modelling of the system, and it is a complex scenario. The report indicates that this is a direction, or a trend and staff don’t have enough information to be sure.

As saline testing of the water in Kaiapoi River has only been undertaken in the last six years, it could be that the incursions were as a result of the earthquakes. Councillor Atkinson noted, possibly liquefaction was the result of the death of willow trees. S Allen said that the reason for the observed changes in the lower Kaiapoi River were most likely due to the increased saline incursions in the Kaiapoi River.

Councillor Stewart asked what things the Council could be doing to improve the situation and the community would want to see the detail on the monitoring being undertaken. How will the Council develop the recommendations into something more succinct? G Cleary noted that there are matters that the Council is already doing, for example any engineering works that the Council is doing is taking into account that it will be in a saline environment and will make an accommodation for that. Also noted that the planting along the river bank as part of the rehabilitation programme, is being done in a staged approach.

S Allen noted that there is other reports being done on this matter, and linking with climate change.

Moved Mayor Ayers seconded Councillor Williams

THAT the Utilities and Roading Committee

(a) Receives report No. 190115003326.
(b) **Notes** the strategy recommended by 3 Waters staff is for the Council to work with the community and other management agencies to discuss response strategies, with an increasing saline environment in the lower Kaiapoi River.

(c) **Notes** that there will likely be changes to the ecology, flora and fauna which will affect local community perceptions, recreational amenity, and the visitor experience of the lower Kaiapoi River area.

(d) **Notes** that buildings and infrastructure such as stop banks and pipes will over time face an increasingly changing environment, with saline and/or tidal groundwater in the lower Kaiapoi River area.

(e) **Advocates** for further monitoring to be carried out by Environment Canterbury to assess the frequency and degree of saline intrusions to enable salinity modelling and predictions. In addition, for Environment Canterbury to determine and employ methods to monitor water quality and aquatic ecology health trends of the tidal section of the Kaiapoi River.

(f) **Circulates** this report to Council, Kaiapoi River Rehabilitation Working Party, and the Kaiapoi –Tuahiwi Community Board.

Mayor Ayers noted there are likely to be a number of variables which will contribute to the Kaiapoi River changes, and acknowledged the comment of staff on looking at the wider coastal area. Of these variables that are contributing to this issue, there are some that the Council will have no control over locally (i.e. sea level rises). The Kaiapoi River will continue to be a challenge in the future.

Councillor Blackie noted the report of Adrian Meredith was done in 2016-2017 which were drought years and the river levels were low. Since August 2017 the drought has broken and the river flows are much different. Councillor Blackie would like to see some further testing be undertaken of the current readings and to see what these are in the river now. Referring to river water flows and push back against incoming salt water, Councillor Blackie questions if the data is accurate enough but does support ongoing investigation.

Councillor Stewart proposed an amendment with an additional recommendation, that specifically focuses on mitigation and prevention methods, with the addition of recommendation (g) below:

Moved Councillor Stewart seconded Councillor Meyer

(g) **Request** a report into options, including costs of mitigating and preventing salt water intrusion into the Kaiapoi River system. Three options to include but are not limited to:

- Instigate the process to raise the minimum flows – outlined in ECan’s current state/Tipā cultural report and the ZIPA for the Kaiapoi/Silverstream and its tributaries streams – Ohoka, Cam, Cust Main Drain and Silverstream – as a matter of urgency.
- Investigate and cost the operation of the existing Cam River flood gate as a tide gate to prevent salt water intrusion up the Cam River and provide a flushing effect of fresh water into the Kaiapoi River
- To cost a tidal/flood barrage on the Waimakariri/Kaiapoi Rivers confluence
- And any other mitigation options
Councillor Stewart noted that the mitigation possibilities were discussed at the Kaiapoi River Rehabilitation subcommittee meeting. Noted that what was discussed at this meeting was not reflected in this report. The community does not accept that the Kaiapoi River is going to turn into a saltwater estuary. Councillor Stewart noted that there is significant investment in the Kaiapoi, with a desire that the river is a focus for the town. Believes that the Council needs to focus on some measures that can be investigated and costed and not just sit back and watch what is happening. This is in addition to the recommendations in the report and urges members to support this.

Councillor Meyer said the Council has a responsibility to look after the river and there needs to be something done for the flows in the Kaiapoi River, Ohoka Stream, Cam River and Cust Main Drain. Councillor Meyer would not feel right if something was not done to improve the current situation and it is very important for the district to get this right. Councillor Meyer spoke on the shutting of the flood gate to stop the salt water going up the Cam River. It was pointed out that this flood gate had not been closed for a long time. He suggests that closing this should be tried to see if it will work, as it would provide enough pressure of water flow to stir up the water to push the saltwater out.

Councillor Barnett acknowledges the concerns of others around the council table, especially the Kaiapoi members and also acknowledged that the Kaiapoi River is an icon of the district and well loved. She noted that the current recommendations covers the intent of the amendment. Referring to recommendation (e), Councillor Barnett noted concerns that this would send a signal to the Kaiapoi community that this could fix the issue right now and she doesn’t believe this is the case. Councillor Barnett also has concerns this would impose extra rating on the community. Though not able to vote, Councillor Barnett would not support this amendment.

Mayor Ayers said this recommendation is beyond the scope of the report before the committee and the matters raised in this amendment are not raised in this report. The Draft Annual Plan process is the time for this to be discussed, on how the Council spends money in support of the ZIPA. There are multiple variables as noted in the staff report and so there could be many options.

Councillor Atkinson supports the recommended amendment which “requests a staff report and options including costs” and believes this should be looked at. This is an addition to give people some focus going forward, and provides clarification. The original motion still stands and there is no harm done by this additional recommendation. Although not part of this committee, Councillor Atkinson urges members to support it.

Councillor Felstead asked if staff had the expertise to answer these questions and if not, what price would it cost for consultants to produce a report. G Cleary said Council does not have the expertise in house to carry out a report of this nature and would need to get some external advice on what is requested in this amendment (g). To get a high level of confidence on the costing and to look at all of the mitigation options, it could be tens of thousands of dollars at the least. This would be fairly substantial work and G Cleary’s recommendation would be that it be done in a staged manner. G Cleary noted that there is a lot of uncertainty on what is causing the saline intrusion. G Cleary advised that there is not funding in the current budget to do the work that is requested today.

The amendment was then put

Moved Councillor Stewart seconded Councillor Meyer
(g) **Request** a report into options, including costs of mitigating and preventing salt water intrusion into the Kaiapoi River system. Three options to include but are not limited to:

- Instigate the process to raise the minimum flows – outlined in ECan's current state/Tipa cultural report and the ZIPA for the Kaiapoi/Silverstream and its tributaries streams – Ohoka, Cam, Cust Main Drain and Silverstream – as a matter of urgency.
- Investigate and cost the operation of the existing Cam River flood gate as a tide gate to prevent salt water intrusion up the Cam River and provide a flushing effect of fresh water into the Kaiapoi River.
- To cost a tidal/flood barrage on the Waimakariri/Kaiapoi Rivers confluence.
- And any other mitigation options.

**LOST**

A division was called

For Councillors Stewart and Meyer
Against Mayor Ayers, Councillors Felstead, Brine and Williams.

The original motion was then put and subsequently became the substantive motion.

Moved Mayor Ayers seconded Councillor Williams.

**THAT** the Utilities and Roading Committee

(a) ** Receives** report No. 190115003326.

(b) **Notes** the strategy recommended by 3 Waters staff is for the Council is to work with the community and other management agencies to discuss response strategies, with an increasing saline environment in the lower Kaiapoi River.

(c) **Notes** that there will likely be changes to the ecology, flora and fauna which will affect local community perceptions, recreational amenity, and the visitor experience of the lower Kaiapoi River area.

(d) **Notes** that buildings and infrastructure such as stop banks and pipes will over time face an increasingly changing environment, with saline and/or tidal groundwater in the lower Kaiapoi River area.

(e) **Advocates** for further monitoring to be carried out by Environment Canterbury to assess the frequency and degree of saline intrusions to enable salinity modelling and predictions. In addition, for Environment Canterbury to determine and employ methods to monitor water quality and aquatic ecology health trends of the tidal section of the Kaiapoi River.

(f) **Circulates** this report to Council, Kaiapoi River Rehabilitation Working Party, and the Kaiapoi –Tuahiwi Community Board.

**CARRIED**

Councillor Atkinson noted that there is nothing in the report which is definitive. The Council needs to make sure that this river has some attention and
acknowledged comments of Councillor Meyer, that it will be ten years before there are any increasing the minimum flow requirements.

Councillor Stewart supports the recommendation in this report and for staff to focus their attention on identified response strategies. Councillor Stewart said the Council has a responsibility to the Kaiapoi population who have invested millions of dollars to making the river a feature of the community and to encourage people to enjoy the river. The report of Adrian Meredith predicts low flows, algal blooms, sea lettuce and this is not acceptable. The response strategies need to focus on exploring a solution. The three suggested options have come up several times in community discussions and were part of the discussion at the Kaiapoi River Rehabilitation subcommittee meeting. Council needs to focus on response strategies with urgency.

7 MATTERS REFERRED FROM COMMUNITY BOARDS

Nil

8 PORTFOLIO UPDATES

8.1 Roading – Councillor John Meyer
8.2 Drainage and Stockwater – Councillor Sandra Stewart
8.3 Utilities (Water Supplies and Sewer) – Cr Paul Williams
8.4 Solid Waste– Cr Robbie Brine

Portfolio updates were held over until the following meeting of the Committee.

9 QUESTIONS

There were no questions.

10 URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS

There was no urgent general business.

11 MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED WITH THE PUBLIC EXCLUDED

Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

Moved Mayor Ayers seconded Councillor Felstead

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:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Minutes/Report of:</th>
<th>General subject of each matter to be considered</th>
<th>Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter</th>
<th>Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>Minutes from the Public Excluded portion of the 19 March 2019 meeting of the Utilities and Roading Committee</td>
<td>Confirmation of minutes</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Reason for protection of interests</th>
<th>Ref NZS 9202:2003 Appendix A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>Protection of privacy of natural persons</td>
<td>A2(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To carry out commercial activities without prejudice</td>
<td>A2(b)ii</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CARRIED

There being no further business the meeting closed at 6.25pm.

CONFIRMED

__________________________
Chairperson

__________________________
Date
MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE REGENERATION STEERING GROUP HELD IN THE RUATANIWHA KAIAPOI CIVIC CENTRE ON MONDAY 6 MAY 2019 AT 4.00PM

PRESENT:

Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust C McMillan, Environment Canterbury representative C McKay, D Ayers (Mayor), J Palmer (Chief Executive), C Brown (Manager Community and Recreation), D Roxborough (Implementation Project Manager - District Regeneration).

IN ATTENDANCE:
M Flanagan, WDC, S Lodge, WDC, G MacLeod, WDC.

1. APOLOGIES
An apology was received and sustained from A Reuben and C Greengrass for absence.
An apology was received and sustained from J Watson and D Ayers for lateness.

Moved: N Atkinson Seconded: S Stewart
CARRIED

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Moved: A Blackie Seconded: J Meyer

THAT the Regeneration Steering Group:
Confirms as a true and correct record the minutes of a meeting held on Monday 1 April 2019.

CARRIED

2. MATTERS ARISING
A Blackie noted the Honda Forest Public Planting day that was originally booked for Saturday 18 May has been changed to Saturday 25 May at 9.30am. A Blackie and J Watson are both unable to attend as they will be away. A Blackie commented that if any members of the committee would like to attend that would be good. S Lodge is working on the arrangements for the day and who will be speaking etc.

A Blackie noted as per the previous minutes he is still to speak with A Reuben in regard to the Mahinga Kai area and looking at getting this underway. A Blackie advised he has done some research and advised that there are not other Mahinga Kai sites that stand out to copy. Ngai Tahu have several areas in Banks Peninsula, Kaikoura and Westland areas but none of these would be suitable to copy.

C McMillan suggested that A Blackie talk with Greg Byrnes or Joseph Hullen.

3. DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS
There were no deputations or presentations.

4. TE KŌHAKA O TŪHAITARA TRUST UPDATE
C McMillan noted the Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust are currently exploring appropriate use of individual sites given they are now all in individual parcels.
5. REPORTS

6.1 District Regeneration Communications Report – April 2019 – Sarah Lodge - (Communications Advisor – District Regeneration), Duncan Roxborough (Implementation Project Manager – District Regeneration)

D Roxborough reiterated that the Honda Forest Public Planting day has been rescheduled to Saturday 25 May and not the 18 May as originally communicated.

D Roxborough commented on Clause 4.4 in regard to the last video and noted that this had a really good reach and received 18,000 views. The format of the videos has been changed to make them a bit shorter. Staff are currently working on the run sheet for the next video and this will be focused on the Honda Forest.

D Roxborough noted in regard to Clause 4.10 that a plaque has now been installed near the steps off Williams Street onto the boardwalk to commemorate the opening of the Riverview Terraces and Boardwalk. There will also be a plaque installed near one of the entrances to the Honda Forest area. This is part of the agreement with the Honda Tree Fund. This is proposed to go at the Charles Street entrance into the reserve. The plaque will be placed on a boulder.

Moved: P Redmond Seconded: N Atkinson

THAT the Regeneration Steering Group:

(a) Receives report No. 190410053300.

CARRIED

7. CORRESPONDENCE

There was no correspondence.

8. MATTERS REFERRED

8.1 CON18/34 Kaiapoi East Enabling Works and Beswick SMA Sports Fields Turfing and Drainage Variation – Fraser Scales (Senior Project Engineer), Duncan Roxborough (Implementation Project Manager – District Regeneration)

This report was referred from the Management Team to be circulated for information.

9. GENERAL

There was no general business.

10. MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED WITH THE PUBLIC EXCLUDED

Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

Moved: A Blackie Seconded: J Meyer

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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Minutes of:</th>
<th>General subject of each matter to be considered</th>
<th>Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter</th>
<th>Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>Minutes of the public excluded portion of the Regeneration Steering Group meeting Monday 1 April 2019.</td>
<td>Confirmation of minutes</td>
<td>Good reason for withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Reason for protection of interests</th>
<th>Ref NZS 9202:2003 Appendix A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>Protection of privacy of natural persons</td>
<td>A2(a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CARRIED

CLOSED MEETING

The public were excluded from the meeting from 4.20pm until 4.25pm.

11. NEXT MEETING

The next scheduled meeting of the Regeneration Steering Group commences at 4.00pm on Monday 10 June 2019 at the Ruataniwha Centre, Kaiapoi.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS THE MEETING CLOSED AT 4.25PM.

WORKSHOP

- Community Acknowledgement Opportunities

STAFF BRIEFING

- General Projects Progress Update
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE WOODEND-SEFTON COMMUNITY BOARD
HELD IN MEETING ROOM A, WOODEND COMMUNITY CENTRE, SCHOOL ROAD,
WOODEND ON MONDAY 13 MAY 2019 AT 7.00PM.

PRESENT
S Powell (Chairperson), A Thompson (Deputy Chair), A Allen, J Archer, A Blackie,
R Mather and J Meyer.

IN ATTENDANCE
D Ayers (Mayor), C Brown (Community and Recreation Manager), G MacLeod
(GreenSpace Manager), J McBride (Manager Roading and Transport), Kieran Straw (Civil
Projects Team Leader), K Rabe (Governance Advisor) and E Stubbs (Governance Support
Officer).
There were five members of the public in attendance.

1 APOLOGIES
Moved A Allen seconded A Blackie
An apology was received and sustained from A Thompson for lateness.
CARRIED

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
There were no conflicts of interest.

3 CONFIRMATION MINUTES
3.1 Minutes of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board – 8 April 2019
Moved J Archer seconded J Meyer
THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:
(a) Confirms the circulated minutes of the Woodend-Sefton Community
Board meeting, held 8 April 2019, as a true and accurate record.
CARRIED

4 MATTERS ARISING
R Mather referred to item 11.3 of the April minutes and advised the Board that the
funding had been received and the Welcome Bags ordered.

5 DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS FROM THE COMMUNITY
5.1 Derek Wilson and Tony Andersen spoke to the Board regarding item 7.1.
D Wilson and T Andersen are neighbours of the original complainant who
owns the property at 55 Esplanade, and who had, at a meeting in July 2018,
requested the removal of Griselinia trees near her property. Prior to the
complainant attending the meeting she had spoken to D Wilson regarding the
possible removal of the trees. D Wilson told the Board that he had been
against the removal and had informed the complainant that they preferred to
retain the trees. He, and his neighbours were unaware that this matter had
been pursued and had not received notification regarding the intention to
remove the trees. The Wilsons and And森ands had bought their sections in
the knowledge there were existing trees and noted that advice from Council
staff was that the trees should not be removed. They believe the Council should reinstate the Griselinia trees rather than another species.

T Andersen commented they would like to see the replacement trees to be of a reasonable height 1.2-1.4 metres so as to achieve a similar landscape as previously. T Andersen noted he had been one of the first purchasers of land in Pegasus. He was concerned with the process of the removal and was unaware the Council would remove trees on one person’s request and was worried about the precedent being set and other requests for removal of trees may follow. He noted that the complainant requested the trees be removed as they felt the trees blocked the view of the lake and this was the reason their section was not selling. Mr Anderson commented that in the months that the trees were gone the section had still not sold.

Questions

A Blackie noted that Greenspace had advised that they had notified neighbours twice and asked why the information did not reach the right people. There was some discussion about how this could have occurred. Residents were not disputing that it had been delivered, however they suggested in this situation, where there were only three households involved, that there could have been a follow-up phone call.

R Mather asked if the residents would be happy for the trees to be replaced in a slightly different location – further from the path. They advised they would not have a problem with that.

J Archer asked if the residents saw the Griselinia as trees or a hedge. T Andersen noted advice from landscapers was that it depended on how they were trimmed. Looking around the lake, Griselinia took a variety of forms and was not against the replacement Griselinia being pruned so as to achieve a tree rather than a hedge.

A Thompson arrived at 7.08pm during Item 5.1

6 ADJOURNED BUSINESS

7 REPORTS

7.1 Request for approval to install replacement planting at Pegasus Lake – Grant MacLeod (Community Greenspace Manager)

G MacLeod spoke to the ability of Griselinia to be trimmed in an appropriate manner to have a decent tree form. It would require more management on Council’s contractors, but could be achieved.

G MacLeod advised that he had contacted the original complainant to put forward the points in report. They still preferred to see a tree rather than replacement Griselinia which they considered a shrub. They felt it was an unnecessary cost for Council to be required to maintain the Griselinia to achieve a tree. They wished to retain their view to the lake.

Questions

S Powell asked if it were possible to source 1.2 – 1.4m Griselinia and G MacLeod advised they would see if any were available at that height.

R Mather asked if it could be confirmed the original complainants would pay for the replacement Griselinia. G MacLeod commented that they had offered to pay for trees, and in their view the replacement was a shrub. C Brown explained resolutions were not legally binding. As the original complainants
did not want the Griselinia they may not wish to pay, however Griselinia were common and a lower cost than specimen trees.

S Powell asked about the growth rate of Griselinia. C Brown advised that it was about 35-40cm annually.

J Meyer asked if it was possible to put the three trees in positions where it was possible for them to grow as trees. Original concerns were around the trees forming a hedge and having had to be cut away from the path.

S Powell asked if the reason Greenspace were advocating the replacement trees to be Griselinia was to have uniformity around the lake. G MacLeod replied that it was the preferred outcome.

A Allen asked if there would be a plan to ensure maintenance of the Griselinia so they did not form a hedge. C Brown advised that Council had a tree contractor which looked after trees, including the formative pruning of young trees. For the first two years pruning laterals would be contractually completed. Previously the trees looked after by Delta were treated as a shrub or hedge.

C Brown noted staff reflection on the lack of feedback and that in the future staff would try harder to get feedback from affected residents.

Moved A Thompson seconded R Mather

THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 190502062501
(b) Approves the planting of Griselinia littoralis on the Pegasus lakeside as replacement for the removed Griselinia littoralis as authorised by the Board on 9th July 2018.
(c) Notes that the Griselinia be planted in locations that are suitable to the landscape and also mitigate the residents’ concerns for the previous trees removal. This creating a uniform landscape on the perimeter of the lake.
(d) Notes that the trees will be subject to formative pruning and regular maintenance in accordance with good arborcultural practice on an ongoing basis
(e) Notes that staff will approach the owners of 55 The Esplanade to get their views on the replacement of Griselinia and where they could be placed to mitigate the original concern they raised. This will be tabled at the meeting.
(f) Notes estimated cost to replant five plants is less than $400.

CARRIED

A Thompson commented that he had voted against the original proposal and believed it had been a bad decision to allow one resident to decide on the outcome of a neighbourhood. Deliberation should refer to the plan for the development, and the consideration of a group of residents rather than one resident. He did not offer judgement on the shape of the trees as that was for the professionals in Greenspace to consider. He believed it would be good for the Board to reflect on the learnings from the issue.

R Mather was happy to support the recommendation. She had been uncomfortable since the Board decision in July 2018 from which she had abstained. She was happy to see the trees go back as Griselinia.

J Archer hoped the trees would go back further from the path and were opened up so were not crowded. Their original form had been as a hedge. It was a good solution as in the long term there would be a nicer group of trees.
A Blackie supported the recommendation and noted resolution (d), which referred to the maintenance of trees.

J Meyer supported the direction of the report with confirmation that the trees would be maintained.

7.2 Hurunui Reserve Development – Tori Stableford (Green Space Community Engagement Officer)

T Stableford spoke to the report which was to seek approval to carry out consultation on a concept plan for the Hurunui Reserve. Elements of that plan included football, natural play and a picnic area.

T Stableford noted the large Karen Eastwood Memorial Park playground was approximately 800 metres from Hurunui Reserve. There were also two other local Reserves less than 500 metres from Hurunui Reserve. Staff believed the use and development of those reserves should be considered when developing the concept for Hurunui Reserve. There was a $75,000 budget allocated to the development of Hurunui Reserve. As there was currently no budget for the development of the other two reserves, feedback on those concepts would not be sought in this process.

R Mather asked if there was concern that a soccer ball could fly onto the road as the reserve was not large. T Stableford replied that residents had indicated they wanted to retain grass space for kids to kick a ball, it would not be suitable for a full game of soccer. The proposed goal would be only 1.5 metres high, strategically placed and angled near trees to help prevent it going onto the road.

J Archer suggested, for consultation purposes, there needed to be more perspective and pictorial images to provide more of a feel of the concept for the public. T Stableford agreed.

S Powell asked if there would be mention of the two other reserves during consultation. T Stableford replied no, as they did not currently have funding, it would not be appropriate to consult. They had been put into the report to create an idea of the possible activities for each reserve.

S Powell referred to the Board’s Long Term Plan submission where it was noted some residents preferred to see the development of Maunga Tere Reserve rather than Hurunui Reserve.

A Blackie asked, bearing in mind the 500 metre rule and enhanced usage of the edge of the lake, why there should be development at Hurunui Reserve. C Brown commented that over a number of years they had had many requests from residents regarding the development of Hurunui Reserve as well as some who preferred to not see it developed. A budget of $75,000 equated to ecological linkage rather than a full development. C Brown agreed that the other reserves needed to be developed and Greenspace would work with the Board and community on achieving that outcome, however the money was currently there for the Hurunui Reserve.

S Powell asked about trees that had died in Maunga Tere Reserve and C Brown advised those should be replaced. Only those trees in deeper swales would not be.

A Allen liked the flying fox concept for Maunga Tere and asked if the $75,000 could be transferred to that reserve. T Stableford replied that as Hurunui Reserve already had funding and residents had asked for its development then process had to be completed for Hurunui Reserve. R Mather concurred with the comments of C Brown noting requests for Hurunui Reserve development came up often.
C Brown commented that the plan would go to consultation with more imagery and the public would be asked for feedback.

S Powell commented, that by asking residents within 500 metres, would they include those that neighboured Maunga Tere. G MacLeod advised they would not create an ‘either/or’ scenario by presenting options for the other two reserves, they did not want to create community conflict.

Moved R Mather seconded A Allen

THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 190502062576
(b) Approves public consultation to be carried out on the attached Hurunui Reserve Concept plan (190502062557) for the development of the Hurunui Reserve.

CARRIED

R Mather was pleased to see progress following requests. From the point of view of the other reserves, the newly elected Board could submit to the Long Term Plan regarding those. She agreed Hurunui Reserve should be addressed at this time and hoped it was well received by the neighbours.

A Allen was impressed with the report. She enjoyed seeing the concepts for the other reserves and endorsed the ‘rock n roll’ of the flying fox.

J Archer commented it was a nice simple design that would create a neighbourhood focus point. He would like to see better images for the public.

A Thompson commented the long term opportunities for the other reserves was a natural question to ask and suggested staff have a statement regarding the plan for those reserves to cover that questioning.

S Powell expressed concern that residents would ask about Maunga Tere and was interested in the feedback.

J Meyer commented on the process of listening to staff and the public and making a decision.

7.3 Service Request Six Monthly Results – Mare Harris (Customer Services Manager)

Moved A Allen seconded S Powell

THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:

(a) Receives report No 190501062270

CARRIED

7.4 Application to the Woodend-Sefton Community Board’s Discretionary Grant 2018-2019 – Kay Rabe (Governance Advisor)

K Rabe advised that Woodend School held a concert every second year in which the whole school was involved. Professional lighting would help make the students feel they had done a good job. The lighting was outside of the budget for the production.
THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:
(a) Receives report No. 190412055485.
(b) Approves a grant of $500 to Woodend School toward the cost of lighting for its School Production to be held on the 12th and 13th of November 2019.
CARRIED

A Allen was excited with the opportunity to support the production.
R Mather commented it was wonderful that students would be able to use the town hall.
A Blackie commented from experience a number of other Boards did not give funding to schools on the principle that was the role of the Ministry of Education’s responsibility to fund school activity. The more Council’s funded schools the less Central Government allocated.
S Powell commented the lighting was a one off, above and beyond what the school could expect of the Ministry of Education.

7.5 Ratification of the Board’s submission to the Waimakariri District Council’s Draft Annual Plan 2019-2020 – Kay Rabe (Governance Advisor)
Moved R Mather seconded A Blackie
THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:
(a) Receives report No 190402048113
(b) Retrospectively ratifies the Board’s submission to the Waimakariri District Council’s Draft Annual Plan 2019-2020 (Trim No. 190327043561)
CARRIED
A Blackie commented positively on the presentation of the Chair at the Annual Plan submissions commenting it was one of the best and the most well supported.
S Powell thanked the other Board members for their support and commented it sent a strong signal to the Council.

7.6 Ratification of the Board’s submission to the Waimakariri District Council’s Draft Rural Residential Development Strategy – Kay Rabe (Governance Advisor)
Moved A Allen seconded R Mather
THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:
(a) Receives report No. 190402048303
(b) Retrospectively ratifies the Board’s submission to the Waimakariri District Council’s Draft Rural Residential Development Strategy (Trim No. 190327043552)
CARRIED

8 CORRESPONDENCE
K Rabe noted the addition of the memo regarding Tuahiwi Road Safety & Speed Limits.
Moved S Powell seconded A Thompson

THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:

(a) Receives the memo of the project update on the Gladstone Road Cycleway (Trim No. 190405050860)

(b) Receives the memo from Joanne McBride (Roading and Transport Manager) regarding Tuahiwi Road Safety & Speed Limits (Trim No. 190512067081).

CARRIED

9 CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT

S Powell advised that she had attended two Forestry Project Control Group meetings. The harvest started on 13 May and the coastal park was basically closed from north of Woodend Beach up to Waikuku Beach. They would try to reopen the path between Waikuku Beach and Pegasus as quickly as possible. She had successfully advocated for Tiritiri Moana Drive to remain open with traffic management when needed.

10 MATTERS FOR INFORMATION

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

10.2 Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board meeting minutes – 15 April 2019 (Trim No. 190410053864)

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

Moved J Meyer seconded A Thompson

THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board receives the information in items 10.1-10.05.

CARRIED

11 MEMBERS’ INFORMATION EXCHANGE

11.1 April Diary for R Mather, J Archer, A Thompson (Trim No. 190502062803)

11.2 R Mather

- Attended ECan presentation 9 April – highlighted areas of concern for ward.
- Pegasus Community Centre expansion – subcommittee of Pegasus Residents Group to assist, upcoming meeting to discuss fit out. Have taken receipt of ten more great photos from Pegasus Bay School.
- Safe Community Planning Forum at Rossburn well attended, covered good ground.
- Raised concern regarding 2degrees cellphone tower to be located next to Pegasus Lake Bridge. How was it able to happen without consultation? J McBride noted that Roading became aware when a Traffic Management Plan for the work was submitted. It was located on road reserve which was there for utilities. The property owner had provided consent and the resource consent application advised it was ‘surrounded by commercial’. R Mather advised the Pegasus Residents’ Group would be following it up with the Planning team the following day.
11.3 **A Allen**
- Attended Annual Plan submission workshop.
- Attended District Plan information session at Woodend Community Centre. Poor attendance by community.
- Attended ANZAC Services at Sefton and Kaiapoi. Concerned with poor sound quality and was following up options for corporate sponsorship.
- Attended District Plan meeting.
- Attended North Canterbury Neighbourhood Support meeting. Chair has resigned. Community BBQs to be maintained.
- Attended Hui at Tuahiwi Marae.
- Attended Safe Community Planning Forum.
- Supported Annual Plan hearing submission.

11.4 **A Blackie**
- Along with John Archer represented the Board at Woodend ANZAC Day Service.
- Noted Mike Kwant’s submission to ECAn regarding Pegasus Bay Bylaw and requesting $10,000 in additional ranger funding. Believed it was likely to be approved.
- Council busy with Annual Plan submission hearings.

11.5 **J Meyer**
- Attended Big Brothers Big Sisters breakfast fundraising event.
- Busy with hearings.
- The roading team was busy.

12 **CONSULTATION PROJECTS**
- ECAn Waimakariri Bus Service Review – Board workshop to be held later in the week.

13 **FOSTERING COMMUNITIES**

14 **BOARD FUNDING UPDATE**
14.1 **Board Discretionary Grant**
- Balance as at 7 May 2019: $1,636

14.2 **General Landscaping Fund**
- Balance as at 7 May 2019: $5,260.

15 **MEDIA ITEMS**
- Woodend School Production funding and Hurunui Reserve public consultation.

16 **QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS**

17 **URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDERS**

**NEXT MEETING**
The next meeting of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board is scheduled for 7pm, Monday 10 June 2019 at the Pegasus Community Centre.
THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE MEETING WAS CLOSED AT 8.29pm.
CONFIRMED

________________
Chairperson

________________
Date

Workshop
- Cycleway connections – Joanne McBride (Transport and Roading Manager)
MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF THE OXFORD-OHOKA COMMUNITY BOARD HELD IN THE RAKAHURI COMMITTEE ROOM, WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA ON THURSDAY 16 MAY 2019 AT 5.30PM.

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

IN ATTENDANCE
S Markham (Manager Strategy & Engagement), Chris Brown (Manager Community and Recreation), Grant MacLeod (Greenspace Manager) Joanne McBride (Roading and Transport Manager) and K Rabe (Governance Adviser).

The meeting was adjourned at 6.08pm and reconvened at 6.22pm.

1 APOLOGIES
Moved J Ensor seconded J Lynn
That apologies for absence be received and accepted from S Farrell and W Doody. CARRIED

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
There were no conflicts of interest.

3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES
6-11
3.1 Minutes of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board – 3 April 2019
Moved M Brown seconded J Lynn
THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:
(a) Confirms the circulated minutes of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board meeting, held 3 April 2019, as a true and accurate record. CARRIED

4 MATTERS ARISING
There were no matters arising.

5 DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS
There were no deputation or presentations.

6 ADJOURNED BUSINESS
There was no adjourned business.

7 REPORTS
7.1 Mandeville Village car parking concern – Grant MacLeod (Greenspace Manager)
An email from S Farrell was read and tabled (Trim Ref: 190517069730) informing the Board of her opinion of the report under discussion. S Farrell
stated that she was against the Council buying land to provide a carpark for the Mandeville Village and against the reserve being used for carparking.

G MacLeod spoke to the report clarifying that the staff recommendation was for initiating the process of changing the current ‘Local Purpose (Plantation) Reserve’ classification of the reserve on 975 Tram Road to ‘Local Purpose (Community Purposes) Reserve’. Staff informed the Board that this process had to be done as the reserve was no longer viable for plantation usage being too small to economically forest. Once the change of status had been achieved, staff would then consult with the community as to the preferred use of the Reserve.

The outcomes of the public consultation would then be brought to the Board for a recommendation on the best option for the reserve. Funding for any changes to the reserve would then need to be applied for through the Annual Plan process.

Questions:

K Felstead asked for clarification on the timeline and the urgency of the matter under discussion, given that funding would only likely be made available in the following financial year. Staff confirmed that this was likely but was dependent on how quickly the Reserve Act change and the subsequent public consultation took as to when the project could proceed.

J Lynn queried what plans had been made to address the shortage of car parking in the interim, especially with wet weather making the temporary car parking on the reserve unacceptable. He requested if staff had made any enquiries regarding the possibility of leasing land in the short term for a temporary car park or if the suggestions put forward by the Mandeville Residents’ Association had been explored more fully.

Staff informed the Board that they could not make recommendations for Council decision regarding the option of improving provision for temporary carparking car parking in the Reserve at this time as it would be perceived that a decision was predetermined in relation to the public consultation they were recommending take place after the Reserves Act Change. Staff also advised that the informal car parking on the reserve was having a negative impact on the trees in the reserve, especially during the winter months.

Staff agreed to investigate short term temporary car parking and the leasing of land as a separate issue, and reminded the Board that the report under discussion was in relation to the long term change of activity on the reserve and not in relation to providing temporary car parking.

J Lynn confirmed staff had been in discussion with the Developer regarding options for car parking. Staff confirmed that the Developer had complied, under the resource consent, with the number of car parks currently provided. The Developer felt no further responsibility and stated that this was a community issue which was the responsibility of the Council. While it was not the responsibility of the Council to supply car parking for a commercial entity, the Council felt a moral obligation to mitigate the problem on a health and safety front.

S Markham stated that the Board should be mindful to determine the long term solution i.e. the change of reserve act and then separately turn its mind to finding a short term solution for a temporary car park.

T Robson asked if this matter of a change to the reserve act could wait while a short term solution was found i.e. keep the status quo. The Board was informed that the trees in the reserve were being negatively impacted by the informal car parking taking place in the reserve and that the change of status was now urgent and should proceed.
D Nicholl commented that no decision had yet been made regarding a car park on the reserve and for members to be aware of the perception of predetermination in this matter and that, in his opinion, ratepayers should not be suppling a car park for a commercial entity.

Members then discussed an advert, seen in a local paper, stating there was further land available for development and if so why could this not be used for car parking. Staff advised that, should more land be purchased by the Developer or other interested parties, the same process would need to be followed as with the original development. This meant resource consent and any new development would need to provide its own car parking so would not impact on the current situation.

M Brown asked how wide the public consultation would reach given this was a reserve on a busy through road that would impact members of the public outside the immediate area. Staff assured members that the consultation would be extensive.

J Ensor asked staff whether they had investigated the matter of angle parking as opposed to square parking and staff informed him that any car parking plan would need to be carried out by a registered traffic engineer and that no parking plan had been investigated as yet. Staff again reiterated that this report was not about dealing with the short term car parking issues at Mandeville Village but about a change to reserves act.

T Robson then drew staff attention to (c) in the staff recommendation which states “Supports staff to prepare a resource consent based on the 50-space car park concept noting that no development can occur for a formalised car park unless a change of purpose and the process for that is completed. The status of the reserve at present does not legally support a formalised car park.” T Robson asked if passing this part of the staff recommendation would not imply predetermination. Staff assured members that this was not the case and that the work required to prepare a possible resource consent was a lengthy one and may not be a viable option in the end but staff had to investigate the option for its feasibility prior to bringing a report back to the Board for a decision after the public consultation.

M Brown sought clarification that including (c) would not open the Council to judicial review in the future.

J Lynn reminded members that the Board could not commit the Council to financial expense.

K Felstead commented that he would support the motion only if the change to the purpose of the reserve was carried out concurrently with the public consultation on its use in the interest of saving time and any risk of confusion.

T Robson again clarified that this matter would come back to the Board and not go straight to the Council. Staff assured members that the report regarding the public consultation and the investigation of options would come to the Board.

S Markham suggested that a further recommendation be added requesting that urgent investigation for a temporary car park be carried out to relieve the pressure of car parking at the Mandeville Village, and the safety issues resulting from this, while further action is taken on the change of purpose of the reserve and public consultation.

Moved M Brown seconded J Lynn

**THAT**

**the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board recommends:**

**THAT**

**the Council:**
(a) **Receives** report No. 190424059175

(b) **Supports** a change in Local Purpose classification of the Council-owned reserve at 975 Tram Road, from Local Purpose (Plantation) Reserve, to Local Purpose (Community Purposes) Reserve.

(c) **Supports** staff to prepare a resource consent based on the 50-space car park concept noting that no development can occur for a formalised car park unless a change of purpose and the process for that is completed. The status of the reserve at present does not legally support a formalised car park.

(d) **Notes** that the proposed change in the type of Local Purpose Reserve requires public consultation and Council approval. Approval by the Minister of Conservation is not required.

(e) **Notes** that Council’s Property Unit no longer has an interest in the reserve for plantation purposes and supports the proposed change. The current purpose is no longer appropriate given the reserves location, site characteristics and competing options for future use.

(f) **Notes** that the proposed Community Purposes sub-classification will allow greater flexibility in providing for community needs within the reserve.

(g) **Notes** that a key driver for a change of reserve purpose is to consider an allowance of a portion of the reserve to be available for formed car park.

(h) **Notes** that funding would need to be sought from a future Annual Plan or Long Term Plan to support the creation of a car park.

(i) **Notes** that sufficient open space for community recreation purposes would exist within the reserve should a 50-space car park be installed.

(j) **Notes** that staff will come back to the Community Board and Council with a report on the feedback and results of the change of purpose process. Staff will also be preparing resource consent for the car park based on the 50-space concept.

(k) **Supports** an urgent investigation for a temporary car park be carried out to relieve the pressure of car parking at the Mandeville Village, and the safety issues resulting from this, while further action is taken on the change of purpose of the reserve and public consultation

CARRIED

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

S Markham spoke to the report and stated that while, on average, 'within target' timeframe response rates were in the 80% mark that there was further work being done to improve response rates to over 90%.

Moved M Brown seconded J Lynn

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) **Receives** report No. 190501062219.

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

K Rabe spoke to the report requesting retrospective ratification of the Board’s submission to the draft Annual Plan.
D Nicholl thanked T Robson for his support during the submission’s hearing and for being able to answer questions relating to Oxford.

Moved T Robson seconded M Brown

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 190402048218.

(b) Retrospectively ratifies the Board’s submission to the Waimakariri District Council’s Draft Annual Plan 2019-2020 (Trim No. 190327043561).

CARRIED

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

K Rabe spoke to the report requesting retrospective ratification of the Board’s submission to the draft Rural Residential Development Strategy.

Moved T Robson seconded M Brown

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 190402048309.

(b) Retrospectively ratifies the Board’s submission to the Waimakariri District Council’s Draft Rural Residential Development Strategy (Trim No. 190401047521).

CARRIED

8 CORRESPONDENCE

Moved J Lynn seconded J Ensor

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) Receives the notes regarding ‘Carparking – Mandeville Commercial Development’ from Mandeville Residents’ Association Committee meeting 25 April 2019 (Trim 190430060849).

CARRIED

9 CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT

9.1 Chairperson’s Report for April 2019

Moved T Robson seconded K Felstead

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) Receives report No 190424059334.

CARRIED

10 MATTERS FOR INFORMATION

10.1 Woodend-Sefton Community Board meeting minutes – 8 April 2019 (Trim No 190404049992).
10.2 Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board meeting minutes – 15 April 2019
(Trim No 190410053864)
10.3 Rangiora-Ashley Community Board meeting minutes – 13 March 2019
(Trim No 190306026941)
10.4 Rangiora-Ashley Community Board meeting minutes – 10 April 2019
(Trim No 190404050002)
10.5 Youth Council meeting minutes – February 26 2019.
10.6 Youth Council meeting minutes – March 26 2019.

Moved M Brown seconded T Robson

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board receives the information in items 10.1-10.6

CARRIED

11 MEMBERS’ INFORMATION EXCHANGE

J Lynn
- Attended Neighbourhood Support meeting – Chairperson resigned and W Doody acting chair until the end of the term.
- Attended ANZAC service at Ohoka
- Update on Gatekeepers Lodge and the reserve - requested staff follow up on payments on invoices presented

J Ensor
- Attended ‘What’s the Plan’ workshop
- Attended electric vehicle workshop
- Tabled a ‘New Dwelling Survey’ for information
- Attended New Zealand Community Board Conference – report on June agenda

M Brown
- Attended ANZAC service at West Eyerton
- Maintenance done to gate at hall at West Eyerton looks good
- Attended West Eyerton Advisory meeting – possible request for funding for a seat
- Attended District Plan drop in session at Oxford

T Robson
- Attended Annual Plan workshop
- Attended District Plan review workshop and drop in session
- Attended Pearson Park Advisory Group meeting – update on new drain and request for lights
- Attended OPAC meeting – work on festival going well
- Attended Ashley Gorge Advisory Group meeting – finalising interpretive panels on history, flora and fauna. Should be ready for summer.
- Attended New Zealand Community Board Conference – report on June agenda

K Felstead
- Update on all reports appearing on the Council agenda and any related matters

12 CONSULTATION PROJECTS

Nil.
13 BOARD FUNDING UPDATE
13.1 Board Discretionary Grant
Balance as at 1 May 2019: $727 (note $500 commitment to Waimakariri Arts Trust).

13.2 General Landscaping Fund
Balance as at 1 May 2019: $1,060.

14 MEDIA ITEMS
Media release on social media regarding the Board’s recommendation on item 7.1.

15 QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS
Nil.

16 URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDERS
Nil.

NEXT MEETING
The next meeting of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board is scheduled for Thursday 6 June 2019 commencing at 7.00pm, at the Ohoka Hall.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE MEETING WAS CLOSED AT 6.55pm.
CONFIRMED

__________________________
Chairperson

__________________________
Date

Workshop
An update on cycleways being developed was presented by Joanne McBride (Transport and Roading Manager)
MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF THE KAIAPOI-TUAHIWI COMMUNITY BOARD
HELD IN MEETING ROOM 1 (UPSTAIRS), RUATANIWHA KAIAPOI CIVIC CENTRE,
176 WILLIAMS STREET, KAIAPOI ON MONDAY 20 MAY 2019 AT 4PM.

PRESENT
C Greengrass (Chairperson), R Blair, J Meyer, M Pinkham, P Redmond, S Stewart

IN ATTENDANCE
J Palmer (Chief Executive), J McBride (Roading and Transport Manager), G Cleary
(Manager Utilities and Roading), K Rabe (Governance Adviser) and C Fowler-Jenkins
(Governance Support Officer)

1 APOLOGIES
Moved S Stewart seconded P Redmond

Apologies were received and accepted for N Atkinson, A Blackie and J Watson, for
absence.

CARRIED

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
There were no conflicts of interest.

3 CONFIRMATION MINUTES
3.1 Minutes of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board – 15 April 2019
Moved P Redmond seconded M Pinkham

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.

CARRIED

4 MATTERS ARISING
There were no matters arising.

5 DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS
5.1 Joy Mehlhopt, a resident of Bayliss Drive, spoke to the Board regarding
Environment Canterbury’s proposed new bus route through the Sovereign
Palms subdivision via Lees Road, Bayliss Drive and up Sovereign Boulevard.
She asked the Board’s support regarding retaining the bus route on Williams
Street.

In residents’ opinion this route was not appropriate as Lees Road has no
lighting or footpath, Bayliss Drive and Sovereign Boulevard have several
roundabouts which are very narrow and would be a problem for buses to
negotiate which would make an even slower trip then it already was. Also
there are parks in Bayliss Drive which are used extensively by children this
would cause a safety concern.
J Mehlhopt informed the Board that many of her neighbours had not realised the proposed change and she then set about contacting people in the subdivision to let them know and to do an informal survey of the support for this change. In her opinion most of the people who she has been in contact with are opposed to buses entering the subdivision and would prefer the status quo.

J Mehlhopt pointed out that many of the people living in the subdivision were young families who did not use public transport and that Environment Canterbury had stated that there was little uptake from the subdivision for public transport. She mentioned that most people were happy to walk to the bus stop on Williams Street or if a quicker service was required people drove into Kaiapoi and caught the bus from there. Most residents had moved into the area for a quiet lifestyle away from traffic and retail areas and did not want their suburb to be a bus corridor bringing unwanted noise, fumes and disruption to their quiet neighbourhood.

She also informed members that Environment Canterbury stated that there were only 17 movements a day on the buses from the Sovereign Palms area which, in her opinion, was not enough to justify adding three more bus routes to the area but residents would appreciate a more frequent service.

Questions

R Blair asked the Chair if they could discuss this matter later during the meeting and was told that the Board would discuss the matter and its own submission during members’ forum after the meeting.

J Meyer asked would residents drive to Kaiapoi and then catch a bus, why not just catch the bus and what age was the majority of the current bus users. He was told that to get a more frequent service residents opted to drive to Kaiapoi especially if they also had chores or appointments in Kaiapoi. The age of users were generally older residents or students.

M Pinkham asked for clarification on how far J Mehlhopt had surveyed residents or if the survey was carried out along Bayliss Drive. J Mehlhopt replied that she had made up flyers informing every household bar two streets and had a very good response rate from that initiative.

M Pinkham also enquired if the residents had any other items they would like support with and was told the frequency of busses along Williams Street would be appreciated.

C Greengrass informed residents that the Waimakariri District Council had previously submitted to get more busses into suburbs and subdivisions to service the elderly and disabled and wondered if leaving one bus route along Bayliss Drive would be acceptable so as to help those who could not walk to Williams Street bus stops. J Mehlhopt told the Board that the residents were adamant that they did not want any busses in Sovereign Palms.

M Pinkham asked if the group had talked to Silverstream residents about how the buses through the subdivision had affected the residents.

C Greengrass encouraged residents to put in individual submissions as well as a group submission. She thanked J Mehlhopt for her presentation and congratulated her on raising many valid points, which the Board would consider when finalising its own submission.

6 ADJOUNDED BUSINESS

There was no adjourned business.
7 REPORTS

7.1 Service Requests Six Monthly Results – Maree Harris (Customer Services Manager)
Moved C Greengrass seconded P Redmond
THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:
(a) Receives report No.190501062291

CARRIED

7.2 Report back on NZ Community Boards’ Conference 2019 – Kay Rabe (Governance Advisor)
Moved C Greengrass seconded S Stewart
THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:
(b) Receives report No. 190423058748

CARRIED

7.3 Ratification of the Board’s Comments on the Reviewed District Plan ‘What’s the Plan’ – Kay Rabe (Governance Advisor)
Moved P Redmond seconded M Pinkham
THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:
(c) Receives report No 190509066112
(d) Retrospectively ratifies the Board’s Comments on the Waimakariri District Council’s Reviewed District Plan (Trim ref: 190508065617)

CARRIED

8 CORRESPONDENCE
There was no correspondence.

9 CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT

9.1 Chair’s Diary for May 2019
Moved C Greengrass seconded S Stewart
THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:
(e) Receives report No. 190506063835

CARRIED

10 MATTERS 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**

M Pinkham thanked staff for the change of process for ‘Matters for Information’ in response to his request at the last meeting. The new method was much appreciated with less volume in one sitting and timely in regards to the matters being dealt with.

Moved P Redmond seconded M Pinkham

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

*Note: Matters for Information were circulated to members separately.*

**CARRIED**

---

11 **MEMBERS’ INFORMATION EXCHANGE**

**R Blair**

- Attended monthly Darnley Club meeting
- Attended the Signage meeting

**P Redmond**

- Attended ANZAC Day Commemorations on 25 April – 10am-Kaiapoi at Trousselot Park, 11:15am – Rangiora, 2pm – Tuahiwi retired to Marae for refreshments
- 29 April attended WDC Rural Residential Development Strategy Hearings, Ohoka natural drainage at capacity, consultation for new residents
- 30 April further RRDS Hearings, extending Mandeville south boundary,
- 2 May attended Big Brothers Big Sisters breakfast
- 6 May attended Kaiapoi Red Cross 80th Birthday
- 6 May attended regeneration steering group meeting
- 7 May attended Board workshop on ‘what’s the plan’
- 8 May attended annual Hui at Tuahiwi
- 9 May attended workshop at Rossburn reviewing safe community accreditation (WDC about 25 years)
- 9 May Annual Plan submission by J Watson
- 9 May attended Ecan drop in session re bus review
- 13 May Attended water zone committee meeting as observer David Ashby to stand down as chair
- 15 May Spent day on bus In north Canterbury and drafted board submission for consideration at Board workshop on 17 May
- 15 May attended all drainage groups meeting at WDC
- 20 May attended sustainability lunchtime presentation at WDC

**C Greengrass**

- Reminded members of Museum AGM on 29 May 2019
- Attended ANZAC service at Tuahiwi
• Attended Red Cross 80th birthday celebrations
• Attended the What’s the Plan workshop
• Attended the Access meeting
• Attended landmarks meeting
• Attended the Signage meeting
• Spoke to UC Political Science students re working in the community and the Community Board
• Attended the Waimakariri Bus Service Review workshop
• Updated members on a resident’s request to have a bench and plaque set up in memory of their late father. Staff working with the family.

J Meyer
• Roading projects busy – finishing up for the financial year
• District Plan Review – working with Working Party to maintain timeline

M Pinham
• Kaiapoi Promotions AGM 17 June 2019 – Mayor is guest speaker
• Working on District Plan Review
• Attended public hearing on Northern Motorway Downstream Effects – Cranford Street

S Stewart
• Update on Draft Plan Change 7
• Attended Combined Drainage Advisory Group
• Attended presentation from St Albans Group on Impact on Cranford Street re Northern Corridor
• Assisting a resident with a Petition to Community and Recreation Committee regarding toxic spraying of public open spaces including carparks

12 CONSULTATION PROJECTS
Nil

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

Question from S Steward regarding new planter boxes installation and if these invoices were to come from the remaining balance or had they already been paid from a previous allocation. Staff replied that this project had already been allocated funding previously so the balance showing as at 15 May 2019 is correct.

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 northeast 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.

R Blair noted his response to M Pinkham’s questions and felt that these had not been answered fully.

M Pinkham thanked staff for their response to his questions.

17 URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDERS

Nil.
**NEXT MEETING**

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

There being no further business the meeting closed at 4.50pm

---

**Workshop**

Cycleway Connections

Joanne McBride, Kieran Straw, Bill Rice Mike Smith and Hari Pillay

**Members Forum**

*The Board’s submission on Waimakariri Bus Service Review*
## WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

**REPORT FOR INFORMATION**

**FILE NO:** GOV-18 / 190524073551  
**REPORT TO:** Council  
**DATE OF MEETING:** 4 June 2019  
**FROM:** David Ayers, Mayor  
**SUBJECT:** Mayor's Diary 1 May - 27 May 2019

### 1. SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 1 May</td>
<td>Enshi Sister City Advisory Group - Inaugural meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rangiora Promotions Last Wednesday Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 2 May</td>
<td>Canterbury Regional Road Safety Working Group meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hurunui presentation of Museum Annual Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community-led initiative for traffic demand strategies for the Downstream Effects Management of the Northern Arterial (NArt) Presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Art on the Quay Opening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 3 May</td>
<td>North Canterbury Musicals: Dirty Rotten Scoundrels Opening Night</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Big Brothers Big Sisters Breakfast, Rangiora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview with David Hill - North Canterbury News</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Island Destination Management Plan meeting, Christchurch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crusaders vs Sharks, Super Rugby at Christchurch Stadium – guest of Research First.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday 5 May</td>
<td>NC CAB Employment Expo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Art Opening, Chamber Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 6 May</td>
<td>Age–friendly Waimakariri, Community Steering Group. +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Residential Development Strategy Deliberation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Mayor Kevin Felstead represented me at Kaiapoi Red Cross 80th Anniversary function</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regeneration Steering Group, Kaiapoi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 7 May</td>
<td>Compass FM Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 8 May</td>
<td>Annual Hui with Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga, Tiahiwi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 9 May</td>
<td>Mayor Taskforce for Jobs Update with Mayor of Otorohanga, Max Baxter and Noa Woolloff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Community Workshop, Rossburn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 10 May</td>
<td>Greater Christchurch Partnership Committee meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronwyn Hayward and UC student presentation, Kaiapoi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday 11 May</td>
<td>Saracens Rugby Club Day, Southbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended Rangiora Brass Band Concert, Rangiora RSA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 13 May</td>
<td>Interview with David Hill - North Canterbury News</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury Museum Trust Board Meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waimakariri Water Zone Committee – for a while</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend-Sefton Community Board meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 14 May</td>
<td>Compass FM Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 15 May</td>
<td>Defence Employers Breakfast, Wigram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring Mayors and Elected Members Catch Up, Ashburton Airfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relaunch of Waitaha Primary Health, Amberley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 17 May</td>
<td>Reopening of Rangiora Eye-Care attended by Cr Dan Gordon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 21 May</td>
<td>Ecan Bus Service Discussion with Fred Rahme and Jack Lin, Silverstream</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compass FM Interview</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 23 May</td>
<td>Kaiapoi Borough School Building Opening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional Transport Committee Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canterbury Mayoral Forum working dinner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 24 May</td>
<td>Canterbury Mayoral Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canterbury CDEM Group Joint Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview with David Hill - North Canterbury News</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday 25 May</td>
<td>Kaiapoi Sod Turning and planting, Regeneration Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 27 May</td>
<td>LGNZ Governance &amp; Strategy Advisory Group, Wellington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 28 May</td>
<td>EQC Public Enquiry – meeting with Dame Sylvia Cartwright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Youth Council meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**THAT** the Council:

a) **Receives** report No. 190524073551.

David Ayers
MAYOR