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AGENDA FOR THE MEETING OF THE WOODEND-SEFTON COMMUNITY BOARD TO BE HELD IN PEGASUS COMMUNITY CENTRE, MAIN STREET, PEGASUS ON MONDAY 10 JUNE 2019 AT 7PM.

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

BUSINESS

1 APOLOGIES

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

3 CONFIRMATION MINUTES
   3.1 Minutes of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board – 13 May 2019

   RECOMMENDATION
   THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:
   (a) Confirms the circulated minutes of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board meeting, held 13 May 2019, as a true and accurate record.

4 MATTERS ARISING

5 DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS FROM THE COMMUNITY

6 ADJOURNED BUSINESS

7 REPORTS

   7.1 Road Naming – Pegasus Town, Stages B8 and B8A – Scott Morrow (Rate Officer land Information)

   RECOMMENDATION
   THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:
   (a) Receives report No. 190529076128.
   (b) Approves one of the following proposed road names for the new road as marked as Road #1 on the attached plan.
       - Māuru Street
       - Waituna Street
- Rango Street

(c) **Notes** the Community Board may replace any proposed names with a name of its choice.

### 7.2 Waikuku Entrance Sign – General Landscaping Budget – Grant Stephens (Greenspace Community Engagement Officer)

**RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:

(a) **Receives** report No. 190529076573

(b) **Notes** the Board has previously allocated $4,300 towards an entrance sign for the Waikuku Beach Community in December 2018

(c) **Notes** That staff have undergone consultation on the sign and the results from this feedback are included within this report.

(d) **Notes** the Revised Design proposed by staff has been approved by the Roading and Greenspace Teams and would cost $6,200 to construct and install.

(e) **Approves** the allocation of $1,900 of the General Landscaping Fund which was previously approved to carry over to the 2019/20 financial year (December 2018 Board Meeting) in order to meet the shortfall between the cost of the Revised Design Sign and that previously allocated.

(f) **Approves** the remaining $602 of 2018/29 General Landscaping Budget be carried over into the following 2019/20 financial year.

### 7.3 Karen Eastwood Memorial Trees – Grant Stephens (Greenspace Community Engagement Officer)

**RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:

(a) **Receives** report No. 190530077180

(b) **Notes** the Board has previously approved the planting of a large established tree in memory of Karen Eastwood.

(c) **Approves** two trees being planted within the area indicated within this report (190530077180) and staff selecting these trees alongside the overseer of the funds.

(d) **Notes** where possible Staff will choose trees from the list within this report which have been proven to be successful and will not select species which have been identified within this report (190530077180) as not suitable for the Pegasus environment.

(e) **Notes** that any costs associated with purchasing and planting these trees will be met through private funding left over from public fundraising for the Karen Eastwood Memorial.
7.4 **Report Back on New Zealand Community Boards’ Conference 2019 – Kay Rabe (Governance Advisor)**

*RECOMMENDATION 46-55*

**THAT** the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:
(a) *Receives* report No. 190430061132.

7.5 **Ratification of the Board’s Comments on the Waimakariri Bus Service Review – Kay Rabe (Governance Advisor)**

*RECOMMENDATION 56-65*

**THAT** the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:
(a) *Receives* report No. 190523072606.
(b) *Retrospectively ratifies* the Board’s Comments on the Waimakariri District Council Reviewed District Plan (Trim Ref: 190524072996).

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

*RECOMMENDATION 66-72*

**THAT** the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:
(a) *Receives* report No. 190509066148.
(b) *Retrospectively ratifies* the Board’s Comments on the Waimakariri District Council Reviewed District Plan (Trim Ref: 190508065614).

8 **CORRESPONDENCE**

9 **CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT**

9.1 **Chairpersons Report for May 2019**

*RECOMMENDATION 73-74*

**THAT** the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:
(a) *Receives* report No. 190604077902.

10 **MATTERS FOR INFORMATION**

10.1 **Oxford-Ohoka Community Board meeting minutes – 16 May 2019 (Trim No.190509065991.)**

10.2 **Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board meeting minutes – 20 May 2019 (Trim No. 190520070602)**

10.3 **Rangiora-Ashley Community Board meeting minutes 15 May 2019 (Trim No. 190508065504)**

*RECOMMENDATION*
THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board receives the information in items 10.1-10.03.

Note: Matters for Information were circulated to members separately.

11 MEMBERS’ INFORMATION EXCHANGE
11.1 May Diary for J Archer, R Mather (Trim No. 190530076795) 75-76

12 CONSULTATION PROJECTS

13 FOSTERING COMMUNITIES

14 BOARD FUNDING UPDATE
14.1 Board Discretionary Grant
Balance as at 4 June 2019: $1,136
14.2 General Landscaping Fund
Balance as at 4 June 2019: $5,260.

15 MEDIA ITEMS

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 8 July 2019 at the Woodend Community Centre.

Workshop
- Climate Change – Simon Markham (Manager Strategy and Engagement)
- Members Forum
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 Andisons 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 and that he had received a written response which he summarised. 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 arboricultural 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 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 12\textsuperscript{th} and 13\textsuperscript{th} 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)
1. SUMMARY

1.1 The purpose of this report is to consider the naming of a new road as part of the development of 57 Pegasus Main Street, Pegasus under Resource Consent RC185181.

1.2 The land parcel being developed is Lot 5 DP 491871.

1.2 The names have been provided by the developer.

Attachments:

i. Plan of subdivision showing the new road to be named. (Trim 190529076108)
ii. Pre-approved Woodend-Sefton Road Naming List. (Trim 190321037831)
ii. Policy for the Naming of Roads in the District. (Trim 120712043907)

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 190529076128.

(b) Approves one of the following proposed road names for the new road as marked as Road #1 on the attached plan.

- Māuru Street
- Waituna Street
- Rango Street

(c) Notes the Community Board may replace any proposed names with a name of its choice.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1 Todd Property Pegasus Town Limited are developing a 2.73Ha block of land zone Business 1 into an intensive housing development. As part of this development an access road will be created between the existing Barnes Street and Winsloe Street.

3.2 As there were no spare names from the original list of names approved when Pegasus Town was first established, new names were needed to be put forward by the developer. It was thought that some of the proposed names were part of the original approved list but this couldn’t be confirmed.
4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1. The developer has put forward three possible names but only one road name is required for this particular subdivision.

4.2. According to the background of the names provided by the developer, Māuru means North West wind, Waituna means waterway or abundance of eel and Rango means roller or skid used for heavy objects such as waka.

4.3. These names have been verified for use by the Rūnanga.

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

5. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

5.1. **Groups and Organisations**

The Te Ngai Turuhiri Rūnanga have been consulted on the names and are fine with any of the proposed names to be used.

5.2. **Wider Community**

Not applicable.

6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**

The developer will meet the costs of the new road name blades.

6.2. **Community Implications**

There will be approximately 40 new land parcels created as part of this subdivision under stages B8 & B8A which will be serviced from new road. The development is zoned Business 1, however land use consents will need to be applied for in order to build residential housing. Naming the new road will mean consistency for emergency services and residents.

6.3. **Risk Management**

6.4. **Health and Safety**

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 1974 sec 319 (1) (j)

The Council shall have power in respect of roads to: name and to alter the name of any road and to place on any building or erection on or abutting on any road a plate bearing the name of the road.
7.3. **Community Outcomes**

Not applicable.

7.4. **Delegations**

The Woodend-Sefton Community Board has the delegated power on behalf of the Council to approve the naming of new roads.

Scott Morrow  
Rates Officer Land Information Officer
# Master List of Pre-approved Woodend-Sefton Road Names

21 March 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aitkin</td>
<td>Early Settlers in the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antill</td>
<td>William Antill - A stock dealer and butcher, Woodend.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archer</td>
<td>Nathaniel Archer - Flower Miller, Ravenswood Roller Flour Mill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Note</strong>: name to be used in conjunction with full name as Archer Place in use in Rangiora.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borland</td>
<td>Robert J Borland - Early settler, Woodend.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brockenhurst</td>
<td>The name of the farm where Ravenswood is located.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chambers</td>
<td>Fred Chambers - Farmer, butcher, Woodend.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaver</td>
<td>Henry Cleaver - Early settler, Woodend.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corlett</td>
<td>Alfred Corlett - Early settler, Woodend.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cousins</td>
<td>Richard Cousins - Farmer Waikuku.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counsell</td>
<td>James Counsell - Stock dealer and butcher, Woodend.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawford</td>
<td>James Crawford - Farmer, Pegasus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossley</td>
<td>John (Dampier-Crossley) - Farmer of Brockenhurst Estate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croydon</td>
<td>Name of town where John Raven was born.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curtis</td>
<td>Alfred Curtis - Miller, Ravenswood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cutler</td>
<td>Thomas Cutler - Headmaster, Woodend.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dellow</td>
<td>Rev John Dellow - Methodist minister, Woodend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edlin</td>
<td>George Edlin - Early settler, Woodend.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eldridge</td>
<td>Thomas Eldridge - Sawmiller, Woodend.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellmers</td>
<td>Fred Ellmers - Early settler, Woodend.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flutey</td>
<td>Charles Flutey - Born in Okains Bay but farmed land in Woodend.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gossett</td>
<td>C H Gossett - Vicar, Woodend, 1885.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griffiths</td>
<td>Thomas Griffiths - Farmer Waikuku, was one of first elected members of the local school committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grimwood</td>
<td>Robert Grimwood - Miller, Ravenswood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henshaw</td>
<td>Joshua Henshaw - Wool manager.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herridge</td>
<td>Fred Herridge - Farmer, clergyman, Ravenswood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higgins</td>
<td>Early settler, Woodend.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kotua</td>
<td>Rau Kotua - An early Resident of Woodend.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ligget</td>
<td>Robert Ligget - Farmer of &quot;Tullyhue&quot; Waikuku.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorimer</td>
<td>James Lorimer - A ploughman, Woodend.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luisettti</td>
<td>Early Woodend family. <em>(also on Rangiora Road Naming list)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McQuillan</td>
<td>Robert McQuillan - Farmer Waikuku, Woodend.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merhrtens</td>
<td>Henrich Merhrtens - Farmer, Woodend.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pre-approved Road Name List as at 21 March 2019
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oakleigh</td>
<td>Name of pastoral run acquired by John Raven.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pateman</td>
<td>Edward C Pateman - Farmer of Beaconsfield Farm, Woodend.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quinn</td>
<td>John A Quinn. Farmer at Ravenswood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhodes</td>
<td>Owned sheep station next to John Raven.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudd</td>
<td>John Rudd - A farmer, Woodend.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salkeld</td>
<td>John Salkeld - A carpenter and undertaker, Woodend.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sills</td>
<td>Robert Sills - Contractor, Woodend.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skevington</td>
<td>Charles Skevington - Born in Bedfordshire farmer, Waikuku.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stackwood</td>
<td>Daniel Stackwood - An early Resident.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steadman</td>
<td>Thomas Miller Steadman - Woodend.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stonyer</td>
<td>William Stonyer - Built the Ravenswood Mill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Pakiaka</td>
<td>Name of farm in Woodend, run by Frederick Horrell.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thirlwall</td>
<td>William Thirlwall - A gardener at ‘Wairoa’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tinkler</td>
<td>Walter Tinkler - Wool classer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weaver</td>
<td>Thomas Weaver - A farmer, Woodend.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilkin</td>
<td>Owned sheep station next to John Raven.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witte</td>
<td>Bernard P H Witte - A brick maker, Woodend.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodford</td>
<td>Pioneer of flour milling in Woodend.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Disclaimer:** All names submitted to the Woodend-Sefton Community Board for consideration are received in good faith. The Board does not check spelling or history details. Errors will be accepted and corrected where possible.
POLICY

NAMING OF ROADS AND STREETS (INCLUDING PRIVATE ROADS) POLICY

1 Introduction
The Waimakariri District Council is responsible for naming (and renaming) roads within its boundaries. Roads are named to reflect the identity of the local area and to ensure ease of identification for the Council, the public and key public and private services such as emergency, postal and courier services.

2 Policy Context
This policy applies where proposed roads and other vehicular accesses are being created either through subdivision development or the formation of existing unformed legal roads and to the naming of existing unnamed roads/vehicular accesses both public and private. This policy should form part of any subdivision design and approval process reference material.

3 Policy Objective
This policy specifies Council’s requirements for the naming of roads and vehicle accesses throughout the District to provide a consistent and comprehensive approach to naming of roads in the District.

The Waimakariri District Council is responsible for the naming of roads by the Local Government Act 1974 section 319(j).

4 Policy Statement
4.1 The Council’s four Community Boards have the delegated authority for the naming of new streets and roads and altering existing street names within their respective wards.

4.2 Re-naming of streets and roads will only be undertaken if the Council considers the change will result in a clear benefit to the community.

4.3 Where a street is named for the first time or a street name is altered then the District Land Registrar, the Chief Surveyor, NZ Fire Service, Telecom, MainPower, valuation service provider, NZ Police, Civil Defence, and the Canterbury Regional Council shall be informed of the new name or change.

4.4 Where an existing street is extended, the street extension will be the same name as that of the existing street.

4.5 All new private roads in the Waimakariri District shall be named in consultation with the applicant, and at the applicant’s expense, and relevant road signs shall be suitably annotated “Private Road”.

All private roads that are to be named, are to have a minimum of four lots with access from the private road.

4.6 A new street or road shall not be named the same or similar to a street or road already in existence in the District.

4.7 Council’s ‘List of Approved but Unallocated Road Names’
The list of unallocated potential road names for the Waimakariri District is maintained by Customer Services. Names approved for addition to the List of Approved but Unallocated...
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Road Names will remain there until they are either allocated to a road or removed as the result of a review of the list.

From time to time a road name may no longer need to be used as two or more roads may be jointed into one road or a road may be permanently closed. In both of these cases, the road name(s) may be put back on the list for potential reallocation, usually for a new or renamed road in the same general area.

The list of Approved but Unallocated Road Names will be reviewed by the Community Boards every six years.

4.8 Naming of streets in new subdivisions:

The rights of the subdivision developer to promote preferred road names for the subdivision will be taken into consideration, but the decision regarding road names will be made by the Community Boards by applying the clauses of this policy.

4.9 Approval Criteria and Weighting

The following factors shall be taken into account when selecting street, road or private road names in the Waimakariri District:

(a) The proposed name has local historical, cultural, environmental or geographical significance - e.g. Torlesse, Boys, Ashley, Cam.

(b) Maori names of local significance chosen in conjunction with local iwi representatives to ensure appropriateness of meaning and correct spelling.

(c) Significant and well known or previously well known names of farms, properties or run holdings – e.g. Coldstream, Carleton.

(d) Names of local residents who have achieved prominence in their chosen fields such as arts, sport, commerce, science, politics, local government, military, etc (e.g. Kippenberger, Kirk), or who have been long term residents.
### NAMING OF ROADS AND STREETS (INCLUDING PRIVATE ROADS) POLICY

#### 4.10 Road Type

The road type should be one that most accurately reflects the type of roadway that is being named. The list below should be used where appropriate, however, this list is not exclusive – refer to AS/NZS 4819:2011.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Type</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Open ended</th>
<th>Cul-de-sac</th>
<th>Pedestrian only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alley</td>
<td>Aly</td>
<td>Usually narrow roadway in a city or town.</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arcade</td>
<td>Arc</td>
<td>Covered walkway with shops along the sides.</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avenue</td>
<td>Ave</td>
<td>Broad roadway, usually planted on each side with trees.</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulevard</td>
<td>Blvd</td>
<td>Wide roadway, well paved, usually ornamented with trees and grass plots.</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circle</td>
<td>Cir</td>
<td>Roadway that generally forms a circle; or a short enclosed roadway bounded by a circle.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close</td>
<td>Cl</td>
<td>Short enclosed roadway.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court</td>
<td>Crt</td>
<td>Short enclosed roadway, usually surrounded by buildings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crescent</td>
<td>Cres</td>
<td>Crescent shaped roadway, especially where both ends join the same thoroughfare.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive</td>
<td>Dr</td>
<td>Wide main roadway without many cross-streets</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esplanade</td>
<td>Esp</td>
<td>Level roadway along the seaside, lake, or a river.</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glade</td>
<td>Gld</td>
<td>Roadway usually in a valley of trees.</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Grn</td>
<td>Roadway often leading to a grassed public recreation area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grove</td>
<td>Grv</td>
<td>Roadway that features a group of trees standing together.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway</td>
<td>Hwy</td>
<td>Main thoroughfare between major destinations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane</td>
<td>Lane</td>
<td>Narrow roadway between walls, buildings or a narrow country roadway.</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loop</td>
<td>Loop</td>
<td>Roadway that diverges from and rejoins the main thoroughfare.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mall</td>
<td>Mall</td>
<td>Wide walkway, usually with shops along the sides.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mews</td>
<td>Mews</td>
<td>Roadway in a group of houses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parade</td>
<td>Pde</td>
<td>Public roadway or promenade that has good pedestrian facilities along the side.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Pl</td>
<td>Short, sometimes narrow, enclosed roadway.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promenade</td>
<td>Prom</td>
<td>Wide, flat walkway, usually along the water’s edge.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quay</td>
<td>Qy</td>
<td>Roadway alongside or projecting into water.</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rise</td>
<td>Rise</td>
<td>Roadway going to a higher place or position.</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road</td>
<td>Rd</td>
<td>Open roadway primarily for vehicles.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Square</td>
<td>Sq</td>
<td>Roadway which generally forms a square shape, or an area of roadway bounded by four sides.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steps</td>
<td>Stps</td>
<td>Walkway consisting mainly of steps.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street</td>
<td>St</td>
<td>Public roadway in an urban area, especially where paved and with footpaths and buildings along one or both sides.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrace</td>
<td>Tce</td>
<td>Roadway on a hilly area that is mainly flat.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Type</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Open ended</th>
<th>Cul-de-sac</th>
<th>Pedestrian only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Track</td>
<td>Trk</td>
<td>Walkway in natural setting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>Thoroughfare for pedestrians.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Way</td>
<td>Way</td>
<td>Short enclosed roadway.</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wharf</td>
<td>Whrf</td>
<td>A roadway on a wharf or pier.</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*AS/NZS 4819:2011 Appendix B, Road Types – New Zealand*

5 Links to other policies and community outcomes

This policy should be read in conjunction with:

5.1 Local Government Act 1974 s319(j).

5.2 AS/NZS 4819:2011 Geographic information – Rural and urban addressing.

5.3 Community Outcome:

There are wide ranging opportunities for people to contribute to the decision-making by public organisations that affects our District.

- Public organisations make information about their plans and activities readily available
- Public organisations make every effort to accommodate the views of people who contribute to consultations

5.4 Waimakariri District Council, District Plan, Chapter 38, Road Names.

6 Adopted by and date

This Policy was approved by the Council’s Resource Management and Regulation Committee and subsequently adopted by the Council on 2 April 2013.

7 Review

Review every six years or sooner on request.
1. SUMMARY

1.1. Following a report and approval by the Woodend - Sefton Community Board in December 2018, Staff took three entrance sign concepts out to the Waikuku Beach community for consultation. Let’s Talk flyers were delivered to local residents, a drop in session was held and information posted on the Council website and Facebook page, including a link to post feedback. In total 111 feedback responses were received and staff have since collated, condensed and made comment on the responses. In general, the vast majority of responses were positive to wanting a sign installed. Of the options the most popular was the surfboard design as seen in option 1, section 3.4. It is important to note that this consultation was not designed to be a vote for the best option, instead it was to give the opportunity for community input into the design and to identify the things people liked and disliked, with the intention that preferences were included in a revised design.

1.2. Some people commented that they would prefer structures that slow traffic be installed instead of an entrance sign. Staff have determined that this sign will act as a traffic calming structure – especially with the addition of a message around speed or driving safely. Among others, the main ideas from this consultation were; the addition of a speed/safe driving message on the sign, incorporating different aspects of the community and/or surrounding wildlife and ensuring it is of a strong and durable construction. Staff saw merit in the ideas put forward and have included them within the revised design. Others felt that local talent should be given an opportunity to design the sign and staff received a few sketches of ideas from a local artist as part of this consultation. Staff felt that one of these ideas successfully incorporated many of the consultation responses into a single sign and have used this design as a base and adapted it to meet NZTA standards to create a Revised Design.

1.3. In December 2018 the Board allocated $4,300 towards the installation of an entrance sign to Waikuku Beach and to carry forward $2,502 into the next financial year for future projects. The Revised Design would require an additional allocation of $1,900 towards the sign in order to meet the higher cost of $6,200. The Board could therefore choose to reallocate some of the money being carried forward to cover the $1,900 shortfall required to construct the Revised Design. This would leave $602 to be carried forward into next year’s General Landscaping Budget should the Board choose to do so. Staff recommend this option as this sign is community driven and better meets the views received in the feedback while still fitting within the NZTA standards for road signs.
2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Woodend - Sefton Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 190529076573

(b) Notes the Board has previously allocated $4,300 towards an entrance sign for the Waikuku Beach Community in December 2018

(c) Notes That staff have undergone consultation on the sign and the results from this feedback are included within this report.

(d) Notes the Revised Design proposed by staff has been approved by the Roading and Greenspace Teams and would cost $6,200 to construct and install.

(e) Approves the allocation of $1,900 of the General Landscaping Fund which was previously approved to carry over to the 2019/20 financial year (December 2018 Board Meeting) in order to meet the shortfall between the cost of the Revised Design Sign and that previously allocated.

(f) Approves the remaining $602 of 2018/29 General Landscaping Budget be carried over into the following 2019/20 financial year.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1. The General Landscaping Budget is a discretionary sum the Board can allocate towards landscape projects within their community area. There have been varying projects that this money has been spent on over the years to enhance the landscape of the Woodend - Sefton area. Projects have included the extra seating, planting, local walkway projects, town centre enhancement etc. There are no documented guidelines which stipulate exactly what the money has to be spent on however it should be for things which will enhance the landscape for the benefit of the community.

3.2. In the past years the Woodend - Sefton Community Board have allocated funds to a range of different projects. These include;

- $2,000 – Taranaki Reserve (Ongoing)
- $5,000 – Woodend War Memorial (Construction)
- $8,058 – Sefton Domain Planting (Planting)
- $1,500 – Sefton Domain Seats (Complete)
- $1,700 – Sefton Domain Sign (Complete)
- $2600 – Pegasus Western Ridge Seat (Pending)

3.3. In December 2018, the Woodend Sefton Community Board approved the allocation of $4,300 towards an entrance sign for Waikuku Beach. As part of this approval, the Board approved staff taking three concepts out for public consultation with the Waikuku Beach community. The Board requested that as part of this consultation, the public would be given an opportunity to provide their own ideas for the sign.
3.4. Staff created a ‘Let’s Talk’ flyer which was distributed to the residents of Waikuku Beach and the surrounding residents such as those who live on Waikuku Beach Road and those within the Northside subdivision. This flyer (Attachment i) included a map showing the proposed location of the sign and images of the three concepts (below) for people to comment on. Information was included on both the Council website and Facebook pages. Feedback could be given by returning the flyer, email, phone-calls or posting on the link on the web/Facebook pages. Residents were also invited to attend a drop in session at the Waikuku Beach Hall on the 28th of March 2019.

![Flyer Image](image)

3.4. Staff created a ‘Let’s Talk’ flyer which was distributed to the residents of Waikuku Beach and the surrounding residents such as those who live on Waikuku Beach Road and those within the Northside subdivision. This flyer (Attachment i) included a map showing the proposed location of the sign and images of the three concepts (below) for people to comment on. Information was included on both the Council website and Facebook pages. Feedback could be given by returning the flyer, email, phone-calls or posting on the link on the web/Facebook pages. Residents were also invited to attend a drop in session at the Waikuku Beach Hall on the 28th of March 2019.

4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

4.1. In total, 21 Let’s Talk flyers were returned to Council with feedback, 64 responses were received through the online link and 29 comments were put on post-it notes at the drop in session. This made a total of 111 feedback responses received and the full responses are included in attachment ii. Staff then collated and condensed this feedback and have provided comments on the responses within attachment iii along with a basic summary below of the feedback. This summary is split into four categories; Sign Preference, Sign Location, Sign Style and Ideas.

4.2. Sign Preference

Out of the responses received, the vast majority were positive to the installation of a sign. Of the responses 83 respondents were in favour of the Surfboard Sign, 12 in favour of the Wave Sign and 5 in favour of the Abstract Sign. While the Surfboard Sign received significantly more positive responses than others, it is important to note that this consultation was not designed to be a vote but instead to identify the things people liked and disliked in a sign. These preferences would then be used to create a revised design for the Boards consideration. Some people commented that they would prefer structures that slow traffic be installed instead of an entrance sign. Staff have determined that this
sign will act as a traffic calming structure – especially with the addition of a message around speed or driving safely. Other initiatives such as speed bumps etc would not fall within the scope of the General Landscaping Budget.

4.3. **Sign Location**

Comments relating to the location of the sign varied and identified that there is a question within the community as to where exactly Waikuku Beach starts and what houses are included in this community. Some felt that the sign should be placed before the Northside subdivision while others felt that these homes and those off Kings Ave etc were part of Waikuku and the sign should be placed past the Kings Ave turnoff. The resident who owns the land on which the sign is in front of contacted Council concerned about the exact location and how they would maintain around it. When staff described the exact location proposed and explained that the sign would have a concrete base to make it easier to maintain around she appeared much happier with the location.

Staff worked directly with roading experts to identify the most ideal location in terms of visibility, safety and traffic calming. It was determined that an entrance sign is best located before the actual entrance to a community and just before the speed limit reduction. This means it creates a visual cue to drivers to slow down before they reach the community or the spot where the limit decreases.

4.4. **Sign Style**

Many respondents liked the colours and interest of the Surfboard Sign and commented that the Abstract and Wave Signs were ‘boring’ or ‘overly Council’. While the surfboard motif proved popular and captured the laid back beach side feel of Waikuku, a lot of responses mentioned that it was exclusive and didn’t reference the other deep aspects that make up the Waikuku community and surrounding wildlife. Concerns were raised about the surfboard sign being prone to vandalism and damage and costly to repair and a number of people didn’t like the font used.

People liked the font of the Wave sign and its simplicity. Positive responses were received about its simple and easily maintained construction and that it reflects the beach well. Some respondents felt that it was very conventional and standard looking sign that lacked interest.

Some found the Abstract Sign timeless and were able to read a lot into the meaning behind the abstract lines and shapes however, similar to the Wave sign, people found it not eye-catching and some found its abstract shape off putting.

4.5. **Sign Ideas**

Some of the main ideas that arose were the addition of a speed/safe driving message on the sign, incorporating different aspects of the community and/or surrounding wildlife to reduce exclusivity (i.e. not just surfboards) and the need for it to be of a strong and durable construction. Staff agree with these ideas and have included them within the revised design.

A number of ideas were put forward where elements from one sign could be added to another such as birds on the surfboard sign or using the wave sign font etc. Staff determined that the appropriate response to the consultation was not to simply take things people liked from one sign and add them to another but rather to create a sign which incorporated the ideas and elements into a single unique sign.
A few comments requested that local talent be given an opportunity to design the sign and staff received a few sketches of ideas from a local artist Marley Biggins (Attachment iv) as part of this consultation. One of the ideas proposed was a sign which staff felt successfully incorporated many of the consultation responses into a single design. Staff have used this design as a base and adapted it to meet NZTA standards and included it below as the Revised Design.

4.6. This sign includes the popular surfboard and wave motifs but also references to the surrounding wildlife and vegetation through the addition of a Fantail, Wrybill and Pukeko along with cabbage trees and a flax bush. All of these would be laser cut out of strong aluminium and constructed to ensure they are durable and strong. Some of the elements (such as the fantail) have also been shifted from the location in Marley’s design to make them less prone to vandalism and damage.

4.7. The wording on the sign has been adapted to ensure it meets the NZTA road sign standards which don’t allow curly fonts and limit words to reduce distraction. The use of the phrase Haere Mai welcomes people to this community in Te Reo and in doing so references to the history and culture of New Zealand and Waikuku.

4.8. Greenspace staff have worked with the Roading team to simplify the overall style and wording of the sign and the Roading Team have given their approval of this design as one which is appropriate for the location and purpose. Greenspace staff agree that this sign meets the intended purpose of an entrance sign (including traffic calming etc) while also incorporating the positive elements which people responded to from the initial three concepts and is community driven.

4.9. Staff have taken the revised design to the sign writer to determine the best way to construct it in a strong, durable and easy to maintain manner. Strong 150 x 150mm Macrocarpa posts would provide the main structure to the sign with the cabbage tree, flax and birds made from 5mm Router Cut Aluminium with full colour digital prints applied. The surfboard would be routed out of ACM with flat digitally printed graphics.
4.10. Based on the more complex nature of the revised design and the use of strong materials for this sign, there is a higher cost associated than that of the original allocation. The estimation of staff based on pricing received from the Sign-writer is that this sign would cost $6,200.

4.11. In December 2018 the Board allocated $4,300 towards the installation of an entrance sign to Waikuku Beach. The Revised Design would require an additional allocation of $1,900 towards the sign in order to meet the higher cost of $6,200. After the allocations in December, the Board were left with $2,502 remaining in their budget and as there were no additional projects at that stage which the Board wanted to pursue, chose to carry this forward into the next financial year for future projects. The Board could therefore choose to re-allocate some of the money being carried forward to cover the $1,900 shortfall required to construct the Revised Design. Staff recommend this option as this sign is community driven, better meets the views received in the feedback while still fitting within the NZTA standards for road signs. This would leave $602 to be carried forward into next year’s General Landscaping Budget.

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

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

Groups and Organisations

5.1. Staff have not spoken to any specific groups or organisations regarding the Waikuku Beach Sign however any groups who may have been interested in providing feedback had opportunity to do so through attending the drop in session or on the online link should they wish to.

Wider Community

5.2. Consultation with the wider community has been undertaken through the use of a Let’s Talk Flyer, an online link on both the Council Website and Facebook page and a drop in session at the Waikuku Beach Hall on the 28th of March. The results of this consultation are included within the attachments and also discussed above in Section 4. While the recommended design is different to the three which were consulted upon, as it incorporates aspects from all of the concepts, is community led and meets many of the ideas and feedback responses received, staff do not believe further consultation is required.

6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1. Financial Implications

In December 2018 the Board allocated $4,300 towards the installation of an entrance sign to Waikuku Beach. The Revised Design would require an additional allocation of $1,900 towards the sign in order to meet the higher cost of $6,200. In December, the Board chose to carry forward $2,502 into the next financial year for future projects. The Board could therefore choose to re-allocate some of the money being carried forward to cover the $1,900 shortfall required to construct the Revised Design. This would leave $602 to be carried forward into next year’s General Landscaping Budget should the Board choose to do so.

Staff believe that the funds sought for this sign are consistent with those spent on other similar sized projects within the district and is reflective of the types of projects which funds from this budget are commonly allocated towards.
6.2. **Community Implications**

Staff believe that there are no significant negative impacts from the installation of the entrance sign for Waikuku. The sign will welcome people to this community, give an idea of what type of community people are entering while also giving a visual cue to drivers to slow down. There is a risk that if one of the original concepts was chosen as opposed to the revised design, this may cause unrest in the community as this would not address the feedback comments received from the consultation.

6.3. **Risk Management**

As the Waikuku entrance sign is within the road reserve there is risk associated with the design and implementation of this project. Staff have worked with Council’s Roading team to ensure that the design of the three initial concepts as well as the Revised Design meet the approved standards and guidelines so that they do not pose a risk to motorists. Should a design be approved, Staff will continue to work with the contractor and where required the Roading Team to ensure that it is installed in a safe manner.

6.4. **Health and Safety**

The installation of this sign will require work to be undertaken within Council land/Road reserves and in particular holes being dug and the use of tools and potentially some machinery. If approved, staff would require any contractors to be Sitewise approved and to submit an appropriate health and safety plan (Site Specific Safety Plan - SSSP). This would need to be approved and signed by the Greenspace Manager prior to construction beginning on site. As it is in the road reserve, it is likely that the entrance sign will require a traffic management plan. If so, Staff will ensure that this is completed and approved prior to installation.

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**

All signage shall be in accordance with the District Plan and the Signage Bylaw (2012). Additional government and NZTA legislation applies relating to signage but this is dependent on the particular road/location and type of sign being proposed. Therefore Staff have worked with our Roading Team who are familiar with this legislation to determine a safe location for the sign and any specific details around the signs construction and design to ensure that it meets the appropriate legislation.

7.3. **Community Outcomes**

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

- The Council makes information about its plans and activities readily available. 1,3
- The Council takes account of the views across the community including mana whenua. 1,3
- Opportunities for collaboration and partnerships are actively pursued. 1,2,3.
The distinctive character of our takiwa – towns, villages and rural areas is maintained.
- Our rural areas retain their amenity and Character.

There is a safe environment for all
- Harm to people from natural and man-made hazards is minimised. 1,2,3,4
- Our district has the capacity and resilience to quickly recover from natural disasters and adapt to the effects of climate change. 1,2,3,4
- Crime, injury and harm from road crashes, gambling, and alcohol abuse are minimised. 1,3,4

7.4. Delegations

The Woodend - Sefton Community Board have the delegation to approve the allocation of the Woodend - Sefton General Landscape Budget.
The Woodend Sefton Community Board are currently looking at options for an entrance sign to the Waikuku Beach Community and would like your feedback.

We will be at the Waikuku Beach Hall on Thursday 28 March between 6pm and 7:30pm and would love to hear what you think about the ideas and any feedback you have which may make them even better.

The Woodend Sefton Community Board are currently considering three potential designs for an entrance sign to the Waikuku Beach Community to be sited in the location shown on the map below.

The three signs are as follows:

**Option 1:** Surfboard Sign

**Option 2:** Wave Sign

**Option 3:** Abstract Beach Sign

Please come along to the drop in session and let us know your ideas and preferences. Your feedback will help the Board make a decision.

**Can't Make it?**

If you can’t make it to see us in person, your ideas are still important to us. Simply write your ideas in the comments section on the back of this page and post it back (Free Post). Otherwise you can email your ideas to records@wmk.govt.nz

**Where?**

The drop in sessions are being held at the Waikuku Beach Hall – 52 Park Terrace, Waikuku Beach.

Tell us what you think by 5pm, Friday 5th April 2019.
If you have any comments or questions regarding Waikuku Beach community entrance signs please contact:

Grant Stephens
Green Space Community Engagement Officer
Waimakariri District Council
Phone: 0800 965 468
Email: records@wmk.govt.nz

Or return this feedback form (no stamp required) back to us by 5pm, Friday 5 April 2019.

Your Comments
Feedback Responses - Raw Data

Let's Talk Flyer Responses

18 March 2019
Sorry, it may just be me and what has happened recently but what... I have lived here for 20 years and the community has survived fine without a sign. Why go for the expense of pamphlet, circulation, holding a meeting etc. Do we need or want one, so that someone will target it. Save the money and reduce the rates.

19 March 2019
Love Option 1 - Surfboard
What a waste of time. Have those people nothing better to do? Any of the signs are ok, but get one up. It never sees so much barometric crap. This time at least was not out of business. What now?

21 March 2019
All look pretty good, our order of preferences are: 1- surfboard sign, 2- Abstract signs, 3- Wave sign. Keep them for the chance to pop it. Have surfboard sign with few fonts and with the village name. Let it be a real sign, not just a logo on a surfboard, sign design is done and understandable. Need to be a real sign not a logo.

22 March 2019
So sorry I can't make it to the meeting. I love Waikuku Beach - think of it as a village - my vote for sign would be number 1 surfboard sign - thank you for the chance of a say - love the idea of a logo.

24 March 2019
Our preferred option is the surfboard sign because of its uniqueness and it identifies Waikuku Beach as a surf beach.

29 March 2019
Our family had a 6 - 4 vote for option 1 - 3 is our fourth votes for sign 1.

To all concerned and 2019
Surfboard sign not appropriate would attract graffiti. If a sign is required at all the Wave sign is most appropriate. What really needed along this area is Beach Road is traffic calming structures to slow traffic to the posted speed limits. Too many drivers still travelling above 70kmh entering the residential zone.

30 March 2019
Hi there, as a resident of Waikuku Beach I would love the ‘surfboard sign’. I have no second choice, I hope I look Forward to seeing it up

29 March 2019
Order of preferences: 1 - 3 - 5 all are acceptable.

29 March 2019
We think the surfboard sign is the best. Thankyou

30 March 2019
I have missed the meeting tonight. I think it would have improved our individual flow. Attached is a still credit no computer program to use. Howz Mal! Welcome to Waikuku Beach community letters on a surfboard shape with native trees and Bird. Could be cut out of colored iron wire scaling etc. Thank you Max! Mike Hughes Wharau

BAGGE ATACHED. YAY.

30 March 2019
Please see attached. Picture credit to Rook Puranga Hughes from金银 Good

30 March 2019
Option 1 looks good but would be good to know prices as this option is most expensive.

1 April 2019
Option 3 is perfect. Nice and clear for old and for old people like me.

1 April 2019
We are not comparing apples with apples here. I don’t feel at thought option 2 could have been missed. It’s a colour, texture, shape, etc. I think this one is most appealing to me.

3 April 2019
For many of us who don’t have our home to surf, it is a little frustrating that the others are so mono seamless and uniform in shape. How about the wave moving on a shape that can change like the surfboards? How about option 2? It is a much more colourful method of surf that is available.

4 April 2019
We favour option 2 - It may be seen as an anti community but I feel a sign coming into Waikuku Beach is unnecessary and visual pollution. There is already a dozen various signs driving in a 4 lane child signs, Public signs etc. It is visual pollution!

8 April 2019
People know where they are and it didn’t Chang much.

9 April 2019
There is not enough of Wave Beach so I would love to see similar opportunity afforded to the community here in Waikuku Beach. Acclimate the concept of ‘Waikuku Signage’ but don’t feel the three options sufficiently represent the richness of our unique coastal community - not just any sense of pride. Please don’t miss the opportunity for authentic partnership with locals here. Voting

5 April 2019
All the signs are nice - preference for the surfboard sign. The sign might encourage people to decrease their speed before the speed limit.

Survey Monkey/Internet Responses

Five or less waves are awesome! You’re seeing new waves for Waikuku Beach community. A welcome sign to our community helps to set both a narrative and feel and is a great opportunity to showcase local artist talent. With this in mind, wondering about the background to both the three designs our community have been asked to vote on (can’t seem to find any detail) and the artist who has worked on these (they’re local!). Given there is a cultural heritage here in Waikuku and surrounding area, it is called Pamagagi represents this and the visuals are closer to what captures/celebrates our unique ‘Village’. Here is the perfect opportunity to showcase local talent and tell an authentic tale of partnership with the community. While both of the options presented go against the original concepts of coastal communities - they are lacking in any attempt to depict the cultural narrative and to be honest, lack rather badly. Have local has been consulted? Have local artist here in Waikuku been asked for their submissions?

1 April 2019
Thank you for the opportunity to comment. I have been giving this matter quite a bit of thought after attending the drop-in session on 28th March and having a discussion with locals and others. I do not agree with the proposed placement of the signs. I think that it should be located before Northside Drive (possibly by the roundabout/turnoff that leads from the Waikuku Beach Road through to Northside Drive). If we are talking about a "Waikuku Beach Community" you should include the Northside Drive residents just as much as the other areas that also include them as well of course.”

5 April 2019
2. Wave sign number 2
Thank you for the opportunity to comment. I have been giving this matter quite a bit of thought after attending the drop-in session on 28th March and having a discussion with locals and others. I do not agree with the proposed placement of the signs. I think that it should be located before Northside Drive (possibly by the roundabout/turnoff that leads from the Waikuku Beach Road through to Northside Drive). If we are talking about a "Waikuku Beach Community" you should include the Northside Drive residents just as much as the other areas that also include them as well of course.”

3 April 2019
I am a local artist. I would like to support option 2 - the novel sign. I believe the novel sign is more engaging and I believe the sign should be a little bit larger as it is a very narrow road.

5 April 2019
I think the abstract option is the best, ideally done in a sort of tiled design. The surfboards are a bit cheesy and everyone would already know the surf is good in the other on I can’t work out what it is doing.

4 April 2019
In my opinion the abstract option is the best, ideally done in a sort of tiled design. The surfboards are a bit cheesy and everyone would already know the surf is good in the other option I can’t work out what it is doing.

28 March 2019
We like option 3. We love surfboard designs. They are very appealing and the different designs with the different fonts are really nice. We would love to see the surfboards in front of the beach house.

21 March 2019
We love option 1. The surfboards place the Northside Country subdivision entrance, and the beach before.

21 March 2019
Surfboard entrance sign

21 March 2019
Like the idea of one with surfboards on it as it explains what the beach is about. Brazilian (or English speaking) tourists would know what we are and overall the sign has a bit of character.
I vote for the surfboard sign. Would like to see "low down" sign attached.

The first option with surf boards.

Option one, with this community. Surf boards are a major part of our community and see better than plain signage.

It's a waste of money to spend on a big sign. I would prefer money is spent on reducing the speed in the 50 km and 30 km areas coming into Walliskill. Police have no chance as people do extreme speed and one day it will be a child especially when they fly round that corner where the school bus. I think a sign is an absolute waste of money do something important now become here and the words and safety.

Think the 1st option is the best because it's colourful but a watch your speed put on the bottom if the sign would be nice.

Surfboard sign

Option 1 with sound level added

The second option with what the community is known for.

Surfing

Located on the right side of the road

My preference is the signs with the surfboards. I would have liked to see a option with books as Walki Beach is an internationally recognized for being.

The second option is the best.

My road fromage that the signs are being placed on and I am not in Walki Beach. Also yes we are to be relying on me to keep a tidy beach. You know what. Who? Is going to read and move and around the sign? No one has talked to me about this. I think sign is better placed at 30km sign near houses and places where the council does keep some of the local property and surfboards. I don’t agree to its current location.

I love the surfboard design. It captures the beach lifestyle on other board, but it is also subtle in its design. It’s uniqueness would be eye catching and I would be proud someone home each day. Love our community. Thanks.

The surfboard related this... beach feel

First design with surfboards.

The three on offer, my preference is option one, surfboard theme.

Surf Board option please!

First one

Get it

Option 1 - the surfboards look really good

The surfboard sign gets my vote.

Surfboard sign is the best.

Sign with the surfboards please. Second choice is the sand sign

The surfboard sign is unique and gives a nice feel of not being to "HIP" in these parts.

I vote for option 3.

Option 2 - I've lived here 17 yrs it's a real cool sign, it reflects the beach

Like the first option, with the surfboards.

Option 1 easily, the site if there was a small warning to beware of fine sand kids tool.

It would like to vote for the surfboard design please, I like the shapes and colours. The best is also much cleaner and easiest to read. Perhaps the thick mussel could be incorporated into the design?

Yes definitely my preference is the first one with the surf boards.

I don't see the need for one at all, but if we are to have one I'd like to see a "low down" or similar message on it. Encourage people to see it as a persons place, not a vehicle place, a place to relax and take things at a bit more slower.

Our household votes 2 for option 1 & 2 for option 2 Thanks

Love the surf board design

Option one would be my choice.

No one please. The surf boards look great.

I'm opposed to having a sign into Walki Beach. I feel that there are far more important issues to be addressed such as IT pathways, a safety bar on Kings Ave by the Water pump to start with. Stop wasting money on decoration and put money where it's needed most.

Like the surf board the best.

Love the surfboards.

Option 1, first choice Option 2 and

Keep our beaches clean and safe. Speed limit needs to reduce too. School bus route and always see speed signs.

Like all the designs but would really appreciate it if it incorporated "low down children and pet like about" or something along those lines. Thanks for taking the time to engage with us. As a family we've voted on the Surfboard Sign for a number of reasons as below. It's different from the Norm and has a distinctive "Beach Community" feel. It's more colourful and up beat. It's more distinctive and draws the eye. It feels like it embodies a "slow down for the" message which is what attracted us to the beach.

I like option 3. It's about the people we wish to attract here. Ecologically sensitive, bird life appreciation, relaxed and the love of a small quiet community. I strongly believe the sign should do more honour and I refer to the Littlefield Beach sign that has a large 30km sign under its images and surfboard signs on beach is the area. People have been bitten by toxic bees, dogs killed and bird life killed and chased. It's only a matter of time before a child is hurt or anyone has to die.

Sign

DROP IN SESSION - March 2019

Surfboard create an exclusivity - we do also have a river = exclusity = an important history

Good sign - Drive safely, jarden and Police

Like the surfboard sign. put jardens on it.

Fun and funny but maybe doesn't represent all the Walki Beach Community. Gimmicky

Gary. Jardines and Gunners

Ronald: Like the surfboard sign - proportions

Remove this word Community and add diverse safely

Love this! Walki Beach font could be a bit bigger (At the moment it's too much like comic sans' bad font) I love the surfboards it represents what Walki is

Surfboards and colours (will this fade)?

Identifiable for north Stuff who come to use this beach throughout their life's. Identifiable for long Sundays and good surf.

If there is to be a sign with a singular message, how about the provision for temporal signs for one off events or pressing issues.

Has anyone asked tangents when in reprints of walki that could be reflected in signage?

This is one with different font

Could be more multi purpose signage - also could be a "welcome to our community"

Love the surfboards sign however think that the font is dated. Beach and jardens font is good.

Add a "shag" to the surfboards. Add a "Polynesian" to the grass

Why is there a hole in the surfer's X

Bit conventional. Lacks oomph

Love the font and colouring

Put surfboard on this one

Too Council for Walki

Bit boring colours and Council type brand - too signage

Put surfboards on this one. Easy to read. Take the font out of the bottom font

Detail along the side gets lost on real sign

Like this curve

This font is not bold enough. It's not eye catching. Font looks like it is about to fall apart

Could be a distraction if turned on side

Sign needs to be the other way round "Walki Beach" in the horizontal

Like this one without the bottom board as it distracts from the message. Maybe change the font.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preference</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surfboard Sign</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave Sign</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstract Sign</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agrees with installation of a sign</td>
<td></td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagrees with installation of a sign</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STAFF RESPONSE**

Based on the feedback, the majority of respondents were supportive of a sign being included at the entrance to Walkuku Beach. The revised design is unique and fits into the natural surroundings of Walkuku. While staff acknowledge there may be other things in Walkuku which require maintenance, this would come from a different budget so this is not a case of not spending on one thing in order to spend on another.

Staff agree, the initial concepts did not represent the full breadth of the Walkuku Community. This is difficult to achieve in an entrance sign however the revised design does highlight a range of different elements relating to Walkuku including the beach, the surf, the birdlife and the native plants. It therefore better represents the entire community than the three initial concepts.

**General**

The location of the sign has been chosen to include what the community see as Walkuku Beach while also being in a safe location and in a location where it will work best as a traffic calming technique. Shifting it to include the Northside residents would not provide the same traffic calming effects to the community. Shifting it to the Council land by Taranaki Stream would include even less residents (i.e., Kings Ave, Allin Drive etc.) and would not slow people before they reached the lower speed areas or the areas with native birds (Taranaki Stream). There is also already a sign in this location so could become a distraction.

All of the signs consulted on were designed by a sign writer specifically for Walkuku Beach and included aspects relating to this community. The revised design better incorporates these elements into one sign and is therefore more unique to Walkuku.

The revised sign includes the phrase "Please Drive Carefully" and provides a traffic calming tool in order to address the speed of drivers and improve safety. This is only one tool out of many which are already in use in Walkuku Beach.

There are differing opinions on where exactly Walkuku Beach starts and whether Northside should be included or not. The location of the sign was looked at with a road user who recommended this as a safe location that would have the best traffic calming effects. Greenspace staff have talked with this owner and explained that the sign would have a concrete footing so would be easy to maintain around. Also the exact location was more preferable to where the owner thought that the sign was being positioned.

**Positives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positives</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have local artists been given opportunity to provide submissions? Do local artists get to help paint the picture as announced to walkside?: Are determined signs?</td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has tangata who has been asked about history so it can be reflected in signage?</td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Surfboard Sign**

As the surfboard sign has more detailed features it is more prone to damage or vandalism. However, cars will be taken to ensure appropriately strong materials are used to reduce the risk of damage as best as possible.

The majority of responses would indicate that sign preference is based more on what is on the sign than the perceived or real cost of creating the sign.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negatives</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surfboard sign prone to vandalism.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the surfboard the best because it costs the most?</td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positives</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surfboard sign has a cool feeling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surfboard sign is bright is memorable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surfboard sign is eye-catching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surfboard sign better than plain signage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surfboard sign captures casual beach lifestyle and is sophisticated.</td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surfboard sign captures the beach feel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surfboard sign is unique and not &quot;stiff&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surfboard look great</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surfboard sign is identifiable to north Cantabria's who use the beach - fast Quennies and good surf</td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Not apples for apples as people voting for the one with most colour and interest. Other two designs better reflect Wallis and more design work.

Concern about durability of surfboard sign and word community. Any sign will be constructed with durability and strength of materials taken into account. The surfboards do pose more risk of damage and would need to be made from a strong material. The word community is not included in the revised concept.

Surfboard sign is cheesy. The revised design includes a number of different elements that represent Wallis and in doing so, hopefully will appear less cheesy or gimmicky.

Surfboards create exclusivity. The different elements in the revised design better represent the whole of Wallis rather than just the surfboards and therefore doesn’t have the same exclusivity that the original design did.

Surfboard sign font is a bad font. Font choice is a personal preference and are governed by NZTA rules around the type of fonts that can be used. The revised design does not use the same font as the surfboard sign.

Surfboard sign font is dated. The revised design has been designed by a sign writer and believe the proportions are correct.

Complex, costly, susceptible to damage and have higher repair costs. Wallis is about more than surfboards.

Will the colours fade? All colours on signs fade over time but the signs are treated to be UV protected to slow this down.

Positives

Like the wave sign font. Noted
Wave sign is good construction, has a good font and graphics don’t distract.
Wave sign is cool and reflects the beach.
Love the font and colour of wave sign.
Wave sign has better font.

Negatives

Wave sign looks like Dudley pool.
Wave sign is a bit too conventional and lacksoomph.
Wave sign is too ‘Council’ for Wallis.
Wave sign is boring.
Wave sign has boring colours - Council type brand - too ‘signage’

Why is there a hole in the T? This was part of the font style used but is not included in the revised design.

Positives

Abstract sign is timeless.
Abstract sign is about the people we wish to attract here. Ecologically sensitive; bird life appreciative, relaxed and the know of a small quiet community.
Like the curve of the Abstract sign.

Negatives

Abstract sign doesn’t look right with curve meeting a straight pole. This is in keeping with the abstract nature of the sign however staff note that to some this is not visually appealing. This is not included in the revised design.
Detail on the side of the abstract sign gets lost. Staff agree with this response and taken into account while creating the revised design.
Abstract sign font is not bold enough, eye-catching and looks like its falling apart.
The font used in the Abstract sign is not included in the revised design.

Abstract sign could be a distortion if turned on its side.
Abstract sign needs to be other way round - Wallis Beach on the horizontal.
Like abstract sign but without bottom board and change the font.

Negatives

Change font to wave sign font.
Instead need structures to slow traffic.

Ideas

A sign helps set a narrative and feel for community. Opportunity to showcase local talent. Most capture cultural heritage and visuals associated with our unique village. Would love to see an opportunity for locals to capture the uniqueness of place and space.

Sign should be of same construction as Wave sign to limit future damage and be easy to maintain. We have a lovely river area, a wonderful estuary and river-mouth, an excellent beach, great forest areas/waels, and a truly wonderful diversity of birdlife. We should have something that reflects more of the wide range of things that make up Wallis Beach. Brian’s Biggens Ideal is a good start but make it simple construction. Word Beach should be the same as Wallis
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ideas</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Needs more colour and shift to include Northside residents</td>
<td>More colour is indicated in the revised design. The location of the sign has been chosen to include what the community sees as Waitakitu Beach while also being in a safe location and in a location where it will work best as a traffic calming technique. Shifting it to include the Northside residents would not provide the same traffic calming effect to the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave needs to be darker to contrast more with the words.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include wording to “slow the folk down” and traffic calming has garden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs a slow down safety message.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slow down included</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to do something to reduce speeds. Do something important to save human lives and the wildlife.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watch your speed sign added</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limit speed added</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The real issue is TRAFFIC SPEED. Initiatives that involve spending my money / time would do better if prioritized appropriately. This initiative is not.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs a slow down message so people see this as a person-oriented space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include a slow down children and wildlife are about.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove the word community and add “drive safe”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive safely, jandals and Paheko added to surfboard sign.</td>
<td>Drive carefully, Pulakeo and native plants have been included in the revised design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would have liked to see an option with birds as internationally known for accentury birds.</td>
<td>Two birds are included in the revised design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signs in better placed in 50km area near grasses and flowers that Council maintains.</td>
<td>An entrance sign is limit located before the actual entrance to a community and before the speed limit reduces. This means it creates a visual cue to drivers to slow down before they reach the community or the spot where the limit decreases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I strongly believe the sign should do more however and I refer to the Leithfield Beach sign that has a large 30km sign under its welcome and enforce signs on both in the area.</td>
<td>The revised design encourages people to drive carefully and there are already signs in this area warning to be aware of children. It is important that we do not overcomplicate this sign so that it becomes a distraction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waring to be aware of children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Also have river, history and estuary</td>
<td>The revised design speaks to the natural environment of the area and the beach while keeping it simple and understandable to drivers passing and not creating a distraction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Put jandals on surfboard sign</td>
<td>Staff determined that the appropriate response to the consultation was not to simply take things people liked from one sign and add them to another. Instead, staff decided to adapt a design provided by a local as part of this process and try to incorporate the thinking behind the responses that were received into this new revised design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use wave sign font</td>
<td>As an entrance sign in an 80km area it is important that this sign is not a distraction. Temporal messages about events etc. would be better suited on a local notice board or similar type of sign.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change surfboard sign font</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could be more multi purpose - welcome to our community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use the Wave sign font on surfboard sign</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add a shadow and Pulakeo to surfboard sign</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Put surfboards on the Wave Sign</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Put surfboards on the Wave Sign</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add provision for temporal messages i.e. events etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Concepts provided by Marley Biggins
1. SUMMARY

1.1. In December 2018 Staff brought a report to the Board in response to correspondence regarding leftover private funding for the Karen Eastwood Memorial. Currently there is $1,800 remaining that was given towards this memorial by groups such as the Lions and has not yet been spent. At this meeting, the Board approved the remaining funds of $1,800 from the private fundraising for the Karen Eastwood Memorial be spent on the supply and installation of a large established tree in the location presented within the report.

1.2. While the original approval was only for one large tree there is sufficient room in this space for two large trees and now sufficient budget. Greenspace staff are supportive of planting two large trees and suggest it would be ideal if one was deciduous and the other evergreen to ensure shelter is provided all year round.

1.3. Staff are seeking approval from the Board to work with the overseer of the funds and the Nursery to select two trees on the understanding that where available, these will be selected from the list of trees within this report which have been established to do well in Pegasus. It is possible that other trees within the nursery would also do well in this area and if there are none of the listed species available which are of an appropriate size or shape, staff hope to identify a suitable alternative under advice from our operations team and the nursery staff.

1.4. All costs associated with the planting of these trees will be covered by the private funding available however approval to plant within a neighbourhood reserve is required from the Board before this can occur.

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Woodend - Sefton Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 190530077180

(b) Notes the Board has previously approved the planting of a large established tree in memory of Karen Eastwood.

(c) Approves two trees being planted within the area indicated within this report (190530077180) and staff selecting these trees alongside the overseer of the funds.
(d) **Notes** where possible Staff will choose trees from the list within this report which have been proven to be successful and will not select species which have been identified within this report (190530077180) as not suiting the Pegasus environment.

(e) **Notes** that any costs associated with purchasing and planting these trees will be met through private funding left over from public fundraising for the Karen Eastwood Memorial.

3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1. In December 2018 Staff brought a report to the Board regarding General Landscaping Budget which also included a section relating to the Karen Eastwood Memorial. This was in response to correspondence regarding leftover private funding for the Karen Eastwood Memorial. Currently there is $1,800 remaining that was given towards this memorial by groups such as the Lions and has not yet been spent.

3.2. At the meeting, the Board were presented with three options. These options were identified with Staff and the overseer of these funds, Davina, as potential projects that this money could be spent on. These options were; Wind Protection – for parents watching the children on the playground, Two small trees and a bench seat – located just north of the toilets as visible in the below map or, one large established tree – in the same location indicated on the map and ready to provide shelter in a short period. At this December meeting, the Board approved the remaining funds of $1,800 from the private fundraising for the Karen Eastwood Memorial be spent on the supply and installation of a large established tree in the location presented within the report.

3.3. As this decision was made in December Staff recommended that any tree planting would not be undertaken until the start of the next planting season in autumn to ensure the most chance of survival of the tree/trees. Davina was made aware of the decision and agreed to wait until the planting season started in order to plant the tree. In the meantime, staff spoke with an arborist who recommended against relocating a very large tree into such a wind prone area with poor soil quality as it would be at high risk of failure and needing to be replaced. Instead it was recommended that we find a large tree within a nursery and plant that within a good sized tree-pit filled with good quality soil.

4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1. In May, Staff met with Davina at Canterbury Trees to select a large tree and determined that based on the cost of the trees, with the money available we could plant two large trees. While the original approval was only for one large tree (based on the estimated cost of shifting an established large tree), there is sufficient room in this space for two large trees and now sufficient budget due to their smaller size. Greenspace staff are supportive
4. While at the Nursery and with the guidance of staff and a tree expert, Davina selected a Liquidambar tree, a Sequoia and a Weeping Elm as potential trees which should suit the environment at Pegasus and were an appropriate size and form for the memorial. Following this, Davina had a discussion with Rhonda Mathers of the Pegasus Residents Association and established that a number of liquidambar trees within the Pegasus area have suffered wind damage. This was confirmed by the Greenspace Operations team and so it was determined not to proceed with the Liquidambar.

4.2. Staff have spoken to the operations team further to establish trees which have not succeeded well in Pegasus in the past few years and along with the liquidambar have recommended against planting Swedish Whitebeam, Norway Maples and London Planes. Staff have also identified a list of trees which should have better chance of survival and health in Pegasus such as Ornamental Pear, Fastigate Hornbeam, Sequoia, Pinoak, Scarlet Oak, Weeping/Horizontal Elm or Ash.

4.3. Staff are seeking approval from the Board to work with Davina and the Nursery to select two trees to plant in the location prior approved on the understanding that these will be trees that where available, these will be selected from the list of trees which have been established to do well in Pegasus. It is possible that other trees within the nursery would also do well in this area and if there are none of the above species which are of an appropriate size or shape, staff hope to identify a suitable alternative under advice from our operations team and the nursery staff.

4.4. All costs associated with the planting of these trees will be covered by the private funding available however approval to plant within a neighbourhood reserve is required from the Board before this can occur.

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

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. Groups and Organisations

Staff have not spoken to any specific groups or organisations regarding the trees.

5.2. Wider Community

5.1. No consultation has been undertaken with the wider community to date regarding these trees. Staff believe that these will have a positive impact on the community and users of the space without any perceived negative effects. The trees are located behind the toilets and would not block the views of any residential homes towards the lake.

6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1. Financial Implications

As this project is fully funded by public funding there is no direct financial implications from the planting of these trees. However there will be ongoing costs associated with these trees in terms of maintenance and watering. These costs can be met within Greenspaces operational budgets.
6.2. **Community Implications**

Staff believe that planting trees in reserves has a positive impact on both the community and the environment. This is especially the case in new developments such as Pegasus where opportunity for large trees is limited to open public spaces. These trees will also have a positive impact on users of the playground by providing shade during the summer close by.

6.3. **Risk Management**

As these trees are part of a memorial to a well-known community member and paid for from funds raised by the community, there is a risk that if these trees are not planted this could cause unrest. Staff will continue to work with the overseer of these funds following the decision of the Board to implement the Boards decision or identify other alternatives.

6.4. **Health and Safety**

The planting of these trees would be undertaken by Council’s tree contractor Asplundh who have an approved health and safety plan for this type of work and will ensure that this is done in a safe and appropriate manner.

7. **CONTEXT**

7.1. **Policy**

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

7.2. **Legislation**

7.3. The planting of trees within Council reserves such as the Karen Eastwood Memorial Playground landscaping fall under the Reserves Act 1977. The Karen Eastwood Memorial Park is classified as a Neighbourhood Reserve which is managed in accordance with the Waimakariri District Council Neighbourhood Reserves Management Plan. The following sections of this plan relate to planting trees within Neighbourhood Reserves.

**SEC POLICY**

10.1.3 Specimen trees will be planted in neighbourhood parks to provide shade and shelter and enhance amenity values.

10.1.6 Any new plantings on parks shall take into consideration: a) Any current landscape concept plan; b) Public safety when considering the scale, form and type of planting; c) The use of locally sourced, native plants where practicable; d) The soil type and microclimates; e) Any effect on underground or overhead services; f) Any potential effects on park users and neighbours; g) Any potential adverse effects on play/leisure equipment (e.g. leaf and seed fall); and h) Functional aspects such as shading, screening and wind protection.

7.4. **Community Outcomes**

**Public spaces and facilities are plentiful, accessible and high quality**

- There is a wide variety of public places and spaces to meet people’s needs.
- There are wide-ranging opportunities for people to enjoy the outdoors.
- The accessibility of community and recreation facilities meets the changing needs of our community.

**The distinctive character of our takiwa – towns, villages and rural areas is maintained.**

- Our rural areas retain their amenity and character.
7.5. **Delegations**

The Woodend - Sefton Community Board have the delegation to approve the recommendations within this report.
1. SUMMARY

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

Attachments:

i. Copy of the Conference Itinerary (Trim Ref: 190417057777)
ii. John Archer’s comments regarding the New Zealand Community Boards’ Conference 2019. (Trim Ref: 190503063127).

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 190430061132.

3. BACKGROUND

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

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

4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

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

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

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

4.5. The conference commenced with registration on 11 April and the formal programme on 12 April.


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

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

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

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

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

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


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

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

4.17. The Management Team have reviewed this report.

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

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

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

6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

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

Summary of actual conference costs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Airfare</td>
<td>444.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation</td>
<td>366.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference fee</td>
<td>755.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extras (meals)</td>
<td>65.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,630</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2. The remaining training budget for the rest of the financial year is $7,910.

6.3. Community Implications
Not applicable.

6.4. Risk Management
Not applicable.

6.5. Health and Safety
Not applicable.

7. CONTEXT

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

7.2. Legislation
Not applicable.

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

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

7.4. **Delegations**

Not applicable.

---

Kay Rabe

Governance Adviser
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.00pm</td>
<td>Registration open</td>
<td>Venue: Foyer Lounge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.45pm</td>
<td>Coaches depart The Devon to Len Lye</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00pm</td>
<td>Welcome function</td>
<td>Venue: Len Lye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.45pm</td>
<td>Coaches return from Len Lye to The Devon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00pm</td>
<td>Registration open</td>
<td>Venue: Foyer Lounge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.30am</td>
<td>Mihi Whakatau</td>
<td>Venue: Hobson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.00am</td>
<td>Conference Opening</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.15am</td>
<td>Plenary: Looking forward, encouraging youth and talent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td>Plenary: Engaging with the Maori community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.45am</td>
<td>Morning tea</td>
<td>Venue: Foyer Lounge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.15am</td>
<td>Plenary: Taranaki Mounga Project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.00pm</td>
<td>Plenary: The important role of Youth Voice Groups locally and regionally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.45pm</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>Venue: Foyer Lounge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.45pm</td>
<td>LGNZ Localism Project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.30pm</td>
<td>Award participants (snap shot) presentations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.15pm</td>
<td>Afternoon tea</td>
<td>Venue: Foyer Lounge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.45pm</td>
<td>FOUR Concurrent workshops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building strong Te Ao Maori relationships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Puna Wano-Bryant &amp; Wharehoka Wano</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Emergency Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Towards Predator-Free Taranaki</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.15pm</td>
<td>Close</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7pm-11pm</td>
<td>Conference dinner and Best Practice Awards</td>
<td>Venue: Hobson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Saturday 13 April**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.00am</td>
<td><strong>Registration</strong> open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.30am</td>
<td>NZCBC Update                                                              Chair of NZ Community Boards, Mick Lester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair: Glen Bennett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.45am</td>
<td><strong>LGNZ Update</strong>                                                             President of LGNZ, Dave Cull</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair: Mick Lester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.15am</td>
<td>Plenary: Local Government update                                                    Hon Peeni Henare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair: Mick Lester / Ryan Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.45am</td>
<td>Plenary: Setting the foundations for community development                        Shay Wright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair: Bronwyn Bauer-Hunt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.30am</td>
<td><strong>Morning tea</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00am</td>
<td>THREE Concurrent workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are we People Friendly enough?                                                     Lance Girling Butcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair: Jayne Beer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Venue: Hobson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How to activate, develop and empower your local youth voice                       Shay Wright and Sarah Colcord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair: Tania Tapsell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Venue: Watson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural Connectivity Group – RB12 and Mobile Black Spots Programme                  Caitlin Metz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair: Doug Hislop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Venue: Courtenay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.30pm</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.30pm</td>
<td>Plenary: The implications of our ageing population                              Natalie Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair: Christine Papps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15pm</td>
<td>Plenary: Engaging the next generation                                             Noa Woolloff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair: Allan Sole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00pm</td>
<td>Conference wind up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.30pm</td>
<td><strong>Post conference BBQ</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


John Archer report

First off I would like to thank the Waimakariri District Council for funding me to this inspiring event. From the Mayor of New Plymouth’s welcome to our departure on Saturday afternoon all the speakers were engaging, inspiring and confident presenters of their topics. So much so it was difficult to take notes and listen as the content of their speeches was so interesting. The MC carried out his duties in humorously and friendly manner.

Looking forward, Encouraging Youth and Talent. (Daren Pratly)

Talked about the speed of change and how technology is changing our world so much so that people struggle to keep up.

There is a need for this change to be embraced and understood, and young people are doing this. They are well informed, so much so we need to engage with them. He noted there are three key drivers to be understood (Sustainability-Technology-Population). We will need to create and develop sustainable modes of operation. This needs to come from the Corporates down to the general Populace. Old business culture needs to adapt to a shift in focus and become more socially responsible if they are to survive.

Young people are underestimated and are now more connected through social media, and adapt quickly to changing technology. Employment models are changing with more people working from a home base. The Question is how do you make connecting through technology easy? There is a need to simplify the technology interface.

We must engage with our youth and re-engage with our aging talent. The new currency is: TRUST: Trust is Credibility-Reliability-intimacy-Personal Interest. ACCESS: Opportunity-mentorship-resources, Talent Development.

Stressed the importance of Youth Voice Groups-Locally and Regionally and should be encouraged and fostered. They are tech. savvy and adapt to change quickly.

Engaging with the Maori Community (Puna Wano-Bryant & Wharehoka Wano)

Tribal change started in 1840 for the Taranaki Iwi. Maori culture, like Pakeha culture is always changing. There is need to understand Tribal affiliations and lessons of the past. Respect for the old and understand the Old Knowledge but embrace the new and develop new relationships that are a Values based culture. We must foster a culture of mutual trust. Connect by a WANT TO rather than NEED TO. Have inclusivity, understanding, respect, compassion. Understand the layers of connection through the internal/external landscapes. Learn the history of the land and what came before to go ahead and avoid old hurts. Do’s and Don’ts come from lessons and guidance from genuine enduring relationships.

Towards Predator free Taranaki. Maunga Project. (Sean Zeiltjes)

The project is about restoring Ecological Sources around Mt. Taranaki. It is a project of collaboration between all interest groups from Doc, Iwi, the Regional Council, Forest and bird and other agencies.
It required a plan to bring people ‘On Board’ and needed to be transformational and be business like to be effective. This business model was adopted and has proven it’s self as an effective method, is working and successes are becoming evident.

**Importance of Youth Voice Groups (Locally and Regionally) Sarah Colcord.**

There is a need to understand and appreciate the role of the Youth Voice Groups. They require help to develop their interactions with decision makers to advance their knowledge of local and regional politics.

Rangitahi often feel side-lined and not taken seriously and often treated as an afterthought. The basic message of Sarah’s presentation was need for young people to be engaged, listened to and respected. Not to be treated as a token gesture, but appreciated for their positive input into matters that impact and will impact on their generation.

Know and respect the rights of young people (UNESCO declaration.)

**LGNZ Localism Project (Malcom Alexander.)**

Development of a case to decentralise decision making.
The New Zealand Government has not got good protocols for localism and there is a need to develop these protocols and for central Government to be less involved with local issues and leave more autonomy for the regions.

Core infrastructure needs to be local responsibility and productivity motivated.
There is too much procrastination in decision making from Central Government. This puts people off, subsequently we just let them make the decision.
There is a need to operate small too big to combat these effects.
How does localism promote growth? By encouraging local businesses, promoting local business and the need to break the old circular pattern. (Same old thinking, same old results.)

A case in point. I engaged in conversation with a gentleman from Forest and Bird who worked in the Waipoua Kauri forest Northland. There was a pest control protocol put in place where local unemployed were provided with trapping gear and got a bounty for every pest they snared. Apparently they very successful and were on top of control when DoC pulled the plug on the initiative and disbanded the group. Not sure of all the issues surrounding this but the message I got was that the local involvement was not considered in the decision.

The Friday workshop I attended was Building Strong Te Ao Maori Relationships. (Same presenters as above.)

Originally there was a genuine belief in the intent of settler authorities but this saw them go from a successful, productive culture to a marginalised one. This came about by the betrayal of that early intent. The need was to address this and build a culture of trust going forward.

Lessons from Parihaka.
Lay down our pain in exchange for peace and the least we can do is honour their memory.
We will always mourn them but they didn’t make sacrifices for us to live in pain, they sacrificed in order for us to live in peace.
Empower of both people.

“All my strength and my voice is the guidance to this generation that you be the empowerer of both peoples. Your voice cannot be smothered by the authorities, your voice cannot silenced by the
powerful nr the turbulent events of this land. Should your voice be abolished you will use Tikanga to respond to the hatred overcoming it with kindness”

TRUST seems the most important thing to be established if we are to advance as a unified nation.

**Saturday’s program in a nut shell was an update from the NZCBE chair and also a Local govt. (Mick Lester)**

An address was given by the President of LGNZ (David Cull mayor of Dunedin.) He opened his speech in fluent Maori and it was very impressive. He commented that Community Boards were in a time of change, that Community Boards are important as they are a conduit of local concerns. Allows engagement- Localism-Empowering the population and allows citizens to have a say on local issues etc. Allows a multi-level representation.

The Challenges ahead. We have an aggravated system in regard to housing. Change in demand happening more quickly than Central Government can cope with. Transport, how the Auckland issues are taking money out of the pot for other issues needing to be addressed or rectified.

On climate change, there is no doubt it is a real threat and we will need to adapt effects that coming. This will have major implications that will have to be dealt with.

Need to opt for more localism and more engagement with the communities and adapt the Maori model Bottom to the Top.

Water issues are another daunting problem for the country. We are on the cusp of considerable change.

**Setting the Foundations for Community Development. (Shay Wright.)**

Young people have met to discuss the type of world they want to inherit. Youth values need to have some input to decisions being made. Must have a relationship with their community.

Understand the meaning of the Maori mihi – Maori values and what community means to Maori. Settlers brought their own sense of community. Community change is fast and there are three trends shaping them.

The population is changing. Technology more perverse in our lives and we need to change the way we deal with problems. There is a social responsibility above the bottom line and we need to hold corporates to prioritise their profits socially. Their need for ethical business and we need to support local business. Maori are more experienced to offer these community values.

Need to be aware of changes. Who are the voices we don’t hear from and we need to have joined up solutions to problems. Understand who are the ‘Allies and Actors’. We must become self-sustaining which is important as we move into the future. Social procurement-using local things.

The second workshop I attended covered a lot of the same material in a lot of the above and I am hopeful a summary of some of the comments etc. put forward by participants will find its way onto my computer.
To sum up. I enjoyed the conference and the subject matter. Was a lot of emphasis on the role of youth going forward due to their ability to adapt to new things without the blinkered backgrounds of the older generation of who it is said, still play a vital role in support and nurturing and perhaps steadying the ship. The older generation must be valued for their inherent wisdom.

The other strong messages were from the Maori speakers and the importance of establishing trust, understanding and mutual respect to forge ahead.
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REPORT TO: Woodend-Sefton Community Board

DATE OF MEETING: 10 June 2019

FROM: Kay Rabe, Governance Adviser
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1. SUMMARY

1.1 The purpose of this report is to retrospectively ratify the Board’s comments made in relation to Environment Canterbury’s Waimakariri Bus Service Review.

Attachments:

i. The Woodend-Sefton Community Board Comments on the Waimakariri District Council Reviewed District Plan (Trim Ref: 190524072996).

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 190523072606.

(b) Retrospectively ratifies the Board’s Comments on the Waimakariri District Council Reviewed District Plan (Trim Ref: 190524072996).

3. BACKGROUND

3.1 Last year Environment Canterbury (ECan) looked at the future of public transport in the region to update its Regional Public Transport Plan. Input from the community helped to reach a finalised plan which includes a three year operational plan, a ten year strategy, and a 30 year vision.

3.2 Based on key feedback from the community, the changes ECan now proposes would provide more coverage and better connections between townships.

3.3 Public consultation took place from 29 April to 26 May 2019, with the specific workshops for the Boards taking place to meet member availability.

3.4 The summary comments were circulated for information on 20 May 2019 and a final document agreed with the Chair on 24 May 2019.
4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

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

4.2. The Management Team have reviewed this report.

5. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

5.1. **Groups and Organisations**
    A major publicity campaign was put in place by EC in including Drop In sessions in all the main townships in the district.

5.2. **Wider Community**
    As for 5.1.

6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**
    Not applicable.

6.2. **Community Implications**
    The Waimakariri Bus Service Review will affect all sections of the community.

6.3. **Risk Management**
    Not applicable.

6.4. **Health and Safety**
    Not applicable.

7. **CONTEXT**

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

7.2. **Legislation**
    Not applicable.

7.3. **Community Outcomes**
    • People have wide ranging opportunities for being informed and being involved in the consultation process.

7.4. **Delegations**
    Not applicable.

Kay Rabe
Governance Adviser
24 May 2019

To: Environment Canterbury
Subject: Waimakariri Bus Service Review
From: Woodend-Sefton Community Board
Shona Powell, Chairperson
Contact: Kay Rabe, Governance Adviser kay.rabe@wmk.govt.nz
C/- Waimakariri District Council, Private Bag 1005, Rangiora 7440.

The Woodend-Sefton Community Board thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Waimakariri Bus Service Review.

Summary
1. Public transport is a key service for Waimakariri given private vehicle is the only other viable option. Given the issue of congestion and vehicle emissions in Christchurch it becomes a key issue for Christchurch
2. The resources from the Pegasus-Silverstream service, which is not needed, should go into:
   a. Retaining a direct service between Christchurch and Pegasus in non-peak hours
   b. Retaining at least two peak hour services to and from Waikuku Beach in the morning and again in the afternoon/evening
3. Include Pegasus in the link service between Silverstream-Kaiapoi-Woodend-Pegasus because of the large population base and fast growth and Rangiora is the service town they mostly use. The route within Pegasus to be determined after consulting with the community
4. Review the hours of operation for the link service and peak hour services to ensure they meet the needs of passengers
5. Retain Express services and look to expand them once the new Northern Corridor is opened
6. The link service should run down Coldstream Road in Rangiora past the sports fields and the future indoor stadium

Whilst the Woodend-Sefton Community Board realise the difficulties in balancing service levels with budgets we have serious concerns with the proposals and the impact on our communities.

Board members have been told that the services for Waimakariri must stay within the current budget. Our question is why, given the population growth and demand for a better service from Waimakariri residents? Environment Canterbury (ECan) rates for Passenger Transport – Urban increased dramatically at the start of the 18/19 year from $51.20 to $75.54, an increase of 47%. For the three years from 15/16 to 18/19 the increase was from $34.58 to $75.51, an increase of 118%. Given the population growth in the Waimakariri District with new households this has meant a large increase in funding available.
It should be noted that Waimakariri has few options for transport except private vehicle, bus or some cycleways. It does not have a local taxi service or regular ride sharing services. If you are able to get a taxi it is an expensive option. Shuttles can be used but they need to be booked and are expensive unless you have a number of people travelling. This reduces the options for travel around our district, and to and from Christchurch. At present there is no safe way to travel between Christchurch and Waimakariri by bicycle, except by using the cycle racks on the buses. Even with the opening of a cycle lane to Kaiapoi at some point in the future, there is still no direct safe cycleway to Woodend or Pegasus. All of this increases the importance of public transport to the District.

ECan has identified, amongst others, the following groups of customers as potentially transport disadvantaged within the region and the Board would like to see services retained and expanded to help meet their needs:

- people with disabilities;
- the elderly, especially those who require access to health care and other necessities;
- people without access to a private vehicle;
- children.

One issue which has been highlighted recently by Christchurch residents is the improvement needed for public transport to and from Waimakariri to increase patronage. This would mean less congestion, in particular around St Albans when the new Northern Corridor is finished. Along with us, they are also concerned about vehicle emissions. There seems to be a common theme that the Waimakariri District needs public transport that meets the needs of residents to give a viable alternative to commuters rather than private vehicle. Instead a direct link to Christchurch on the 95 service is proposed to be cut during non-peak hours. There is also no information on the proposed frequency of the Blue Line bus from Rangiora which makes it difficult to determine service levels.

**Loss of direct non-peak hour bus service between Woodend/Pegasus and Christchurch**

The proposed loss of the direct non-peak hour service between Woodend/Pegasus and Christchurch is a major blow and short-sighted. Residents will have to catch an hourly service to Kaiapoi to connect with the bus from Rangiora to the city and again to return home. This will make for a very long trip with the waiting times included and never fun in inclement weather. Pegasus is a terminus point and most bus services start and end with few passengers on board and pick up and drop off as they go.

Other Waimakariri residents and Christchurch residents will find it more difficult getting to the Key Activity Centre (KAC) of Woodend/Pegasus and to the coastal area to enjoy the Tūhaitara Coastal Park, Pegasus Lake, and the beaches by public transport. Pegasus is a popular destination with a great playground, good food outlets and easy access to the Tūhaitara Coastal Park and wetlands. It is also widely used by those with mobility issues and the elderly as there
are good paths, including around the lake. Migrant communities also view it as a good
destination for walks and picnics and is popular with them. Add to that the significant number
of residents from the greater Christchurch area who come to Pegasus for sporting and other
events held at the lake.

The Board believes that the Pegasus-Silverstream service is not needed as it does not go where
the majority of people wish to travel and the resources from this service could be better used
providing a non-peak hour service between Pegasus and Christchurch.

**Loss of peak hours service to and from Waikuku Beach**

Again, Waikuku Beach is a terminus and most bus services start and end at a terminus point
with few passengers on board. This is a vital service for residents that have no other means of
getting to and from work or school. The Board agrees that patronage has been low but the 95
bus does have good patronage at peak hours over the route. It is difficult in that the bus is
unable to go directly between Pegasus and Waikuku Beach as planned and has to go out to SH1
and then back in again. The Board would like to see at least two peak hour services to and from
Waikuku Beach in the morning and again in the afternoon/evening retained as a social benefit
to this community.

**Link Service**

The three Key Activity Centres (KAC’s) of Rangiora, Kaiapoi and Woodend/Pegasus need to be
connected by public transport. This is so residents can easily move between the three for retail,
accessing services, education, healthcare, and employment.

The Board find it inconceivable that Pegasus is not included in the link service between Kaiapoi
and Rangiora. The population of Pegasus is around 3,000 and the growth is continuing.

The following statement from ECAn does not match with the reality as the population growth in
Pegasus is ignored.

> We're looking at how we can tailor the existing bus services to cover a bigger area in growing towns like
> Rangiora and Kaiapoi and provide better connections between townships across the district, based on the key
> feedback we received during the Regional Public Transport Plan process.

- **More coverage** – almost 2,500 additional homes would have access to public transport in the growing
  centres of Rangiora, Kaiapoi and Woodend.

- **Better connections between townships** – new ‘Link’ services would enable people to travel between
  Rangiora, Kaiapoi and Woodend.

The population growth is best highlighted by new building consents issued over the last 15
months in the Waimakariri District as highlighted below.
An underlying assumption has been used in developing the proposed bus routes and that is that Woodend/Pegasus residents look to Kaiapoi as the local town they use for retail and services. From speaking to many residents this is not the case and the majority of residents look to Rangiora as the local service town they wish to travel to. This is for a number of reasons, including that Rangiora is the most dominant retail and service destination within Waimakariri with greater variety and choice. Rangiora also has the health hub, has the most employment available, and has the community college. By far the largest retirement facilities are in Rangiora which means more residents from other parts of the District visiting.

This is well illustrated in a recent survey commissioned by Waimakariri District Council of Woodend, Woodend Beach and Pegasus residents in September/October 2018 on community facilities and libraries in that area. A total of 2081 questionnaires were mailed out. 241 questionnaires were returned by households at Pegasus and 129 from households at Woodend and Woodend Beach.

A question regarding library use was designed to ascertain use of current libraries in the District with the following results:

- 77.6% of respondent households used the district’s library service
  - 47.8% used Rangiora library
  - 11.6% used Kaiapoi library
  - 12.2% used both Rangiora and Kaiapoi libraries.

The extra distance from SH1 to Pegasus on the current route is 8.2km return. ECan staff asked at consultations if a shorter route within Pegasus could be an option. If absolutely necessary to enable a service that includes Pegasus the Board would consider supporting an option which would form a loop. Examples of loop routes, including the distance from SH1 return are:

- Infinity Drive, Pegasus Main Street and Pegasus Boulevard - 5.5km return
- Infinity Drive, Lakeside Drive, Tiritiri Moana Drive, Te Kohanga Drive – 9.2km return
- Existing route but exiting via Te Kohanga Drive – 10km return

This compares with 5.6km from Williams Street in Kaiapoi to Silverstream and return.

However, the Board believe it is imperative that any change to the route within Pegasus needs to be bought to the community for their input before any decision is made.
It is noted from conversations with ECan staff that once Bob Robertson Drive is opened between the Ravenswood Commercial area and Rangiora Woodend Road this would be the preferred route for the link bus to travel. The Board agrees with this route and would allow the bus easier access to Pegasus and would mean that the Commercial area is linked to both Woodend and Pegasus by bus. Until that time including Pegasus in the route would mean that there is no potentially unsafe and difficult right turn out of Woodend Road onto SH1 in Woodend. The Board are concerned that this has not been made clear to Woodend residents and believe that this should be brought back to the community.

Omitting Pegasus from the Link service means that Pegasus residents would have to get to Woodend by car, on foot, by bike or by an hourly bus service to catch the connecting link service to Rangiora. If people have a car they will not stop in Woodend and wait for a bus but will carry on driving to Rangiora. For those that do not have access to a car this means for a relatively short 10km trip they will have to take two buses each way and given the issues with connections that can arise has the potential to turn into a very slow trip. They will also have to cross SH1 in Woodend, which is no easy or safe feat.

The Board’s recommendation has always been a circular route with two buses going in opposite directions between Silverstream-Kaiapoi-Woodend-Pegasus-Waikuku Beach (at a lower frequency)-Rangiora. The ECan proposal has two buses, one running between Silverstream and Pegasus and the other linking Silverstream, Kaiapoi, Woodend to Rangiora, but missing Pegasus and Waikuku Beach. From a practical point of view the idea of a circular route using two buses is much more useful to residents, rather than repeating a large piece of the same route but with the Silverstream-Pegasus link route not connecting to anywhere different i.e. Rangiora.

From the ‘Waimakariri 2048 District Development Strategy Our District. Our Future’ document in relation to the Woodend/Pegasus KAC. Feedback from many included “… that strategic transport links are needed to support this and that transport network impacts are appropriately considered - pg 30.

The Board would also like to see Waikuku Beach included in the link route for some services to allow residents to access Pegasus, Woodend, Kaiapoi and Rangiora which would also give them the opportunity to connect to Christchurch on the Blue Line. It is apparent that this would have to be a limited number of services but would provide a service to those that are ‘transport disadvantaged.’

The Board is concerned that the route for the link service doesn’t run along Coldstream Road in Rangiora where there are already many sports fields with an indoor stadium to be built. This seems counterproductive as this development will be used by people from across the district. The link service is an ideal way for people, including children to access the main recreational facility in the district. The weekends are already busy on the sports fields and the Board would
like to see Coldstream Road included in the link route, at least on the weekends, and then this may need to be extended once the indoor stadium is opened.

School Pupils
There has been discussion at consultations around students using the buses to get to schools they are out of zone for, for example schools in Rangiora and Christchurch. It has been felt that these passengers have not been given much importance. It needs to be recognised that for whatever reason passengers are using the bus, when they pay a fare they are a fare-paying customer, and this includes school pupils travelling to and from school out of zone.

Connections
With the present bus routes one of the difficulties for Woodend and Pegasus residents wishing to travel to Rangiora is the need to travel to Kaiapoi on the 95 bus and then connect to the blue line bus to Rangiora and reverse to get home. Distance wise these are short trips but using public transport makes for a slow trip. One issue that residents have spoken of is being ‘stranded’ in Kaiapoi as the buses that are meant to connect don’t, for whatever reason, and they are forced to wait a lengthy period for the next bus.

Looking at the proposal Woodend and Pegasus residents will have to travel to Kaiapoi to catch the Blue Line bus in off peak hours and at weekends. Residents travelling by bus are concerned the same issue will arise with slow trips due to a missed connection. The other option is for people to drive to Kaiapoi to catch the Blue Line bus to the city. Most people that have to drive that far will continue onto Christchurch by vehicle, given that it is non-peak traffic which does nothing for reducing fossil fuel use, vehicle emissions and congestion in Christchurch.

For those wishing to travel between Pegasus and Rangiora whether it be for work, recreation, shopping, or leisure they would be severely disadvantaged by having to connect through Woodend given the connection is only hourly.

Hours of Operation
The link routes are only scheduled to start at 8am or 8.30am which means that students wishing to travel from Woodend or Pegasus to access education in Rangiora, either school or the Community College will not be able to use them as they would be late and this will force them to travel to Kaiapoi on the 95 and connect to Rangiora on the Blue Line which is a slow trip. This also applies to people working standard hours wishing to travel between Woodend, Pegasus and Rangiora as this is too late for them to get to work.

The proposal is for peak hour trips on the 95 service to depart from Pegasus for Christchurch between about 6.30-8am, and trips departing from Christchurch back to Pegasus between about 2.30-6pm. Those wishing to make use of their Super Gold Card to get free travel to or
from Woodend or Pegasus will be disadvantaged in the mornings as they will have to connect through Kaiapoi. This makes for a slow trip for them and there is always the possibility of that missed connection. In the afternoon the direct 95 service between Christchurch and Woodend and Pegasus would have to depart before 3pm to allow the super gold card users free travel. If they have to connect through Kaiapoi they will end up paying a fare for between Kaiapoi and Woodend or Pegasus. It would serve this group well if an extension was made to the Super Gold Card hours by removing the 3 pm cut-off on weekdays.

The proposal for peak hour trips on the 95 service departing from Christchurch to Pegasus is only between about 2.30-6pm. This means there is no direct bus service after 6pm from Christchurch to Woodend or Pegasus and users will have to connect through Kaiapoi. This is far too early for the direct bus to end as workers may only just be finishing around 6pm and also those that usually finish earlier but occasionally have to work later without notice, for example to cover for another employee or to finish some work. These workers will not wish to risk a slow trip having to connect through Kaiapoi so will be less inclined to use public transport on a regular basis. In addition, residents of Woodend and Pegasus will find it difficult to use public transport for an evening out in Christchurch with the early end of the direct bus service.

Express Services
It is noted that the thinking is “the current express trips on the Blue Line and 95 Pegasus-City services have not provided any significant time saving benefits.” The proposal to remove the express service is short-sighted. There is nothing as frustrating to the long-distance passengers than when the bus stops to pick up someone and then they get off a short time later when there are other buses at the stop at that time that they could have caught. Stopping at a selection of key stops would be more palatable as long as no pick-ups are allowed.

Frequency of Services
The Board have spoken with a number of residents of Woodend and Pegasus and many would be happy with an hourly service for the one link route between Kaiapoi and Rangiora if it meant that Pegasus and some services for Waikuku Beach were included.

The Future
One of the best ways to encourage people to use bus services is to provide a fast and convenient service. With the Northern Corridor development and the High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lane over the Waimakariri River, a new faster route will be opened up. It is noted that these opportunities are being considered. It is imperative that some new services make use of these to ensure that passengers can move between Central Christchurch and the Waimakariri District quickly and easily. Given that at present it takes over an hour at any time of the day to get from Rangiora or Pegasus to the Bus Interchange this does not encourage people to use the bus service.
Thank you once again for the opportunity to comment.

[Signature]

Shona Powell
Chairperson
Woodend-Sefton Community Board
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1. SUMMARY

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

Attachments:

i. The Woodend-Sefton Community Board Comments on the Waimakariri District Council Reviewed District Plan (Trim Ref: 190508065614)

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 190509066148.

(b) Retrospectively ratifies the Board’s Comments on the Waimakariri District Council Reviewed District Plan (Trim Ref: 190508065614).

3. BACKGROUND

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

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

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

3.4 A further consultation opportunity has been undertaken entitled ‘What’s The Plan – Shaping the Content of the Reviewed District Plan’. This engagement sought further comments on 13 topic areas and suggested over 50 possible questions for the community to consider. Given the importance of the plan and to enable the Community Boards to have
a further input at this formative stage, WDC Planning staff undertook extensive (2 to 3 hour) focussed workshops with each of the boards to answer any queries as well as to seek feedback on these key areas. The workshops were facilitated by the specialist staff and targeted to concentrate on those aspects of the plan that members wished to offer comments.

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

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

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

3.8 The Rangiora-Ashley workshop was held on Monday 6 May 2019.

3.9 The summary comments were circulated for information on 8 May 2019 and a final document agreed with the Chair on 13 May 2019.

4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

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

4.2. The Management Team have reviewed this report.

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. Groups and Organisations

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

5.2. Wider Community

As for 5.1.

6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1. Financial Implications

Not applicable.

6.2. Community Implications

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

6.3. Risk Management

Not applicable.

6.4. Health and Safety

Not applicable.
7. **CONTEXT**

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

7.2. **Legislation**
Not applicable.

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

7.4. **Delegations**
Not applicable.

Kay Rabe
Governance Adviser
Woodend-Sefton Community Board
Notes on the ‘What’s the Plan’ Consultation
Contact: Shona Powell (Chairperson)

Acknowledgement:
That these notes are feedback given at the workshop held on Monday 6 May 2019 at the Woodend Community Centre at 2pm. This is not a formal submission.

Historic Heritage
- Everything is about current Historic Heritage, what about the future? How do we capture significant features which will become future Historic or Heritage in the future? These will be needed to be shown respect and care but no vehicle to identify them now.
- The Maori Carvings - they should be protected and respected
- What about identifying artefacts that could be become heritage items?
- We would like some form of recognition and protection for items that are only 10-15 years old
- There should be a clause in there to protect heritage features
- There needs to be a mechanism to review the historical heritage inventory more frequently - people should be able to nominate historic heritage at any time.

Protected Trees
- It is too hard for people who have an issue with trees on private property to have something done about it - there needs to be more flexibility there within a fairly strict criteria for the pruning or felling or replacement of trees
- People are constantly being refused the removal certain trees – more balanced approach
- Is there some way that trees on private property (eg Rangiora Woodend Road significant/ionic Oak trees) can have clearer instructions regarding possible solutions to pruning to discourage owners from opting to fell trees on boundaries of Council owned land, or the Council should do it themselves to trim trees with their own arborist
- Flag significant trees on private land with instructions to consult with the Council before cutting them down
- If we have iconic trees on private land that are affecting public areas, we need clear consultation with the community about how these should be dealt with
- There needs to be a mechanism to review the protected trees inventory/audit more frequently - people should be able to nominate the trees more often

Open Space and Recreation Zones
- Lakes and rivers should be recognized as recreational assets
- Lakes should be under an Open Space Zone – eg Pegasus Lake
- There are water bodies in the District; in general do Lakes fit into this zone?
Noise
- Complaints with trucks/heavy vehicles associated with temporary activities
- Possibility of restrictions in residential areas regarding hours of business in relation to trucks particularly those on the Pegasus Boulevard and Infinity Drive
- How can this be enforced to ensure businesses comply with the rules
- Contractor's needs/requirements have to be taken into account as do their clients
- Balance commercial vs ratepayer needs/rights
- Scope within the plan to enforce hours of operation
- Plan to recognize that Waimakariri is a growth area so this will be an ongoing issue

Earthworks
- If you have a property with a wetland, or abounding a wetland, do you need a consent to fill? You should need one. There should be protection for wetlands, they are really important
- Protection of streams, waterflow

Quarrying
- The bays where trucks pull out, they need to be wide enough that they can stop safely
- Dust mitigation is important
- Egress onto sites need to be wide and durable and sufficient space for trucks can exit safely
- Needs to be decent setback from houses
- Significant issue for the District

Natural Environment
- Inventory to record wetlands both on public land and on private so these can be protected. Birds habitat being destroyed.
- Need to ensure maximum protection for Tuhaitara Coastal Park and other eco-sensitive areas in the district

Coastal Environment
- Maximum protection is important

Temporary Activities
- Events often result in bins overflowing and a delay in collection
- Road closures can cause frustration for residents - if there are multiple events held in quick succession that require road closures - i.e. recently in Pegasus - one resident was told they could not access their property for several hours
- Notification of road closures needs improvement
- Restitution of areas affected by temporary activities is important eg grass damage
Residential
- The Plan needs deal with remediation of areas when developers have introduced new infrastructure
- Fence height and type on street frontage - new developments have quite an open feel - but is only enforceable under covenants. Covenants don’t work, especially after the first rush of buying. Using covenants is not enough, Pegasus is a classic example
- Reduction in hard surfaces for stormwater management - there are more permeable products out there that could be used
- Investigate better practices to encourage less impacting of the ground to enable better percolation of stormwater
- Where swales are utilized, there should be something to ensure pedestrian crossings - this is a significant health and safety issue.

High density
- Allowing for green spaces within high density is important eg Pegasus everything boxed but places like Kippenberger provides more of a sense of community because the housing wraps around greenspace. From a community point of view, this is much better another eg is Pounamu Place is a good example of where it works well as well as attractive it provides shortcuts to the schools and other features
- The provision of 1-2 bedroom places is important for the ageing population – included within the community
- Mixed-use property is important for diversity in an area
- If you have medium density, sunlight is key

Rural
- People are moving to rural residential areas – Need better management of the effects on both sides
- Plan needs to focus on better setbacks
- Odor and smoke carry and contaminate urban areas – stronger restrictions
- Help/encourage ways to make land more efficient i.e increasing the minimum lot size is a good thing
- The production and the versatile soils have to be protected

Business
- Support Large Format Retail on Smith Street
- No industry in retail areas
- Support industry remaining primarily for industry

Transport
- With new developments happening, cooperation between all authorizes is required to mitigate transport issues
- Provision for sufficient parking especially in areas with smaller homes and narrow streets
• There is no bus/public transport between communities in the district
• Planning has not accommodated buses in predominantly residential areas and park bays are not long enough to accommodate larger vehicles like SUVs
• Bad planning means the physical connectivity of new developments is poor eg Burger King intersection in Rangiora, there is a significant conflict between the traffic and pedestrians and BP at Ravenswood has a shared entrance with McDonalds - there is a real conflict here
• Pegasus over to Ravenswood - people are running across the road - physical linkages must be considered, assessed, and put in place before residents move in.

The Board would like to thank staff for the time extension so it could offer its feedback on What's the Plan.
**Chair's Report for May 2019**

1 May  | Coastal Forestry Harvest Project Control Group Meeting  | Equipment will be bought in from 6th May with logging due to start a week later
6 May  | WSCB District Plan Workshop  | Session with staff for Board members to get questions answered and give feedback on ‘What’s the Plan?’
8 May  | Annual joint Hui between Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga and Waimakariri District Council  | Great hospitality at the Marae with a lovely meal followed by the Hui with many interesting points of view raised
9 May  | Presentation of WSCB submission to Council at Annual Plan Hearings  | Thanks for the support from fellow Board members during the presentation of the Board submission
10 May | Board meeting pre-briefing with Governance Advisor  | Run through the agenda
13 May | Woodend-Sefton Community Board meeting  | Regular monthly meeting
14 May | Waimakariri Access Group  | Regular monthly meeting
14 May | Public drop-in session for ECan Waimakariri bus service review – Pegasus Community Centre  | Well attended from the start time so began with a presentation from ECan staff followed by questions. This gave everyone the opportunity to hear the many valid issues raised by the community. This also helped in developing the Board submission
15 May | Pegasus Community Cuppa  | A good turnout to this regular monthly event. Spoke about the ECan bus service review to encourage feedback to ECan
15 May | Coastal Forestry Harvest Project Control Group Meeting  | Logging started as scheduled on 13th May. The aim is to have the path between Pegasus and Waikuku Beach closed for as short a time as possible
16 May | WSCB Bus Service Review Workshop  | Session for Board members to start finalising submission to ECan
21 May | Pegasus Residents Group AGM  | Good turnout with CEO Jim Palmer representing Council. An opportunity to hear about any issues raised and to talk with local residents
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21 May</td>
<td>Public drop-in session for ECan Waimakariri bus service review – Woodend Community Centre</td>
<td>Dropped in briefly to get a couple of questions answered</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Shona Powell
Chair
Woodend-Sefton Community Board
31 May 2019

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 190401047078.
Rhonda Mather

- Compiled ‘Pegasus Page’ for June Woodpecker.
- 8 May – Social Inclusion Initiatives Group (SIIG) – discussed update of ‘New to Waimakariri’ booklet, Welcome Bag distribution going well and Age-Friendly project
- 14 May – Attended Community Networking Forum at Rangiora – 3 Mayoral candidates in attendance! Discussed new spaces becoming available at PCC and cellphone tower.
- 14 May – Woodpecker Community Trust AGM – They have gained some good financial ground in the last year, but need to keep looking at how to maintain affordability as production numbers needing to increase due to population growth in Woodend and Pegasus. Chair is still Graham Wood, Treasurer is Ian Lennie and Thea Kunkel has taken on the Secretary role.
- 14 May – ECan public consultation session at Pegasus. About 30 people attended and ECan staff were persuaded to run the session in a seated meeting format, then concluded with one-on-one questions and discussions. Thanks to Shona and others for bringing some significant matters to the attention of ECan staff; such as Kaiapoi is not the main service town for Pegasus/Woodend, Rangiora is!
- 16 May – WSCB ECan submission workshop
- 17 May – PCC Expansion fitout planning meeting with Roger Rule, Ronel Stephens and Grant Macleod
- 27 May – SSW Forum at Kaiapoi. Presentation about restorative justice and family violence
- 29 May – Attended morning session of Annual Plan deliberations
- 31 May – Attended Family Violence Awareness Training breakfast presentation at Rosburn. Presented by Senior Constable Chris Hurring and a woman from Women’s Refuge whose name I have forgotten! A hard-hitting presentation.

Coming Up – verbal report at meeting

- 5 June – SIIG meeting
- 6 June – Woodend road safety project (public) meeting at Grub Hub with Matt Doocy and Simon Bridges

Pegasus Residents’ Group

- 21 May PRGI AGM held at Pegasus Bay School. Attendance of approx. 60 people
  - New President is Roger Rule, Vice President is Rhonda Mather and Secretary is Thea Kunkel. Treasurer remains the same (Don Smith). Two new committee members appointed and no resignations.
- Good talks from guest speakers Mike Kwant and Greg Byrnes.
- Jim Palmer in attendance. Mayor was unable to attend due to having a cold.
  - ECan submission from PRGI supports WSCB submission.
  - Work will soon be commencing on the Pegasus, Woodend & Waikuku Community Directory to be distributed to all Pegasus and Woodend homes in October.
  - Ronel’s community cuppa for May produced a capacity crowd. Woodend Volunteer Fire Brigade were invited to attend and 3 members were able to join us. A cheque for $100 was presented to the WVFB from PRGI in thanks for them watering our new garden on Pegasus Blvd on their training nights. The garden is thriving!
  - May – (on behalf of PRGI) Numerous discussions, emails and phone calls regarding the installation of a 2 Degrees cellphone tower on Motu Quay, next to the Pegasus Lake swingbridge. This matter is ongoing at time of writing, but a final decision on moving the tower is expect on Tuesday 4 June. PRGI are grateful to all parties for taking our concerns seriously and keeping us in the loop throughout discussions and negotiations.

**John Archer**

- 6th May – Woodend-Sefton Community Board workshop at the Pegasus Community Centre to discuss Annual Plan submission.
- 8th May - Attended Annual Hui at the Tuahiwi Marae. Presentations from Council Officers and CEO regarding issues within the community and impacting on Tuahiwi. There was a concern with the Iwi regarding planning and how the existing rules etc. stymie development in their Community.
- 9th May - Supported Shona speaking to our submission to the Annual Plan.
- 13th May - Woodend-Sefton Community Board Meeting
- 15th May - Northern Pegasus Bay Advisory group Meeting. Discussions revolved around damage to shell fish beds by the horse training activity and my concerns for the health of the beach environment.
- 16th May – Woodend-Sefton Community Board workshop to discuss bus issues and proposed routes. A very comprehensive report submitted by Shona.
- Attended Annual Drainage Groups hui and there was a very interesting presentation regarding simple changes to how we design structure that allow fresh water fish to migrate. A really interesting video clip showed Elver and whitebait climbing a vertical barrier of some height only to have their passage blocked by a lip on the structure. Fascinating.
- 23rd May - Met with Makarini Rueban, Greg Byrnes and Doug Whethy at the Tuhaitara Trust Rooms at Woodend Beach to discuss our concerns regarding the beach ecology and impact activities were having on it. As discussed above. Especially the impact on the Pipi and Tuatua shell fish that breed and develop in the intertidal zone where the horses run. Now dredging for the beach Clams and Tuatua.
- 28th May - Met with Safer Roads duo, Janet Luxton, Peter Lacelle and Brian and Julie Topp to discuss safety on SH1 especially the impact that increased traffic volumes are having on residents. They listened to our concerns and showed us the safety options they were developing. By the sounds of things it could be another 2 years plus before we see any action.

**Andrew Thompson**

- Pegasus Bay Residents Group AGM.