



# Ashburton District Council

## AGENDA

A MEETING of the ASHBURTON DISTRICT COUNCIL  
will be held as follows:

**Date:** Thursday 20 May 2010

**Venue:** Holyoake Auditorium  
Ashburton College  
27 Walnut Avenue  
Ashburton

**Time:** 2.30 pm

### MEMBERS:

His Worship the Mayor, M B O'Malley  
Cr R C Beavan  
Cr N A Brown  
Cr I J Burgess  
Cr J A Everest  
Cr K L Holmes  
Cr R J Kilworth  
Cr J A Kingsbury  
Cr L J Leadley  
Cr K W P Lowe  
Cr P W Reveley  
Cr J Sparks  
Cr B A Tasker

B LESTER  
Chief Executive

14 May 2010

---

# AGENDA

---

	Page
<b>1 APOLOGIES</b>	
<b>OPENING PRAYER</b>	
– Pastor David Jensen – Ashburton Baptist Church	
<b>2 NOTIFICATION OF EXTRAORDINARY BUSINESS</b>	
<b>3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES</b>	
3.1 Council Meeting – 8 April 2010	1
3.2 Extraordinary Council Meeting – 29 April 2010	9
3.3 Matters Arising from Minutes	
<b>4 REPORTS</b>	
4.1 Mayor	10
4.2 Chief Executive	12
4.3 <b>Operations Committee — 22 April 2010</b>	17
— Recommendation <i>Receive minutes of meeting</i>	
4.4 <b>Environmental Services Committee — 29 April 2010</b>	23
— Recommendation <i>Receive Minutes of Meeting</i>	
4.5 <b>Finance and Community Services Committee — 4 May 2010</b>	27
— Recommendation <i>Receive Minutes of Meeting</i>	
4.6 <b>Second Bridge across Ashburton River – Project Update and additional work approval</b>	31
4.7 <b>Mt Hutt – Riverbank Stock Water Supply Investigation</b>	40
4.8 <b>Ashburton Lyndhurst Irrigation Scheme – Piping Proposal</b>	43
4.9 <b>Closure of Stockwater Race – Buttericks Road</b>	46
4.10 <b>Closure of Stockwater Race – Barrhill Rakaia</b>	50
4.11 <b>Trevors Road Plan Change – Final Consideration</b>	56
4.12 <b>Carters Estate Plan Change – Final Consideration</b>	58
4.13 <b>Plan Change for Areas of Significant Nature Conservation Value (Group 2) Final Consideration</b>	60
4.14 <b>Canterbury Water Management Strategy – Zone Committee Establishment</b>	62
4.15 <b>Methven Heritage Project</b>	70
4.16 <b>Smoke Free Sports Fields Policy Launch</b>	71
4.17 <b>Creative Communities Funding Assessment Committee</b>	74
4.18 <b>SPARC Rural Travel Fund 2010</b>	78
4.19 <b>Youth Council Update and Minutes of Meeting (4/05/10)</b>	80

Cont'd

<b>5</b>	<b>BUSINESS TRANSACTED WITH THE PUBLIC EXCLUDED</b>	
	[to be considered by Council at 10.30 am on 20 May, in the Council Chamber]	
<b>5.1</b>	<b>Confirmation of Minutes</b>	<b>85</b>
<b>5.1.1</b>	<b>Council Meeting – 8/04/10</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposed 2<sup>nd</sup> Bridge Section 7(2)(h) Commercial activities</li> <li>• Service delivery procurement review Section 7(2)(h) Commercial activities</li> <li>• Ashburton Aquatic Park Charitable Trust Section 7(2)(h) Commercial activities</li> <li>• Stadium Complex Update Section 7(2)(h) Commercial activities</li> </ul>	
	[Now in open meeting]	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Freeholding Glasgow lease land 6-8 Bryant St</li> <li>• Sale of land – Geoff Geering Drive</li> <li>• RDR Mgt Ltd Loan Security</li> <li>• Solid Waste Mgt contracts</li> <li>• Extension of Contract C524 – operation &amp; maintenance of transportation networks</li> <li>• New street lighting operation &amp; maintenance contract</li> <li>• Contract DW-AN11 Fairton water supply upgrade</li> <li>• EA/BCI request to utilise Council stockwater main</li> <li>• Village Green private Plan Change decision</li> <li>• ACL – investment in Lake Hood extension project</li> <li>• Ashburton Railway Station</li> </ul>	
<b>5.1.2</b>	<b>Extraordinary Council Meeting – 29/04/10</b>	<b>93</b>
	[Now in open meeting]	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land purchase for Tinwald Domain Section 7(2)(h) Commercial activities</li> </ul>	
<b>5.1.3</b>	<b>Environmental Services Committee – 29/04/10</b>	<b>95</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Methven Trotting Club Appeal Section 7(2)(h) Commercial activities</li> </ul>	
<b>5.1.4</b>	<b>Finance &amp; Community Services Committee – 4/05/10</b>	<b>96</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Property &amp; Investment Subcommittee Section 7(2)(h) Commercial activities</li> <li>• Audit &amp; Budget Subcommittee Section 7(2)(h) Commercial activities</li> <li>• ACL Draft Statement of Intent Section 7(2)(h) Commercial activities</li> <li>• Sale of Land Section 7(2)(h) Commercial activities</li> </ul>	
<b>5.2</b>	<b>Ashburton Business Estate</b>	<b>97</b>
	Section 7(2)(h) Commercial activities	
<b>5.3</b>	<b>Property Matter</b>	<b>100</b>
	Section 7(2)(h) Commercial activities	
<b>5.4</b>	<b>Ashburton Water Supply Easement</b>	<b>104</b>
	Section 7(2)(h) Commercial activities	
<b>5.5</b>	<b>Contract AM-AC10 – Utility operation &amp; maintenance 12 month extension</b>	<b>107</b>
	Section 7(2)(h) Commercial activities	
<b>5.6</b>	<b>Contract 477 – Preferred professional services provider (water services) – 12 month extension</b>	<b>110</b>
	Section 7(2)(h) Commercial activities	
<b>5.7</b>	<b>Mill Creek Bank Stabilisation 2009/10 – Tender Award</b>	<b>112</b>
	Section 7(2)(h) Commercial activities	

<b>Timetable</b>	
<b>10.30 am</b>	<b>Council meeting to consider in-committee agenda (Council Chamber)</b>
<b>2.30 pm</b>	<b>Ordinary Meeting Commences at Holyoake Auditorium OPENING PRAYER</b>
<b>2.45 pm</b>	<b>New Zealand Transport Agency – presentation</b>

## ASHBURTON DISTRICT COUNCIL REPORT

FILE NO: 1/3/1  
DATE: 20 May 2010  
REPORT TO: Council  
FROM: Mayor

---

### 4.1. MAYOR'S REPORT

#### 4.1.1 CALENDAR

Some of the meetings and functions I have attended since reporting to the last Council meeting on 8 April 2010 ---

- 13 April Met with Water Rights Trust representative  
Met with ECan Commissioner Dame Margaret Bazley  
Chaired Canterbury Water Management Strategy meeting
- 14 April Met with representatives from Ashburton A & P Assn  
Met with Snr Sgt Grant Russell & Newcomers Group representative  
Welcoming speech at World Ploughing Championships Dinner
- 15 April Attended Seniors Centre Trust meeting
- 16 April Attended meeting with Minister of Transport, Christchurch  
Met with Tinwald residents re Bridge siting  
Met with ratepayer re Tradewaste Bylaw  
Attended opening of World Ploughing Championships Event at Methven
- 19 April Visited new Ashburton Plunket Rooms  
Attended Ashburton Business Association Board meeting
- 20 April Attended opening of Community Entry Programme new premise at Polytech  
Met with Rachel Prendergast, Youth Broker  
Met with Grove Street representatives re Bridge siting
- 21 April Attended R D R Directors meeting
- 22 April Met with Tinwald Reserves Board  
Hosted Mayoral Reception at ADC for New Zealand Lions Convention
- 23 April Met with Mayfield Citizens Group  
Interview with Guy Salmon - from Ecologic re CWMS  
Chaired Age Concern AGM  
Welcomed delegates and opened New Zealand Lions Convention
- 24 April Attended two Anzac Day Services
- 26 April Attended opening of new Westpac Building in Ashburton  
Hosted two Chinese delegations at ADC  
Attended Ashburton Business Estate Focus Group meeting
- 27 April Addressed Irrigation Conference
- 28 April Attended Advance Ashburton Trust meeting
- 29 April Attended Mid Canterbury Federation of Women's Institute 75<sup>th</sup> Anniversary function
- 30 April Chaired Canterbury Water Management Strategy meeting followed by meeting with Commissioner Dame Bazley
- 2 May Took part in Wheels Week Parade
- 3 May Attended Canterbury Mayoral Forum  
Attended IPANZ Awards in Wellington
- 4 May Attended function at Westpac Bank

- 6/7 May Attended Zones 5/6 Conference in Dunedin
- 7 May Addressed Federated Farmers Conference in Ashburton  
Attended Mid-Canterbury Sports Awards
- 10 May Visited Ashburton Borough School  
Hosted Ashburton Resource Centre volunteers presentation and morning tea  
Addressed Cardiac Companions group in Ashburton
- 11 May Attended Te Hono Tangata Trust meeting  
Attended Allenton School cross country event
- 12 May Attended presentation by CEO and local representatives from the heavy  
transport industry at ADC  
Chaired Ashburton Business Estate Project Board meeting  
Attended Launch of 'Canterbury Brides' publication
- 13 May Attended Mt Somers Springburn School Re-dedication  
Attended opening of new buildings at Mt Hutt College  
Attended opening of new Ashburton Youth Health Centre
- 14 May Met with Rob Brawley, Grow Mid-Canterbury  
Met with MP Jo Goodhew
- 15 May Attended Operatic Society 50<sup>th</sup> Jubilee Lunch
- 17 May Addressed Canterbury University group of students re CWMS  
Attended Trustpower Awards function
- 18 May Attended Hinds School for Book Week

M B O'MALLEY  
**Mayor**

## ASHBURTON DISTRICT COUNCIL REPORT

FILE NO: 1/3/3  
DATE: 20 May 2010  
REPORT TO: Council Meeting  
FROM: Chief Executive

---

### 4.2 CHIEF EXECUTIVE'S REPORT

#### 4.2.1 CANTERBURY WATER MANAGEMENT STRATEGY

Work is continuing on completing the strategy related to identified work programmes and finalising targets. At the same time, the Strategy is moving towards implementation through setting up the zone committees and the regional committees. ECan Commissioners are also working towards these. Meetings this period included steering group meetings on 13 and 30 April, and a work group on funding / financing on 29 April.

#### 4.2.2 GROUP STUDY EXCHANGE - SWEDEN

On 14 April along with Councillor Leadley, we hosted a GSE team from Sweden. They were interested in the structure and governance of government in New Zealand, our strategic planning processes, and wastewater and water systems. Cr Leadley and Mr Guthrie showed them our water supplies and Ocean Farm treatment system.

#### 4.2.3 CIVIL DEFENCE CONTROLLERS' FORUM

This forum was held on 21 April and attended by Crs Holmes and Lowe, and Mr Rouse, Mr Geddes and myself. Along with general forums, exercises were undertaken with respect to a tsunami event and a foot / mouth outbreak. MAF staff (Assure) were in attendance with respect to the latter. They will be developing a response plan recognising local support capability.

#### 4.2.4 MAYFIELD CITIZENS GROUP

I met with two representatives with respect to the water supply development with Mr Brake and Mr Guthrie. This was a generally constructive meeting to clarify funding and development issues.

#### 4.2.5 CHINESE DELEGATION

We hosted two Chinese delegations on 26 April, the first from Taizhou and the second from Puyang.

#### 4.2.6 POWERHOUSE SEMINAR

I attended this seminar with Mr Rob Brawley at Canterbury University on 28 April. This was an informative evening with respect to new technologies. Mr Brawley will be undertaking some follow up.

#### 4.2.7 CANTERBURY MAYORAL FORUM

The Mayor and I attended this forum on 3 May. The meeting met with the ECan Commissioners and also provided a report back on the Canterbury Water Management Strategy.

#### 4.2.8 IPANZ (Institute of Public Administration of New Zealand)

The Mayor and I attended an evening in Wellington where the finalists of the IPANZ Best Practice and Innovation Awards were announced.

Ashburton District Council made the final three in the “Working Together for Better Services” category. The finalists were announced and presented awards by the Minister for State Services. There were over 60 nominations. The overall winner of the Prime Minister’s Award is to be announced on 18 June.

#### **4.2.9 ZONES 5 / 6 MEETING, LGNZ**

This was held in Dunedin on 6/7 May and attended by the Mayor, Cr Leadley and myself. There was a good line up of topics and discussion.

##### **4.2.9.1 Dr Alan Bollard**

Dr Bollard referred to the recession, built up through a decade of bad practices brought to a head through the crash of the sub-prime market in 2007. He believed the worst is over, however the recovery is still fragile. Sectorial lending was cut back heavily, business at 8%, however finance is starting to flow again.

##### **4.2.9.2 Ministry of Justice**

Two representatives attended to discuss funding related to safer community projects. Unfortunately, funding allocations for the next year have not been finalized as yet due to the budget process. Current funding (\$6.1 m) is expected to be retained, however priorities are being reviewed. The priorities being programmed focused on crime prevention and community safety. Further meetings are planned for June around 3 yearly funding with quarterly reporting to ensure results are measured and ‘good stories reported’.

##### **4.2.9.3 Environment Southland – Collaborative Approach**

This presentation referred to the development of the Southland Discharge Plan. The focus was on dairy discharge, both land and water discharge, including non-point discharge. Issues included faeces contamination, nutrient and sedimentation. Variables include soil types, land slopes, management practices. The working group consisting of farmers / irrigators / Ag Research are developing relevant plans and policies.

Incentives for the sector include:

- Streamline / remove consent processing
- Remove affected party approvals
- Farmer developed solution
- Reduced audit / inspections

Regional Council benefits include:

- Access to industry investment
- Farmers identify unintended consequences
- Buy-in for proposed changes
- Industry focus on implementation
- Farming sector getting same message from inside and outside

The conclusion was that incentives for both parties do matter.

##### **4.2.9.4 George Hawkins, Opposition Spokesman on Local Government**

Comments were largely around the Auckland changes and concerns related to the impact on democracy. He did also comment that changes needed to be made with respect to the Canterbury Regional Council.

The Local Government Act amendment was introduced to Parliament (TFAM) which he flagged some concerns. He undertook to get around Councils, recognizing that best ideas are often local. He commented that “hands from Wellington are too tight around local authority throats”.

#### 4.2.9.5 LGNZ Report

This report has been circulated separately for Councillors' information.

Concern was raised with respect to the proposed amendments to the Local Government Act. Among these are the levy proposed to be imposed on the sector for performance management. We will look to submit on these.

#### 4.2.9.6 Proposed NPS on Freshwater

This was an 'in house' presentation, referring to the move from Sustainable Programme of Action

|  
New start for freshwater  
|  
Land and Water Forum

Recent announcements on water metering

- over 20 litres / sec by 2012
- over 10 litres / sec by 2014
- over 5 litres / sec by 2016

Issues referred to include:

- contamination
- over allocation
- loss of wetlands
- no integrated management

The proposed Policy Statement would require any change or increase in intensity of land use to require a resource consent. This policy has not been adopted by the current government, but referred to the Forum for review. The Forum is to report back by 31 July 2010.

The Policy Statement has a proposed timeframe for implementation by 31 December 2014, or to have a defined time specific programme for full implementation by 31 December 2030.

The Canterbury Water Management Strategy was acknowledged and supported.

#### 4.2.9.7 Hon Nick Smith, Minister for the Environment, Climate Change Issues, ACC

The Minister covered a variety of topics, including:

- **Waste Levy.** Large number of applications. Funding to be allocated based on environmental harm minimisation rather than volume reduction.
- **ETS,** to incentivize renewable energy development rather than geo-thermal, and more forestry planting. He commented that 29 of the 38 Kyoto signatories have some form of ETA. New Zealand will review in 2011, and no further steps will be taken unless major trading related countries are doing similar (Australia, United States).
- **Land and Water Forum.** Recognised that the Forum is following the development of the Canterbury Water Management Strategy, recognising the strategy is yet to be implemented.
- **Climate change guidance material** to be produced to assist in managing flood risks, recognizing huge national variations.
- **Canterbury Regional Council.** Commended the Canterbury territorial authorities on their approach to the water issue, an issue as large nationally as the Auckland roading issues. The Government's threshold for intervention is very high – intervention was also considered by the previous Government.

- **Aquaculture.** Lack of progress is embarrassing. Working to develop a framework to enable further development.
- **Infrastructure Advisory Group,** set up to develop an improved consenting framework, looking at Public Works Act, Resource Management Act, Urban Development Group. He considered the resource consent costs are too high, impacting on section and housing costs.
- **EPA (Environmental Protection Authority)** framework being developed. They are not looking to re-define relationships between regional and central government.
- **Freedom camping,** a challenging issue which he is happy to set up a joint working party with LGNZ. He sees a National Environment Standard to prohibit, unless allowed by a local authority as being a pragmatic way forward

In response to a question related to Government Policy and imposition of costs to Councils, the Minister acknowledged a big problem when the policy setter is disconnected from the funder. Central Government needs to recognise this and be realistic with their demands, particularly if the requirements place capital requirements for large projects (ie water upgrades). It was gratifying to see this issue recognised.

#### **4.2.9.8 Auditor-General (Lynne Provost) and Assistant (Bruce Robertson)**

Identified concerns including the proposed amendment to the Local Government Act (TAFM – transparency, accountability, financial management), and co-management (Waikato River).

Other pressures include water, environmental auditing, ensuring core services are provided, financial management and accountability.

With respect to ratepayer relationships, the Auditor-General in receiving a complaint will look at processes and systems involved, not for the ‘perfect decision with the benefit of hindsight’.

International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS), acknowledged that these are not working for the sector. Looking to go to Public Sector Accounting Standards – not a silver bullet and will require another transition.

Member Interest (1953) – “working on, but do not hold your breath”.

#### **4.2.9.9 Hon Rodney Hide, Minister for Local Government**

- Local Government Act Amendment, fiscal envelope, core functions, accountability / transparency. LTCCP simpler, more flexible on service delivery.
- Auckland, were 300 CCO’s, replaced with 9. No more amalgamations – unless locally initiated through Local Government Act provisions.
- CCO’s – focus on specific activities with identified expertise. Greater transparency but does not replace Council decision making.

The Minister identified the fact that local government has not been defined constitutionally and believes this needs to be done. Locally there are differences and diversity, and at times central government looks on local government as ‘another government department’, referring to the Waikato Settlement. He is looking to prepare a paper on the role, expectation and relationship of local government. He would like to see a debate on what he sees as the need for a constitutional base for local government.

#### **4.2.9.10 Sheryl Stevens**

Sheryl gave an update on the Waste Advisory Board.

**B LESTER**  
**Chief Executive**

## ASHBURTON DISTRICT COUNCIL REPORT

FILE NO: C554  
DATE: 20 May 2010  
REPORT TO: Council  
FROM: Operations Manager  
SUBJECT: Second Bridge across the Ashburton River

---

### 4.6 SECOND BRIDGE ACROSS THE ASHBURTON RIVER – PROJECT UPDATE AND ADDITIONAL WORK APPROVAL

#### 4.6.1 SUMMARY

On 25 February 2010, Council identified a preferred site option and second site option for further investigation and consultation for a second bridge across the Ashburton River.

Affected parties have been contacted, a public meeting and three open days have been held, additional work identified and project briefs prepared.

The purpose of this report is to provide a project update, provide details of additional work to be carried out and to formally request the required funding.

#### 4.6.2 RECOMMENDATION

“That Council

1. approves the additional technical investigation and social impact assessment work;
2. approves additional funding in the sum of \$106,631.40 excluding GST being the local share of the costs of the additional work within the total cost of the work, being \$247,980 excluding GST; and
3. approves the formation of a reference group.”

#### 4.6.3 BACKGROUND

On 25 February 2010 Council formally resolved:

- “1. That Council approves Option D-E – Chalmers Avenue to Grove Street as the preferred option for the second bridge across the Ashburton River for Stage 2 investigation and consultation with a view to identifying a site and land designation for a second bridge across the Ashburton River; and
2. That Council approves Option D as its second option, also to be part of the Stage 2 investigation and consultation.”

After Council formally adopted the above options property owners directly affected by the Chalmers Avenue Grove Street option were contacted and meetings held. This was done to ensure they were advised of the project prior to it being made public. Letters were also sent to property owners on Grove Street, Chalmers Avenue and properties potentially affected by the other options.

A public meeting was held on Tuesday 6 April to provide information on the project and three open days were held on 15, 16 and 17 April.

Observations of the feedback relating to the public response made during the above include but are not necessarily limited to the following:

- Council is not clearly communicating what would be achieved by the construction of a second bridge.
- It is unclear to the community why NZTA and/or the existing State Highway corridor do not feature in the second bridge project.
- Some information appeared to result in a level of misunderstanding mainly around “presentation” (level crossing across railway for the Melcombe Street option).
- Heavy traffic and safety are significant concerns.
- Rural bridge location is considered more forward thinking.
- Council has not considered impacts on people.
- There is a high level of interest in using the existing state highway corridor.
- Council is putting money before people.

The above has formed the basis for identifying additional work. This work is discussed further in the report.

### **CONSULTATION – STAGE 1**

Set out below is a summary of the results of the first stage of consultation.

- Public consultation commenced with letters being mailed to the following:
  - Grove Street residents affected by Option D-E Chalmers Avenue to Grove Street
  - Landowners between Carters Terrace and Grahams Road affected by Option D - Chalmers Avenue to East of Tinwald
  - Residents along Chalmers Avenue and Bridge Street
  - Landowners in and around the possible bridge locations for the remaining options

The letters advised details of the option potentially affecting them and advising them of the open days and where to obtain additional information.
- A public meeting was held on Tuesday 6 April. An information pack containing project details, the criteria used to assess each option and the feedback form were available at the meeting. An estimated 300 people attended the public meeting.
- Open days were held on:
  - Thursday 15 April
  - Friday 16 April
  - Saturday 17 April

Information consisted of the following:

  - Display of all options considered
  - Grove Street cross sections (indicative layouts)
  - Tinwald traffic count information
  - Project process diagram
- There were 185 entries on the community open day register.
- Feedback forms were available at the open days and participants were encouraged to fill out the form.
- There was also an opportunity for open day participants to leave a comment on the “comments wall” and see the comments made by other participants.

- As at 7 May 2010, 70 feedback forms have been received. 31 submissions to the Annual Plan also mentioned the second bridge project. 24 submitters to the Annual Plan were additional to the feedback forms received. In total 94 written submissions on the project were received.
- Collation and analysis of the feedback forms identified opposition to a number of options as well as concerns about effects of the preferred option on the community.
- Set out below is a summary of the responses:
  - Option D-E Chalmers Avenue to Grove Street
    - Outright support 3
    - Outright opposition 39
    - Concern about effects 65
  - Option D Chalmers Avenue to East of Tinwald
    - Outright support 12
    - Outright opposition 8
    - Support for either D or D-E 1
  - Support for other options
    - Option H/H1 30
    - Bypass 22
    - 4 laning of existing bridge and SH 2

(note based on 94 feedback responses)
- Response made by open day participants and left on the “comments wall” are as follows:
  - Option D-E Chalmers Avenue to Grove Street
    - Outright support 6
    - Outright opposition 10
    - Concern about effects 22
  - Option D Chalmers Avenue to East of Tinwald
    - Outright support 14
    - Outright opposition 3
  - Support for other options
    - Option H/H1 17
    - Bypass 6
    - Opposition to H 4

(note 110 responses on the “comments wall”)
- A number of comments in response to questions on the feedback form were also made. These are summarised in the full consultation report.
- A summary of the issues raised is as follows:
  - Effects on residents of Grove Street including:
    - Increase in traffic down residential street
    - Heavy vehicles using bridge/route
    - Disturbance to residents
    - Noise
    - Increase in accidents (including children)
    - Effects on retirement home
    - Pollution

- Reduction in property values
  - Exit strategy onto state highway
  - Consider options around the existing state highway/Melcombe Street
  - Consider the need for a bypass rather than a local bridge
  - The effect of increased traffic on the Tinwald School
  - The need for a second bridge?
  - Clarify the local traffic issue
  - Can traffic lights be put in first?
  - The need to think long term and have the best solution for the future
  - Funding options from NZTA
- All feedback forms and submissions to the Annual Plan will be responded to.

### **ADDITIONAL WORK**

- Based on the public meeting and the results of the consultation process to date, the following additional work has been identified:
- Social impact assessment
  - Investigating local road/state highway intersection interfaces and associated impacts arising from the construction of a second bridge.
  - Further investigation of option D including cost estimates.
  - Further investigation of impacts on the Tinwald School.
  - Further investigation of “bypass” option
  - Further investigation of the Melcombe Street/SH 1 corridor options to meet community information requirements.
  - Engage with NZTA to more formalise their position and involvement in the second bridge project.

The additional work identified above is being carried out to:

- Provide additional detail to the work carried out to date.
  - Fill information gaps.
  - To invite and involve NZTA in the project as the authority administering the existing state highway corridor and bridge.
  - To meet Council’s expectation particularly with respect to social impact assessment.
- Separate project briefs have been prepared for:
- The social impact assessment
  - Further technical investigations

### **ADDITIONAL WORK SCOPE**

#### **Social Assessment**

Set out below is a summary of the work scope. Completion dates and costings for the social impact assessment:

- Attendance at three open days and prepare a brief report (complete)
- Form and facilitate a reference group

- Carry out social impact assessment for appropriate options
- Assist and advise Council on the most appropriate way to communicate the results of the social impact assessment and additional technical work to the wider community.
- Prepare reports on:
  - Completion of field interviews
  - The work of the reference group
- Prepare a project report at the completion of the project.

The forecast completion date for this work and final project report is Friday 19 November.

This completion date is influenced by the timing of the reference group meetings, up to four spaced approximately three weeks apart and communicating the results of all additional work to the wider community.

The cost of the social assessment work is \$60,000 excluding GST. This includes a sum of \$10,000 to carry out a survey if it is considered it will add value to the project. This is yet to be determined/confirmed.

### **Technical Investigations**

Set out below is a summary of the work scope, completion date and costs for the additional technical investigations:

- Investigation of impacts on Tinwald School
  - Vehicle survey and pedestrian numbers
  - Mitigation options
  - Costings
- Option D-E Chalmers Avenue to Grove Street
  - Identify local road state highway interfaces
  - Land acquisition requirements
  - Consider interface issues and solutions in the Transportation Study
  - Desktop Geotech considerations
  - Potential impacts on buried services
  - Cost estimates
- Option D Chalmers Avenue to east of Tinwald
  - Concept design and cost estimates
  - Land acquisition requirements
  - Desktop Geotech considerations
  - Staging of road construction
  - Transportation modelling
- Melcombe Street options
  - OnTrack requirements
  - Concept design development and cost estimates

- Bypass Option
  - Identification of information relating to a “by pass” (typical) option
  - Rough order of costs for a typical “by pass” option
- General
  - Review of the Transportation Study
  - Liaison and support for the reference group
  - Revision of the transportation model

The completion date for this work is 19 November 2010 and is linked to the work to be carried out as part of the social impact assessment and by the reference group.

The work identified above will be completed at various times during the revised project programme.

The cost of the additional technical work is \$187,980 excluding GST (includes a \$20,000 contingency sum).

## **NEW ZEALAND TRANSPORT AGENCY**

- The New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA) has been invited to make a presentation to Council at the meeting to be held on Thursday 20 May.

They have been requested to provide information on the following:

- NZTA's position regarding the existing state highway corridor and the existing bridge
- General information relating to the second bridge project
- The status and implementation of the Transportation Study

- A number of questions have been raised by people submitting feedback forms. These questions have been developed and forwarded to the NZTA with a request that they answer/cover the information in their presentation.

The questions are as follows:

1. What are NZTA's intentions with respect to the existing bridge and state highway corridor and the timeframes for implementation?
2. Why is this project not being carried out by the NZTA and being fully funded by the NZTA?
3. Why can't Ashburton have traffic lights to reduce congestion?
4. Would NZTA support a bypass? If not, why not?
5. Would NZTA support any options using Melcombe Street or the widening of the existing bridge? If not, why not?
6. Will the new bridge be changed to or be taken over as a state highway?
7. Will the existing state highway bridge be closed more frequently when there is road works when there is a second bridge?
8. Can the existing state highway bridge cope with new overweight and over dimension regulations?

## **ONTRACK**

For the purposes of clarification of a number of points regarding rail, the following questions were asked of ONTRACK.

The questions and responses are indicated below:

1. *What is the minimum separation between a roadway and rail line – ie from the centre line of the track to the edge/boundary of the road reserve?*
  - a. ONTRACK requires 5m clearance from centreline of railway to boundary.
  - b. Governing factor is often NZTA clear zone requirements. We have calculated this as 6.5m from edge line to roadside hazards (including structures).
  - c. ONTRACK signals are located at 3m from centreline, and equipment boxes up to 5m from centreline. Equipment boxes can all be located on one side, allowing 3m to boundary on one side.
  - d. Therefore to achieve clear zone requirements lane edge line needs to be 11.5m from rail centreline. Parking, footpath etc can be within this distance, so kerb can be 8.5m from rail centreline. If necessary this can be reduced to 5m absolute minimum by providing guardrails or other protection for isolated hazards. It can also be reduced on one side to 6.5m desirable or 3m with guardrails by locating all equipment boxes on one side of track.
2. *What is the minimum stacking distance at a level crossing from the centre line of the track and the parallel road? The total distance being twice the stacking distance to allow for the entry into the second road.*
  - a. ONTRACK requires a desirable minimum of 30m from centreline of railway to limit line where vehicles crossing the railway have to give way to other traffic after crossing the railway.
  - b. Their absolute minimum is 23m.
  - c. This is a significant safety issue, and it would be difficult to justify using the absolute minimum standard in a location where SH1 crosses the main trunk railway line.
  - d. ONTRACK required 32m at the rail crossing at the intersection with SH1 servicing a significant development between Ashburton and Christchurch.
3. *What is the minimum height of an underpass?*
  - a. NZTA Bridge Manual requires 6m preferred minimum (4.9m absolute minimum) for roads passing under a structure
  - b. They are likely to require 6m for SH1.
4. *What is the minimum height for an overpass?*
  - a. ONTRACK Infrastructure Engineering Handbook (T-200) requires 4.9m vertical and 2.75 horizontal from rail centreline

### **4.6.4 OPTIONS**

Options regarding the additional work and formation of a reference group are outlined below:

#### **ADDITIONAL WORK OPTIONS**

*Option 1: Approve the additional work*

The additional work scope is outlined in the body of this report and includes further technical investigations and a social impact assessment.

This work has been identified to:

- Provide additional detail to the work already carried out
- To fill information gaps identified through Stage 1 consultation
- To meet Council's expectations re social assessment
- To ensure all options are adequately considered

The cost of this work is as follows:

- Social assessment \$60,000 excluding GST
- Technical investigations \$187,980 excluding GST

Completing the above investigation work will assist Council in further consultation and planning work.

*Option 2: to not approve the additional work*

If the additional work is not approved the benefits identified in Option 1 will not be delivered.

***The preferred option is Option 1: to approve the additional work.***

## **REFERENCE GROUP OPTIONS**

*Option 1: To approve the formation of a reference group*

The social impact assessment work scope includes the formation of a reference group with membership from the wider community, stakeholders, directly affected parties, representatives from local schools and Road Transport Association.

The purpose of the reference group is that it will be a sounding board for Council, will not be involved in "decision making" and will provide advice to Council and the project team.

The reference group will be facilitated by the social impact assessment service provider and will be the subject of Terms of Reference etc. It is the view of the project team that the formation of a reference group will add value to the project and will be a direct line of communication with interested parties and the local community.

*Option 2: To not approve the formation of a reference group*

If this option is supported and a reference group is not formed, there may be no way of facilitating input from interested parties and the local community into the project.

***The recommended option is Option 1: to approve the formation of a reference group.***

### **4.6.5 STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS**

There are not statutory implications arising from the recommendations in this report.

It will be necessary to apply for additional funds from the New Zealand Transport Agency for the subsidised portion of the work.

### **4.6.6 CONSULTATION**

The additional work has been discussed previously with Council on 8 April and with the NZTA.

The recommendations in this report have not been the subject of consultation with the wider community.

#### 4.6.7 STRATEGIC LINKS

The second bridge project and the recommendations in this report are consistent with the Transportation Study and the 2009/2019 LTCCP.

#### 4.6.8 FINANCIAL

The value of the currently approved work is \$120,500 for project management and general Stage 1 Issues and Options report Stage 2 Notice of Requirement (Detailed investigation etc).

The above work has attracted a NZTA subsidy.

The value of the additional work is as follows:

- Social impact assessment \$60,000 excluding GST
- Additional technical investigations \$187,980 excluding GST  
(including open days and public meeting
- already carried out)

We have discussed financial assistance with NZTA Regional staff who have signalled that Council can have a reasonable expectation that the funding for the additional work will be supported. (*note we expect a formal decision in early June*).

\$220,000 has been budgeted in the 2010/2011 financial year for the statutory Notice of Requirement phase of the project.

Based on the above, the total value of the additional work is \$247,980

The local share based on a 57% subsidy would be \$106,631.40 excluding GST (43%).

The subsidy would be \$141,348.60 excluding GST.

Prepared By:

R S ROUSE  
**Operations Manager**

Approved by:

B LESTER  
**Chief Executive**

## ASHBURTON DISTRICT COUNCIL REPORT

FILE NO: SK-BG 01  
DATE: 20 May 2010  
REPORT TO: Water Subcommittee  
FROM: Operations Manager  
SUBJECT: Mount Hutt – Riverbank stockwater supply

---

### 4.7 MOUNT HUTT – RIVERBANK STOCKWATER SUPPLY INVESTIGATION

#### 4.7.1 SUMMARY

Council has been approached by members of Mount Hutt – Riverbank Stockwater Supply Incorporated regarding a formal proposal to pipe stockwater from the Pudding Hill intake to service approximately 50 properties with a combined potable water/stockwater scheme.

The purpose of this report is to formally request approval to investigate this proposal and additional funding in the sum of \$15,000.

#### 4.7.2 RECOMMENDATION

<p>“That Council grants up to \$15,000 for the investigation of a concept design for a stockwater supply for the Mount Hutt – Riverbank development area”</p>
---

#### 4.7.3 BACKGROUND

The Mount Hutt – Riverbank Stockwater Supply Incorporated has formally written to Council presenting a proposal they feel may be beneficial to landowners in the upper plains area.

They advise that currently land between the north branch of the Ashburton River and the Rakaia River and above the Rangitata Diversion Race is not well serviced for potable water. A large proportion of this area has no available aquifers which can be accessed by wells and is therefore dependent on the stockwater race network for stockwater and rainwater for domestic potable water supply.

The Incorporated Society currently provides water from a consented supply on Mt Hutt Station to 25 farms on the eastern half of the area identified for servicing. Currently there is no backup supply and most farmers would like more water than is currently available.

The Society's proposal involves the taking of water from the Pudding Hill Stream intake (Council's stockwater intake) at an elevation of approximately 500m. This would involve a pipeline being laid eastwards meeting the Rakaia River Road at an elevation of approximately 400m.

“Feeder lines” from the main down Pudding Hill, Waimarama and Mount Hutt Station Roads would service all farms in the area and supply extra water to the existing Mt Hutt supply.

The Society also advises that the pipeline could be increased in size to supplement the Methven potable water supply.

In order to proceed this proposal would require council to allocate a portion of its consent to take water to the society.

They have advised that they believe that the proposal would allow more efficient use of the water and allow the closure of some of the open races in the area.

Farmers in the area have been approached and there appears support for the proposal and access to land to lay pipelines would be approved.

The following is a summary of information gained during discussions with members of the Mount Hutt – Riverbank Stockwater Supply Incorporated:

- There are currently 25 properties accessing water from the Mount Hutt Station scheme.
- Approvals by farmers for the proposal to date have been informal.
- The proposal would be a combined scheme (note a potable water supply will have more onerous requirements than a standalone stockwater supply).
- 1,000m<sup>3</sup>/day (1,000,000l/day) has been requested. This equates to 11.57l/sec. The consented take from Pudding Hill Stream is 500l/sec (note this quantity is not always available).
- This volume of water would need to be transferred to the society.
- The main driver for the proposal is for stockwater.
- 50 properties would be serviced.
- The proposal currently involves approximately 12km of gravity pipeline that would be “mole ploughed in”.
- All work (directly related to the proposal) would be funded by the serviced properties.
- The society has indicated that it would like to start physical works etc within the next 12 months.

After considering the above, this proposal may have the following “wider community” benefits:

- Race closures (lengths yet to be determined)
- Increasing the number of properties that receive potable water (note it appears the Mt Hutt Station supply provides an adequate service).

The primary benefit to the ‘wider community’ (excluding private benefit) appears to be race closures.

In order to progress the consideration of this proposal, further investigation work is required. This is summarised below:

- The impact the take will have on the stockwater system.
- The length of race that could potentially be closed.
- Statutory requirements around the transfer of part of the Pudding Hill take to the society.
- Any additional benefits the piping of part of the stockwater network may deliver.
- Implications on the proposal of using the system to provide potable water.
- Further liaison with the society.

If the above work is approved, additional funding will be required. There is no budget provision in the 2010/2011 financial year.

#### **4.7.4 OPTIONS**

The following options are available to Council:

*Option 1: to carry out investigation work*

This option will allow Council to accurately identify the impacts, implications and benefits of the proposal.

If the proposal goes ahead without this investigation work, there may be implications for the stockwater system and its availability and reliability. This investigation work would also assist the society to progress the project.

*Option 2: to not carry out the investigation work*

The option would result in either the proposal not going ahead or proceeding with some risk without determining the impact on the stockwater network in the area.

***The Water Subcommittee's recommended option is Option 1: carry out investigation work.***

#### **4.7.5 STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS**

There are no statutory implications arising from the approval of the recommendations in this report. Implementation of the Society's proposal, however, will require the following:

- Formal transfer of part of Council's consented take at Pudding Hill to the Society.
- For a combined potable/stockwater supply compliance with relevant drinking water standards.

#### **4.7.6 CONSULTATION**

The proposal has been the subject of discussion with members of the Mount Hutt – Riverbank Stockwater Supply Incorporated. The content of this report and the proposal in general was discussed by the Water Subcommittee on Thursday 13 May.

The Subcommittee's recommendation to Council is:

*"That Council grants up to \$15,000 for the investigation of a concept design for a stockwater supply for the Mount Hutt – Riverbank development area."*

#### **4.7.7 STRATEGIC LINKS**

The recommendation and the Society's proposal is consistent with the following community outcomes in the 2010/2019 Community Plan:

*A thriving and diverse local economy that provides the foundation for a quality life style.*

*Natural and developed environments are sustained for the enjoyment of current and future generations.*

#### **4.7.8 FINANCIAL**

There is no budget provision in the 2009/2010 or 2010/2011 financial years.

A rough order of costs to carry out the investigation work outlined in this report is up to \$15,000.

Additional funding in the stockwater activity area of \$15,000 is required.

Prepared By:

**R S ROUSE**  
**Operations Manager**

Approved by:

**B LESTER**  
**Chief Executive**

## ASHBURTON DISTRICT COUNCIL REPORT

FILE NO: SK-BH 01  
DATE: 20 May 2010  
REPORT TO: Water Subcommittee  
FROM: Operations Manager  
SUBJECT: Ashburton Lyndhurst Irrigation Scheme

---

### 4.8 ASHBURTON LYNDHURST IRRIGATION SCHEME – PIPING PROPOSAL

#### 4.8.1 SUMMARY

An informal approach has been made by the Ashburton Lyndhurst Irrigation Scheme regarding a proposal to pipe their irrigation scheme and asking Council to consider including the piping of the stockwater network in the area to be serviced.

The purpose of this report is to provide background information on the scheme's piping proposal.

#### 4.8.2 RECOMMENDATION

"That additional information be requested from the Ashburton Lyndhurst Irrigation scheme when it is available; this information to be used to assist in determining Council's involvement in the proposal."

#### 4.8.3 BACKGROUND

On 3 May 2010, a meeting was held at the request of the Ashburton Lyndhurst Irrigation Scheme to discuss a proposal to pipe their irrigation scheme and asking Council to consider including the piping of the stockwater area in the area to be serviced.

Set out below is a brief summary of the discussions:

- The proposal involves the piping of the existing open race irrigation network.
- They have identified some potential benefits by including stockwater in the proposal.
- The existing open race system is independent of the stockwater system.
- The area serviced is approximately 25,000ha and comprises dairying and cropping.
- The scheme currently sources water from the RDR.
- They believe there will be significant water savings if water is conveyed in a pipeline and that this water could be made available to other users increasing the irrigated/serviced area.
- Some new property owners will be able to access water.
- Key drivers for the project include:
  - Better water distribution
  - Increased efficiency
  - Freeing up water to irrigate a larger area.
- Approximately 180km of main pipeline are required to pipe the open irrigation race network.

- The piped irrigation scheme would be owned by the Ashburton Lyndhurst Irrigation Scheme.
- The scheme representatives indicated that they would prefer the construction work to proceed to full completion rather than taking a staged approach.
- The project is intended to be “design build”.
- Three prices are currently being obtained (design/build). The estimated cost of the project is \$70m.
- Pipelines will primarily be located on private land.
- No formal arrangements or agreements have been made with farmers. The scheme currently includes 220 shareholders.
- The scheme representatives have indicated the following timeframes:
  - Shareholder approvals – September
  - Completion of design – before September
  - Construction - 2011
- The intake could be relocated to the RDR.
- The current stockwater intake/intakes are located on the north branch of the Ashburton River.

Our comments on the above are as follows:

- The piped network would discharge into the open race system on the eastern side of the state highway.
- We need “water to convey water” the savings may be significantly reduced because the piped scheme will discharge into open races.
- The cost of piping the scheme at \$70m could mean Council's contribution to pipe the stockwater component of the flow could be significant.
- The level of support for the scheme from shareholders is unclear and has not been formalised.
- To determine the level of Council involvement in this proposal and Council funded investigation work further information should be provided by the “scheme” when it becomes available.

#### 4.8.4 OPTIONS

The following options are available to Council:

**Option 1:** *Council investigates benefits to the stockwater network from joining the piped scheme*

This option would require an investment of approximately \$15,000 to fund the investigation work.

Commencing this work could be premature and it may be worth requesting further information when it is available prior to approving any investigation work.

**Option 2:** *Council is not involved in the proposed piping of the scheme*

This option may result in a lost opportunity to rationalise a significant part of the stockwater network and increase scheme efficiency.

Further information should be requested when it is available prior to declining involvement in the project.

**Option 3:** *Request additional information from the scheme when it is available*

This option will allow time for the scheme design and the scheme “management options” to develop to provide Council with the required information.

This information could include but not be limited to the following:

- Confirmed level of support from the shareholders
- Cost information
- How the scheme will be operated and maintained
- Priority of access to water for stock purposes

***The Water Subcommittee’s recommended option is Option 3: request additional information from the scheme when it is available.***

#### **4.8.5 STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS**

There are no statutory implications arising from the approval of the recommendation in this report.

#### **4.8.6 CONSULTATION**

This proposal has been the subject of discussion with representatives of the Ashburton Lyndhurst Irrigation Scheme.

This proposal and the content of this report has been the subject of discussion by the Water Subcommittee on Thursday 13 May.

The Water Subcommittee’s recommendation to Council is

*“That additional information be requested from the scheme when it is available. This information will be used to assist in determining Council’s involvement in the proposal”.*

Note: this information will be requested and ongoing dialogue will be carried out to as far as possible meet the projects timeframe. Further information will be provided to the Water Subcommittee when it is available.

#### **4.8.7 STRATEGIC LINKS**

The proposal which is the subject of this report is consistent with the following community outcomes in the 2010/2019 Community Plan:

*A thriving and diverse local economy that provides the foundation for a quality life style.*

*Natural and developed environments are sustained for the enjoyment of current and future generations.*

#### **4.8.8 FINANCIAL**

There is no budget provision in the 2009/2010 or 2010/2011 financial year.

A rough order of costs to carry out investigation work to determine detailed costings and benefits and impacts arising from joining the scheme is \$15,000.

Additional funding in the stockwater activity area is required to fund this work.

Prepared By:

R S ROUSE  
**Operations Manager**

Approved by:

B LESTER  
**Chief Executive**

## ASHBURTON DISTRICT COUNCIL REPORT

FILE NO: SK-AN 02  
DATE: 20 May 2010  
REPORT TO: Council  
FROM: Administration Officer  
SUBJECT: Closure of Stockwater Race – Buttericks Road

---

### 4.9 CLOSURE OF STOCKWATER RACE – BUTTERICKS ROAD

#### 4.9.1 SUMMARY

A section of stockwater race running from a junction at Stanley Road, along Buttericks Road and Inverrose Road, continuing to the coastline – a distance of approximately 11.9 kilometres, has been investigated for closure. Full support has not been obtained.

The purpose of this report is to provide background information and present the Water Subcommittee's recommendation regarding the closure of the race.

#### 4.9.2 RECOMMENDATION FROM WATER SUBCOMMITTEE

“That the special consultative procedure be commenced to close the stockwater race running from a junction at Lot 2 DP 8442 to where it ceases at the coastline on Lot 26 DP 289.”

#### 4.9.3 BACKGROUND

This race was nominated for closure by a property owner presently serviced by the subject race.

In April 2009, a standard letter and survey form was forwarded to all affected property owners for an indication of support for closure of this race. The results of this survey and consultation are summarised in the consultation section of this report. A plan showing the location of the race is appended to this report. **Page 49**

The results indicated four properties opposed to closure. The reasons given by the parties opposing the closure are:

- stock use
- fire fighting
- aesthetic values

At this point, consideration is given to whether the properties (where the property owner/s oppose closure) have a cost-effective alternative to the water race network.

In this case investigations have confirmed that of the four opposing parties all four have groundwater bores. Council staff confirmed these four properties will be able to supply a cost effective alternative for stockwater to service the affected paddocks for this race closure for under the \$10,000 threshold.

#### 4.9.4 STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS

##### Local Government Act 2002

If race closure was to be progressed, the mechanism will be in accordance with the Special Consultative Procedure as outlined in Section 83 of the Local Government Act 2002.

The special consultative procedure is reproduced below:-

- (1) *Where this Act or any other enactment requires a local authority to use or adopt the special consultative procedure, that local authority must—*
  - (a) *prepare—*
    - (i) *a statement of proposal; and*
    - (ii) *a summary of the information contained in the statement of proposal (which summary must comply with [section 89](#)); and*
  - (b) *include the statement of proposal on the agenda for a meeting of the local authority; and*
  - (c) *make the statement of proposal available for public inspection at—*
    - (i) *the principal public office of the local authority; and*
    - (ii) *such other places as the local authority considers necessary in order to provide all ratepayers and residents of the district with reasonable access to that statement; and*
  - (d) *distribute in accordance with [section 89\(c\)](#) the summary of the information contained in the statement of proposal; and*
  - (e) *give public notice, and such other notice as the local authority considers appropriate, of the proposal and the consultation being undertaken; and*
  - (f) *include in the public notice a statement about how persons interested in the proposal—*
    - (i) *may obtain the summary of information about the proposal; and*
    - (ii) *may inspect the full proposal; and*
  - (g) *include in the public notice a statement of the period within which submissions on the proposal may be made to the local authority; and*
  - (h) *ensure that any person who makes a submission on the proposal within that period—*
    - (i) *is sent a written notice acknowledging receipt of that person's submission; and*
    - (ii) *is given a reasonable opportunity to be heard by the local authority (if that person so requests); and*
  - (i) *ensure that the notice given to a person under paragraph (h)(i) contains information—*
    - (i) *advising that person of that person's opportunity to be heard; and*
    - (ii) *explaining how that person may exercise that person's opportunity to be heard; and*
  - (j) *ensure that, except as otherwise provided by [Part 7](#) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987, every meeting at which submissions are heard or at which the local authority, community board, or committee deliberates on the proposal is open to the public; and*
  - (k) *subject to the [Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987](#), make all written submissions on the proposal available to the public.*
- (2) *The period specified in the statement included under subsection (1)(g) must be a period of not less than 1 month beginning with the date of the first publication of the public notice.*
- (3) *This section does not prevent a local authority from requesting or considering, before making a decision, comment or advice from an officer of the local authority or any other person in respect of the proposal or any submission or both.*

#### **4.9.5 OPTIONS AND RISKS CONSIDERED**

The Council has two options.

##### **Option 1 – Retain the Status Quo**

Race is retained. Council will be obligated to maintain a service on this system. Property owners will continue to be required to maintain the races traversing their properties.

##### *Risks*

- None identified

##### **Option 2 – Progress Race Closure through SCP**

The special consultative procedure is commenced to close the race. This approach is considered to be consistent with Council's closure guidelines.

#### Risks

- May be challenged through the SCP process and result in an inability to close the race.

Our preferred option is **Option 2**. This option is consistent with Council's stockwater race closure guidelines.

#### 4.9.6 CONSULTATION

A survey was carried out to establish whether this stockwater race was still required for stockwater purposes. The covering letter and survey forms were sent out to all property owners on the affected race section in April 2009.

The final results of the consultation process are set out in the table below:

	Total	Percentage
Properties affected	13	
Surveys returned	13	100%
Supporting for Closure	9	70%
Opposition to Closure	4	30%

The high return rate of 100% provides confidence that the survey process represents the views of users on this race system.

This report was the subject of consideration by the Water Subcommittee at the 13 April meeting. The Subcommittee supports the recommendation.

The special consultative procedure provides an additional formal opportunity for affected property owners to make their views known.

#### 4.9.7 STRATEGIC LINKS

The recommendations contained in this report are consistent with Outcomes and Strategic Objectives outlined in the LTTCP. In particular;

**Outcome 1: A thriving and diverse local economy that provides the foundation for a quality lifestyle.**

*Strategic Objective – Our community has access to quality infrastructure (roading, water, footpaths, wastewater, and storm water) that is efficient and reliable (Priority Objective).*

**Outcome 2: Natural and developed environments are sustained for the enjoyment of current and future generations.**

*Strategic Objective – Water, land and air are managed sustainably (Priority Objective).*

#### 4.9.8 FINANCIAL

There are no financial implications arising from the recommendation contained in this report.

Prepared By:

J K CHAPMAN  
Administration Officer

Approved by:

R S ROUSE  
Operations Manager

## ASHBURTON DISTRICT COUNCIL REPORT

FILE NO: SK-AP 02  
DATE: 20 May 2010  
REPORT TO: Council  
FROM: Administration Officer  
SUBJECT: Closure of Stockwater Race – Barrhill Rakaia

---

### 4.10 CLOSURE OF STOCKWATER RACE – BARRHILL RAKAIA

#### 4.10.1 SUMMARY

A section of stockwater race commencing from a junction near Accommodation Road on Lot 1 DP 23885, running parallel to Rakaia Barrhill Methven Road, and terminating below Baker Road on Lot 14 DP 1017 – a distance of approximately 22.2 kilometres, has been investigated for closure.

The outcome of consultation with affected property owners indicates there is significant opposition to the proposed race closure.

The purpose of this report is to provide background information and present the Water Subcommittee's recommendation regarding the closure of the race.

#### 4.10.2 RECOMMENDATION FROM WATER SUBCOMMITTEE

"That the special consultative procedure be commenced to close the stockwater race commencing from a junction near Accommodation Road on Lot 1 DP 23885, running parallel to Rakaia Barrhill Methven Road, and terminating below Baker Road on Lot 14 DP 1017."

#### 4.10.3 BACKGROUND

This race was nominated for closure by a group of property owners presently serviced by the subject race.

In June 2009, a standard letter and survey form was forwarded to all affected property owners for an indication of support for closure of this race. The results of this survey and further investigations are detailed in the consultation section of this report and the summarised version was reported to the Water Subcommittee meeting on 17 December 2009. A plan showing the location of the race is appended to this report. **Page 55**

The initial results indicated twenty-eight properties opposed to closure. The reasons given by the parties opposing the closure are:

- stock use
- domestic
- fire fighting
- aesthetic values
- irrigation
- too expensive to replace water supply
- domestic wells unreliable – race good for back up
- domestic well insufficient to also supply stock

Consideration has been given to whether the properties (where the property owner/s oppose closure) have a cost-effective alternative to the water race network.

Results from the initial survey indicated that of the 28 opposing properties:-

- 2 opposing properties have groundwater bores for irrigation purposes.
- 14 opposing properties have groundwater bores for domestic purposes.
- 12 opposing properties do not have groundwater bores.
- At least 2 opposing properties use the race for domestic purposes.

Further investigation of the opposing properties was requested by the Water Subcommittee at the meeting held on 18 March 2010. Stockwater ranger staff performed site visits to all opposing properties to confirm the results of the initial survey.

The stockwater ranger staff investigation was completed on or about 30 March 2010 and confirmed that of the 28 opposing properties:

- 11 opposing properties have groundwater bores
- 2 opposing properties have irrigation systems
- 17 properties do not have an alternative water supply for stockwater

The results from the initial survey and the March 2010 onsite investigation indicate that not all properties opposed to its closure have “cost-effective” alternatives to the open stockwater race.

#### 4.10.4 OPTIONS

The Council has two options.

##### **Option 1 – Retain the Status Quo**

Race is retained. Council will be obligated to maintain a service on this system. Property owners will continue to be required to maintain the races traversing their properties.

##### *Risks*

- None identified

##### **Option 2 – Progress Race Closure through SCP**

The special consultative procedure (SCP) is commenced to close the race. This approach is considered to be inconsistent with Council’s closure guidelines given the results of the investigations/survey work carried out.

##### *Risks*

- Council may be criticised for not following its own adopted procedures.
- May be challenged through the SCP process and result in an inability to close the race.

#### 4.10.5 STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS

##### Local Government Act 2002

If race closure was to be progressed, the mechanism will be in accordance with the Special Consultative Procedure as outlined in Section 83 of the Local Government Act 2002.

The special consultative procedure is reproduced below:-

- (4) *Where this Act or any other enactment requires a local authority to use or adopt the special consultative procedure, that local authority must—*
  - (a) *prepare—*
    - (i) *a statement of proposal; and*
    - (ii) *a summary of the information contained in the statement of proposal (which summary must comply with [section 89](#)); and*

- (b) include the statement of proposal on the agenda for a meeting of the local authority; and
  - (c) make the statement of proposal available for public inspection at—
    - (i) the principal public office of the local authority; and
    - (ii) such other places as the local authority considers necessary in order to provide all ratepayers and residents of the district with reasonable access to that statement; and
  - (d) distribute in accordance with [section 89\(c\)](#) the summary of the information contained in the statement of proposal; and
  - (e) give public notice, and such other notice as the local authority considers appropriate, of the proposal and the consultation being undertaken; and
  - (f) include in the public notice a statement about how persons interested in the proposal—
    - (i) may obtain the summary of information about the proposal; and
    - (ii) may inspect the full proposal; and
  - (g) include in the public notice a statement of the period within which submissions on the proposal may be made to the local authority; and
  - (h) ensure that any person who makes a submission on the proposal within that period—
    - (i) is sent a written notice acknowledging receipt of that person's submission; and
    - (ii) is given a reasonable opportunity to be heard by the local authority (if that person so requests); and
  - (i) ensure that the notice given to a person under paragraph (h)(i) contains information—
    - (i) advising that person of that person's opportunity to be heard; and
    - (ii) explaining how that person may exercise that person's opportunity to be heard; and
  - (j) ensure that, except as otherwise provided by [Part 7](#) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987, every meeting at which submissions are heard or at which the local authority, community board, or committee deliberates on the proposal is open to the public; and
  - (k) subject to the [Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987](#), make all written submissions on the proposal available to the public.
- (5) The period specified in the statement included under subsection (1)(g) must be a period of not less than 1 month beginning with the date of the first publication of the public notice.
- (6) This section does not prevent a local authority from requesting or considering, before making a decision, comment or advice from an officer of the local authority or any other person in respect of the proposal or any submission or both.

#### 4.10.6 CONSULTATION

A survey was carried out to establish whether this stockwater race was still required for stockwater purposes. The covering letter and survey forms were sent out to all property owners on the affected race section in June 2009. The initial return rate was around 75%. Follow-up correspondence improved the return rate markedly. The final results of the consultation process are set out in the table below. The high return rate of 94% provides confidence that the survey process represents the current views of users on this race system.

	<b>Total</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Properties affected	52	
Surveys returned	49	94%
Supporting for Closure	21	43%
Opposition to Closure	28	57%

At the request of the Water Subcommittee further onsite investigations were performed by stockwater ranger staff to confirm the initial survey results for all opposing properties.

A summary of responses from opposing properties to the survey and on-site investigation is set out below:-

2009 Survey (mailed into office)		
Bore	Irrigation	Troughs
No	No	No
Yes	No	Yes
Yes	Yes	No
---	---	No
---	No	No
No	No	No
No	No	No
No	No	No
No	No	No
Yes	No	Yes
No	No	---
Yes	No	Yes
No	No	No
Yes	No	No
No	No	No
Yes	No	Yes
Yes	No	Yes
Yes	No	Yes
No	No	No
No	No	No
Yes	No	Yes
No	No	No
No	No	No
Yes	No	No
Yes	No	No
Yes	No	No
Yes	No	No

2010 Investigation (by water ranger)			
Bore	Irrigation	Troughs	Area (Ha)
No	No	No	2
No	Yes	Yes	5
Yes	Yes	Yes	260
Yes	Yes	Yes	8
No	No	No	2
No	No	No	2
No	No	No	2
No	No	No	2
No	No	No	2
Yes	No	Yes	345.0
No	No	Yes	2.5
Yes	No	Yes	82
No	No	No	2
Yes	No	Yes	25
No	No	No	2
Yes	No	Yes	6
No	No	Yes	2
Yes	No	Yes	2
No	No	Yes	2
No	No	Yes	2
Yes	No	Yes	2
<i>Refused To Participate</i>			2.5
No	No	Yes	11
No	No	No	2.5
Yes	No	No	215
No	No	Yes	10
Yes	No	Yes	4
No	No	Yes	4

The content of this report was considered by the Water Subcommittee on Tuesday 13 April. The Subcommittee's recommendation is as follows:

*"That the special consultative procedure be commenced to close the stockwater race commencing from a junction near Accommodation Road on Lot 1 DP 23885, running parallel to Rakaia Barrhill Methven Road, and terminating below Baker Road on Lot 14 DP 1017."*

The Subcommittee supports the recommendation.

The special consultative procedure provides an additional formal opportunity for affected property owners to make their views known.

#### **4.10.7 STRATEGIC LINKS**

The recommendations contained in this report are consistent with Outcomes and Strategic Objectives outlined in the LTTCP. In particular;

**Outcome 1: A thriving and diverse local economy that provides the foundation for a quality lifestyle.**

*Strategic Objective – Our community has access to quality infrastructure (roading, water, footpaths, wastewater, and storm water) that is efficient and reliable (Priority Objective).*

**Outcome 2: Natural and developed environments are sustained for the enjoyment of current and future generations.**

*Strategic Objective – Water, land and air are managed sustainably (Priority Objective).*

#### **4.10.8 FINANCIAL**

There are no financial implications arising from the recommendation contained in this report.

Prepared By:

J K CHAPMAN  
**Administration Officer**

Approved by:

R S ROUSE  
**Operations Manager**

## ASHBURTON DISTRICT COUNCIL REPORT

FILE NO: PC9/2010  
DATE: 20 May 2010  
REPORT TO: Council  
FROM: Senior District Planner  
SUBJECT: Trevors Road Private Plan Change – Final consideration of change to the District Plan

---

### 4.11 TREVORS ROAD PLAN CHANGE – FINAL CONSIDERATION

#### 4.11.1 SUMMARY

The Council's final consideration of the Trevors Road Private Plan Change (No 9) is necessary for the Plan Change to become operative. There have been no appeals on the decision, which was notified to the public on 10 February 2010, and the Council can therefore approve the Plan Change.

#### 4.11.2 RECOMMENDATION

- |  |
|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. That the report be received.</li><li>2. That the Trevors Road Plan Change to the Operative District Plan be approved in accordance with Clause 17, Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991, so that the Council seal can be affixed to the decision and that the Operative District Plan be amended in accordance with the approved decision."</li></ol> |
|--|

#### 4.11.3 BACKGROUND

G and A McPhail lodged a request for a private plan change under the First Schedule of the Resource Management Act 1991 ("RMA") for the rezoning of land held in Lots 9, 10 and 17 DP 33674 on Trevors Road, Wakanui Road and Beach Road East from Rural A to Residential, Residential A, Rural-Residential, Business 2 and Open Space. The Plan Change includes an Outline Development Plan and amendments to rules in the Residential zone and Subdivision chapters of the Operative District Plan.

The Proposed Private Plan Change was publicly notified on 6 May 2009, and the period for submissions closing on 5 June 2009. A total of six submissions were received. The period for further submissions ended on 21 July 2009, with one further submission received. The hearing of the application was held in the Council Chambers of Ashburton District Council on 24 November 2009.

The decision of the Hearings Panel, which included a change to the proposed zoning of land from Business 2 to Residential, was notified on 10 February 2010. From this date a statutory appeal period of 30 working days commenced. The statutory period for appeals to the Environment Court has closed and no appeals have been received to the Plan Change decision.

#### 4.11.4 OPTIONS

There is one option available to the Council which is to approve Plan Change No 9.

#### 4.11.5 STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS

Clause 17 to the First Schedule of the Resource Management Act 1991 states:

***Final consideration of policy statements and plans other than regional coastal plans***

*(2) A local authority may approve part of a policy statement or plan, if all submissions or appeals relating to that part have been disposed of.*

*[(3) Every approval under this clause shall be effected by affixing the seal of the local authority to the proposed policy statement or plan.*

The approval is in accordance with Clause 17 to the First Schedule of the Resource Management Act 1991

#### 4.11.6 CONSULTATION

No further consultation is necessary for this stage of the Private Plan Change process.

#### 4.11.7 STRATEGIC LINKS

**Community Outcome 2: Natural and developed environments are sustained for the enjoyment of current and future generations**

- a. Water, land and air are managed sustainably. (Priority)
- b. Our towns and rural areas are developed in ways that respect the local environment and meet the needs of the community. (Priority Objective)
- c. Our community understands the need to protect our natural environment and acts to do so.

#### 4.11.8 FINANCIAL

No additional costs are incurred in approving the Trevors Road Plan Change.

Prepared By:

Approved by:

M STEVENSON  
Senior District Planner

J MCKENZIE  
Environmental Services Manager

## ASHBURTON DISTRICT COUNCIL REPORT

FILE NO: PC11/2010  
DATE: 20 May 2010  
REPORT TO: Council  
FROM: Senior District Planner  
SUBJECT: Carters Estate Private Plan Change – Final consideration of change to the District Plan

---

### 4.12 CARTERS ESTATE PLAN CHANGE – FINAL CONSIDERATION

#### 4.12.1 SUMMARY

The Council's final consideration of the Carters Estate Private Plan Change (No 11) is necessary for the Plan Change to become operative. There have been no appeals on the decision, which was notified to the public on 4 March 2010, and the Council can therefore approve the Plan Change.

#### 4.12.2 RECOMMENDATION

- |  |
|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. That the report be received.</li><li>2. That the Carters Estate Plan Change to the Operative District Plan be approved in accordance with Clause 17, Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991, so that the Council seal can be affixed to the decision and that the Operative District Plan be amended in accordance with the approved decision."</li></ol> |
|--|

#### 4.12.3 BACKGROUND

Carters Estate Ltd lodged a request for a private plan change under the First Schedule of the Resource Management Act 1991 ("RMA") for the rezoning of a 9.05 ha site between Carters Road and Racecourse Road from Rural A to Residential. The purpose of the Plan Change is to provide for low density residential development with a minimum allotment size of 2,000m<sup>2</sup>. The Plan Change includes an Outline Development Plan and amendments to rules in the Residential zone and Subdivision chapters of the Operative District Plan.

The Proposed Private Plan Change was publicly notified on 16 September 2009, the period for submissions closing on 14 October 2009. A total of six submissions were received. The period for further submissions ended on 27 November, with one further submission received. The hearing of the application was held in the Council Chambers of Ashburton District Council on 10 February 2010.

The decision of the Hearings Panel was sent to all submitters, following which a statutory appeal period of 30 working days commenced. The statutory period for appeals to the Environment Court has closed and no appeals have been received to the Plan Change decision.

#### 4.12.4 OPTIONS

There is one option available to the Council which is to approve Plan Change No 11.

#### 4.12.5 STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS

Clause 17 to the First Schedule of the Resource Management Act 1991 states:

***Final consideration of policy statements and plans other than regional coastal plans***

*(2) A local authority may approve part of a policy statement or plan, if all submissions or appeals relating to that part have been disposed of.*

*[(3) Every approval under this clause shall be effected by affixing the seal of the local authority to the proposed policy statement or plan.*

The approval is in accordance with Clause 17 to the First Schedule of the Resource Management Act 1991

#### **4.12.6 CONSULTATION**

No further consultation is necessary for this stage of the Private Plan Change process.

#### **4.12.7 STRATEGIC LINKS**

**Community Outcome 2: Natural and developed environments are sustained for the enjoyment of current and future generations**

- a. Water, land and air are managed sustainably. (Priority)
- b. Our towns and rural areas are developed in ways that respect the local environment and meet the needs of the community. (Priority Objective)
- c. Our community understands the need to protect our natural environment and acts to do so.

#### **4.12.8 FINANCIAL**

No additional costs are incurred in approving the Carters Estate Limited Plan Change.

Prepared By:

Approved by:

M STEVENSON  
**Senior District Planner**

J MCKENZIE  
**Environmental Services Manager**

## ASHBURTON DISTRICT COUNCIL REPORT

FILE NO: PC10/2010  
DATE: 20 May 2010  
REPORT TO: Council  
FROM: Senior District Planner  
SUBJECT: Plan Change for Areas of Significant Nature Conservation Value (Group 2)–  
Final consideration of change to the District Plan

---

### 4.13 PLAN CHANGE FOR AREAS OF SIGNIFICANT NATURE CONSERVATION VALUE (GROUP 2)– FINAL CONSIDERATION

#### 4.13.1 SUMMARY

The Council's final consideration of the Plan Change for Areas of Significant Nature Conservation Value (No 10) is necessary for the Plan Change to become operative. There have been no appeals on the decision, which was notified to the public on 24 February 2010, and the Council can therefore approve the Plan Change.

#### 4.13.2 RECOMMENDATION

- |  |
|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>“1. That the report be received.</li><li>2. That the Plan Change to the Operative District Plan for ‘Areas of Significant Nature Conservation Value (Group 2) be approved in accordance with Clause 17, Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991, so that the Council seal can be affixed to the decision and that the Operative District Plan be amended in accordance with the approved decision.”</li></ol> |
|--|

#### 4.13.3 BACKGROUND

The Plan Change amends the District Plan to appropriately reflect the process that has been undertaken to review the Group 2 Areas of Significant Nature Conservation Value (ASCV), in order to avoid significant adverse effects and remedy or mitigate other adverse effects on the ecological integrity and functioning, habitat values and natural character of areas of significant nature conservation value in accordance with Policy 4 (3.1.3.2) of the District Plan.

The scope of the proposed Plan Change is limited to Group 2 ASCV sites only, by:

- transferring those sites in Group 2, which have been assessed as having significant nature conservation values, into Group 1.
- removing from the District Plan those sites in Group 2, which have been assessed as not having significant nature conservation values.
- amending site boundaries to adjust areas of Group 2 sites to be included in Group 1 sites.

The Proposed Plan Change was publicly notified on 12 August 2009; the period for submissions closing on 10 September 2009. A total of nine submissions were received. The period for further submissions ended on 19 October 2009, with two further submissions received. The hearing of the application was held in the Council Chambers of Ashburton District Council on 18 December 2009.

The decision of the Hearings Panel was notified on 24 February 2010. From this date a statutory appeal period of 30 working days commenced. The statutory period for appeals to the Environment Court has closed and no appeals have been received to the Plan Change decision.

#### **4.13.4 OPTIONS**

There is one option available to the Council which is to approve Plan Change No 10.

#### **4.13.5 STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS**

Clause 17 to the First Schedule of the Resource Management Act 1991 states:

***Final consideration of policy statements and plans other than regional coastal plans***

*(2) A local authority may approve part of a policy statement or plan, if all submissions or appeals relating to that part have been disposed of.*

*[(3) Every approval under this clause shall be effected by affixing the seal of the local authority to the proposed policy statement or plan.*

The approval is in accordance with Clause 17 to the First Schedule of the Resource Management Act 1991

#### **4.13.6 CONSULTATION**

No further consultation is necessary for this stage of the Plan Change process.

#### **4.13.7 STRATEGIC LINKS**

**Community Outcome 2: Natural and developed environments are sustained for the enjoyment of current and future generations**

- a. Water, land and air are managed sustainably. (Priority)
- b. Our towns and rural areas are developed in ways that respect the local environment and meet the needs of the community. (Priority Objective)
- c. Our community understands the need to protect our natural environment and acts to do so.

#### **4.13.8 FINANCIAL**

No additional costs are incurred in approving the Plan Change for Areas of Significant Nature Conservation Value (Group 2).

Prepared By:

Approved by:

M STEVENSON  
Senior District Planner

J MCKENZIE  
Environmental Services Manager

## ASHBURTON DISTRICT COUNCIL REPORT

FILE NO:  
DATE: 20 May 2010  
REPORT TO: Council  
FROM: Community Planning Manager  
SUBJECT: Canterbury Water Management Strategy – Zone Committee Establishment

---

### 4.14 CANTERBURY WATER MANAGEMENT STRATEGY – ZONE COMMITTEE ESTABLISHMENT

#### 4.14.1 SUMMARY

As part of the process of establishing the Ashburton Water Management Zone Committee Council needs to adopt the Terms of Reference for the Ashburton Water Management Zone Committee including an appendix Terms of Reference for the combined Ashburton and Selwyn/ Waihora Zone Subcommittee which will deal with issues affecting the Rakaia River and its catchment.

Council is also required to appoint its two representatives to the Zone Committee Selection Working Group which will undertake a selection process for candidates seeking positions on the Zone Water Management Committee.

#### 4.14.2 RECOMMENDATION

“1. That Council adopts the Terms of Reference for the Ashburton Water Management Zone Committee including Appendix I - Terms of Reference for the combined Ashburton and Selwyn/ Waihora Zone Subcommittee; and

2. That Council appoints \_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_ as its representatives on the Ashburton Zone Committee Selection Working Group.”

#### 4.14.3 BACKGROUND

The Canterbury Water Management Strategy is moving to its implementation phase with the establishment of Zone Water Management Committees which will develop implementation plans for the ten water management zones in Canterbury.

As part of the process of establishing the Ashburton Water Management Zone Committee Council needs to adopt the Terms of Reference for the Ashburton Water Management Zone Committee including an appendix Terms of Reference for the combined Ashburton and Selwyn/ Waihora Zone Subcommittee which will deal with issues affecting the Rakaia River and its catchment. The draft Terms of Reference are attached to this report.

Council is also required to appoint its two representatives to the Zone Committee Selection Working Group which will undertake a selection process for candidates seeking positions on the Zone Water Management Committee.

The Selection Working Group is to comprise two elected councillors from Ashburton District, two appointees from the Regional Council, a representative from Te Runanga o Arowhenua, and one person from Canterbury Water Executive.

Council will also need to appoint its elected member representative to the Ashburton Zone Committee in the next month or so.

#### 4.14.4 STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS

The Committee will be a joint committee of Ashburton District Council and Environment Canterbury, and as such, the Council must be represented by elected member. The Committee will report to Council.

#### 4.14.5 OPTIONS AND RISKS CONSIDERED

Not applicable.

#### 4.14.6 STRATEGIC LINKS

The work of the Ashburton Zone Water Management Committee is expected to contribute to achieving the following strategic goals of Council

##### **Ashburton District Community Outcomes**

##### ***Outcome 1: A thriving and diverse local economy that provides the foundation for a quality lifestyle***

- a. A growing population enjoying a high quality of life
- b. A prosperous and diverse local economy, and a skilled workforce
- c. A community with access to quality infrastructure (roading, water, footpaths, wastewater and storm water) that is efficient and reliable **(Priority Objective)**
- d. We recognise the importance of access to sustainable water sources for our economy and work together to make a water storage facility a reality **(Priority Objective)**

##### ***Outcome 2: Natural and developed environments are sustained for the enjoyment of current and future generations***

- a. Water, land and air are managed sustainably **(Priority Objective)**
- b. Towns and rural areas are developed in a way which enhances the local environment and meets the needs of the community **(Priority Objective)**
- c. Our community understands the need to protect our natural environment and acts to do so

##### ***Outcome 7: A community that contributes to improving our quality of life through democratic participation***

- a. The community is provided with opportunities to participate in local decision-making
- c. Advocacy by Community leaders for identified local concerns and issues at a local, regional and national level **(Priority Objective)**

##### **Canterbury Water Management Strategy**

The principles, vision and targets of the strategy

#### 4.14.7 CONSULTATION

Not applicable at this stage.

#### 4.14.8 FINANCIAL

Council will share in the cost of administering the Ashburton Zone Water Management Committee with the Regional Council. This has been provided for in the 2010/ 11 budget.

Report Prepared By

G THOMAS  
**Community Planning Manager**

Report Approved By

B LESTER  
**Chief Executive**

## ASHBURTON DISTRICT COUNCIL REPORT

FILE NO:  
DATE: 20 May 2010  
REPORT TO: Council  
FROM: Manager Democracy & Community Services  
SUBJECT: Methven Heritage Project

---

### 4.15 METHVEN HERITAGE PROJECT

#### 4.15.1 BACKGROUND

On 17 September 2009, Council resolved –

*“That, on the basis of the personal guarantees being in place to cover the \$500,000 loan facility, Council allows CBS Canterbury to register a security over the Heritage Centre.”*

The Trust now advises that it was always its intention to have access to \$600,000 and it is reliant upon that sum being available. The personal guarantees given in respect of the original sum (\$500K) remain in respect of the \$600K with each of the five guarantors pledging \$120,000 if required.

Council is certainly exposing itself to risk in respect of a larger sum, however it also has the same level of commitment from the guarantors.

#### 4.15.2 RECOMMENDATION

- |   |
|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. That Council rescinds its resolution of 17 September 2009.</li><li>2. That, on the basis of the personal guarantees being in place to cover the \$600,000 loan facility, Council allows CBS Canterbury to register a security over the Heritage Centre.”</li></ol> |
|---|

J G ROLLINSON  
**Manager**  
**Democracy & Community Services**

## ASHBURTON DISTRICT COUNCIL REPORT

FILE NO: 7/13/9 1/1/8  
DATE: 20 May 2010  
REPORT TO: Council  
FROM: Policy Advisor  
SUBJECT: Smoke-free Sports Fields Policy

---

### 4.16 SMOKE-FREE SPORTS FIELDS POLICY LAUNCH

#### 4.16.1 SUMMARY

In February 2010, Council adopted a policy extending the existing Smoke-free Playgrounds policy to include Council sports fields in Ashburton (Ashburton Domain, Argyle Park, Digby Park and Robilliard Park).

When Council adopted the policy it undertook to work in partnership with Smoke-free Mid Canterbury to ensure its successful launch on World Smoke free Day, 31<sup>st</sup> May 2010.

A communication plan has been developed to ensure that the partnership between Council and Smoke-free Mid Canterbury makes the best possible use of the resources available.

#### 4.16.2 RECOMMENDATION

"That the report be received."
--------------------------------

#### 4.16.3 BACKGROUND

An initial Smoke-free Playgrounds Policy was adopted by Council in 2007, following a proposal put forward by two Hampstead School students at the Young Persons Forum. This proposal was supported by the Canterbury District Health Board and the Cancer Society. The initial proposal requested Council to make the Friedlander Park smoke-free.

The Services and Operations Committee, at its meeting on 1 February 2007, adopted a recommendation that the playground at Friedlander Park be made smoke free through voluntary compliance and, if the concept proved successful, all other playgrounds in the district be made smoke free before the end of 2007.

At the Finance and Community Services meeting on 15 November 2007, it was decided all Council owned playgrounds would be smoke-free. Council adopted the Smoke-free Playgrounds Policy on the 22 November 2007.

The policy was communicated through on-site signage funded jointly by Smoke-free Mid Canterbury and Council. Smoke-free Mid Canterbury funded the sign writing of 20 signs (totalling approximately \$4,000) and Council covered the remaining costs of the powder coating, making of sign frames and installation (totalling approximately \$4,000).

Smoke-free Mid Canterbury and the Canterbury District Health Board made submissions to Council's Community Plan 2009/19 requesting that Council extend its current policy to include all Council owned parks, playgrounds, sports fields, and the proposed new aquatic centre and indoor stadium as smoke-free. Council resolved during the submission deliberation process that this proposal would be investigated further.

A report was presented to the Finance and Community Services meeting on Thursday 29 October 2009, regarding the extension of the existing Smoke free Playgrounds policy to include sports fields also. The sports fields proposed to be included in this policy are in the Ashburton Domain, Argyle Park, Robilliard Park and Digby Park.

The Committee agreed to the development of an educative playgrounds and sport fields policy for these areas, and this was adopted by Council in February 2010.

Through the different agencies involved with Smoke-free Mid Canterbury the smoke-free message is now being widely spread throughout the community. The extension of Council's existing policy to include selected sports fields contributes to supporting the smoke-free message throughout the community. Council and Smoke-free are working together to ensure the policy is recognisable and well understood by the community.

The policy is being launched to coincide with World Smoke free Day, 31 May 2010. A communication plan has been developed to ensure the launch of Council's smoke-free sports field policy makes the best use of the resources available. Specifically the plan aims to ensure that the messages regarding the policy are consistent, timely and accurate.

Community and Public Health have funding available for the implementation of the policy through signage and a launch event. Council is able to use existing resources to support Community and Public Health with the launch of the policy.

- The following 'tools and tactics' have been utilised for the launch of the policy:
  - Media Releases – local newspapers and radio
  - Radio Advertising
  - Community Noticeboard
  - District Diary
  - Feature page in The Guardian
  - Broadcast on Canterbury TV
  - Memo to Elected Members
  - Memo to ADC Staff
  - Signage
  - Free give aways' at Saturday morning sport (including drink bottles, lip balm, key rings and corner flags)
  - Council website

All elected members are invited to attend the launch event on Saturday 29 May, 2010 at 9am at Argyle Park.

#### **4.16.4 OPTIONS & RISKS CONSIDERED**

There are no options or risks to be considered.

#### **4.16.5 STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS**

The Local Government Act (2002) (Section 10) states that one of the purposes of Council is to promote the social, economic, environment and cultural wellbeing of communities, in the present and for the future.

The Health Act (1956) (Section 23) states it is the duty of every local authority to improve, promote and protect public health within its district.

The Smoke-free Environments Act (1990) requires all school and early childhood centre buildings and grounds to be smoke free and licensed premises and workplaces to be smoke free indoors amongst other statutory requirements.

Council is not obligated by the Smoke-free Environments Act to designate public open spaces as smoke free, however, in promoting the broad objectives of the Local Government Act (2002) and Health Act (1956) Council may choose to do so.

#### **4.16.6 CONSULTATION**

There is no consultation required.

#### 4.16.7 STRATEGIC LINKS

##### Community Outcomes

##### ***Outcome 5: Healthy, Active People enjoying a good quality of life in a caring and safe community***

###### *Strategic Objectives:*

- a. Healthy, active people with good access to health services (Priority Objective)
- b. A range of agencies work together to create a safe environment
- d. Young people are supported to lead healthy and safe lives and are active participants in community life

##### ***Outcome 6: A community with access to a variety of cultural, recreational and heritage experiences and facilities that enrich our quality of life***

###### *Strategic Objectives:*

- a. Cultural, recreational and heritage experiences and facilities are accessible to the community and actively used

#### 4.16.8 FINANCIAL

Community and Public Health have sourced funding to cover the costs of the signage and promotional material for the launch of the policy. Council will cover the costs of installing the signage from existing budgets.

Promotion of the policy is being undertaken at no additional cost through Council's existing communication channels (eg District Diary, Radio Advertising and Local Media) and through Smoke-free Mid Canterbury's publicity links.

Prepared By:

T DURHAM  
Policy Advisor

Approved by:

G THOMAS  
Community Planning Manager

## ASHBURTON DISTRICT COUNCIL REPORT

FILE NO: 3/7/1  
DATE: 20 May 2010  
REPORT TO: Council  
FROM: Community Services Officer  
SUBJECT: Creative Communities Funding

---

### 4.17 CREATIVE COMMUNITIES FUNDING

**Report and Minutes** of a meeting of the **Creative Communities Funding Assessment Committee**, held in Meeting Room 2, 5 Baring Square West, Ashburton, on Thursday 29 April, 2010, commencing at 10.10 am.

**PRESENT:** Cr R Beavan (Chair), Cr J Sparks, Mr V Barrett, Mr D Favel, Mr J Ross, Mrs J Wilkinson.

Also in attendance Community Services Officer.

**APOLOGIES:** Mayor, Mrs J Wright, Mr D Favel (lateness)

Barrett/Ross

**Sustained**

#### *Correspondence*

The Committee has received a letter from the Minerals to Art Festival organisers advising that their festival will not be going ahead. They have returned \$3000 to the Creative Communities Scheme. A letter has been sent to Minerals to Arts thanking them for returning funding and encouraging them to reapply for their proposed 2011 festival.

The Committee agreed that the Ashburton Parent Centre should be asked to return the funding from 2009 and encouraged to reapply for the next round.

*David Favel attended the meeting at 10:21am.*

#### *Schedule of Applications*

The Committee had a total of **\$14,983.60** (this includes the \$3000 returned by the Minerals to Arts organisers) available to distribute and agreed that funding be distributed as follows:

Number	Applicant	Amount Requested	Amount Granted
<b>PROJECTS THAT INCREASE PARTICIPATION IN THE ARTS</b>			
1	Hakatere Maori Komiti	6650.00	2400.00
2	Methven District Heritage Association	536.36	402.00
3	Ashburton College Drama Department	1125.00	1000.00
4	Ashburton Society of Performing Arts Inc	1310.00	1310.00
5	Ashburton Writers Group	100.00	100.00
6	United Filipinos in Mid Canterbury	5243.00	3400.00

<b>PROJECTS THAT INCREASE THE RANGE AND DIVERSITY OF THE ARTS AVAILABLE TO THE COMMUNITY</b>			
7	Methven Theatre Company	2227.50	2000.00
8	Ashburton Art Gallery – “Sweet As” exhibition <i>Joan Wilkinson declared an interest</i>	2500.00	1500.00
9	Ashburton Art Gallery – “Crescent Moon” exhibition <i>Joan Wilkinson declared an interest</i>	2500.00	2000.00
10	Annie’s Country Quilt Store	420.00	200.00
<b>PROJECTS THAT ENHANCE AND STRENGTHEN THE LOCAL ARTS SECTOR</b>			
11	Variety Theatre Ashburton <i>David Favel declared an interest</i>	500.00	500.00
<b>Total:</b>		<b>23,111.86</b>	<b>14,812.00</b>

The Committee allocated the funding to the Hakatere Marae Komiti on the condition that it was used for tutor costs. Under Creative New Zealand criteria, funding cannot be allocated for Catering costs.

On allocation of the funding to the Ashburton Writers Group, the Committee requested that they be asked to better advertise their competition and advised that arts-related promotional activities can also be funded through the Creative Communities Scheme.

The funding allocated to the United Filipinos in Mid Canterbury was designated primarily for the full \$2333.33 for costumes. The Committee did not see costumes as being classified as equipment in this instance. The balance of the funding was to go towards musical instruments.

Annie’s Country Quilt Store was allocated \$200 towards wages for manning the exhibition. The Committee agreed that this was **not** “ongoing salaries and administration costs” which criteria states is exempt from funding.

### ***General Business***

The Committee discussed the timing of the next funding round and agreed to hold this one month earlier due to Local Body Elections on 9 October 2010 and the subsequent change of assessment committee. In recent rounds, applications have closed 30 September but the Committee proposes to call for applications a month earlier, closing 31 August 2010.

The new, recently signed contract with Creative New Zealand, effective 1 July 2010, specifies that

*“The Territorial Authority agrees to:*

- 3.6 hold at least two and a maximum of four funding rounds each financial year and the Scheme’s local administrator will inform Creative New Zealand of the dates of these funding rounds”*

### ***Presentation of Funding***

Up to 5% of the scheme’s annual allocation can be spent on promotion of the scheme. The Committee agreed to hold the presentation evening for the successful applicants, at 5.30 pm on Friday 21 May, 2010 at the Council administration office.

The meeting concluded at 11:50am.

## **CREATIVE COMMUNITIES FUNDING AGREEMENT**

The Ashburton District Council has recently signed a further three year agreement with Creative New Zealand for the continued administration and allocation of the Creative Communities Scheme within the Ashburton District.

The new agreement allows for \$21, 423 (excluding GST) to be distributed annually, for three years. Currently the funds are distributed to applicants in two funding rounds each financial year with applications closing 30 September and 31 March.

The allocated funding is based on a funding formula of:

- A base grant of \$5000
- \$.60 per capita
- A GST component

The assessment committee currently comprises the Mayor and two elected members of the Ashburton District Council along with iwi and community representatives from differing arts backgrounds, democratically nominated and elected following each local body election.

From 1 July 2010, Creative New Zealand is requesting that the Assessment Committee composition adhere to the following provisions:

- Ideally, no more than two members of the assessment committee should be elected councillors and/or community board members;
- Elected councillors and/or community board members shall not comprise more than 50% of the assessment committee;
- Ideally, the chairperson is to be elected by the assessment committee. The chairperson should not serve more than two consecutive years;
- Recommendations must be sought from the local iwi or hapu for at least one member to be appointed. In areas with more than one iwi or tangata whenua group it is suggested that representation is sought from each iwi;
- At least one member is to be appointed on the recommendation of local community arts councils;
- The balance of members will consist of community representatives familiar with the range and diversity of local arts and community activities;
- Community representatives cannot be elected council members or community board members appointed by the Territorial Authority;
- Community representatives will be recruited in an open and public way using:
  - Public nomination processes; and
  - Public election processes; or, if necessary;
  - Recommendations from communities or community arts organisations;
- The Scheme's local administrator will provide Creative New Zealand with an annual update on the composition of the assessment committee.

Creative New Zealand forwards funding to the Ashburton District Council in two installments, August and February each year, and this will continue under the new contract. Currently Ashburton District Council distributes that funding on behalf of Creative New Zealand twice annually, with applications closing 30 September and 31 March.

At the recent meeting of the Creative Communities Assessment Committee on 29 April 2010, the Committee discussed the timing of the next funding round and agreed to hold this one month earlier due to Local Body Elections on 9 October 2010 and the subsequent change of assessment committee. In recent rounds, applications have closed 30 September but the committee proposes to call for applications a month earlier, closing 31 August 2010.

The new, recently signed contract with Creative New Zealand, effective 1 July 2010, specifies that

*“The Territorial Authority agrees to:*

*3.6 hold at least two and a maximum of four funding rounds each financial year and the Scheme’s local administrator will inform Creative New Zealand of the dates of these funding rounds”*

This change in date will allow the current committee to undertake the next funding round, with a new assessment committee being elected following local body elections in October 2010. The committee also agreed that it would be advantageous to continue with two funding rounds each financial year, instead of increasing it to three or four as the contract allows. It was felt that, as the funding would be reduced for each round, it would not be advantageous to the groups applying. However, this is subject to discussion with the election of the new assessment committee.

**Prepared By:**

J NAYLOR  
**Community Services Officer**

**Approved by:**

J G ROLLINSON  
**Manager**  
**Democracy & Community Services**

## ASHBURTON DISTRICT COUNCIL REPORT

FILE NO: 3/7/2  
DATE: 20 May 2010  
REPORT TO: Council  
FROM: Community Services Officer  
SUBJECT: SPARC Rural Travel Fund 2010

---

### 4.18 SPARC RURAL TRAVEL FUND 2010

**Report and Minutes** of a meeting of the **SPARC Rural Travel Fund Assessment Committee**, held in Meeting Room two, 5 Baring Square West, Ashburton, on Thursday 18 March, 2010, commencing at 10.10 am.

**PRESENT:** Cr K Lowe (Chair), Cr J Everest, Mrs P Paterson, and Mr M Urquhart  
Also in attendance Community Services Officer

**APOLOGIES:** Mr B Jonas, Mrs C Murdoch, Mrs M Hooper **Sustained**

Mr Jonas informed the Community Services Officer that he has resigned from the Committee as he has had to move back to Auckland for family reasons. The Committee agreed to leave his position vacant, as applications will be called for representatives of the SPARC Committee following the Local Body Elections in October 2010.

On investigation prior to the meeting, Fiona Ramsay advised that Chess is not on SPARC's list of recognized sports. She also confirmed that the funding does not extend to the Ashburton College Senior A Netball Team, as they are choosing to travel to an elite competition.

“That the Ashburton College Press Chess Team and Ashburton College Senior A Netball Team applications be declined and removed from the applications.”

Urquhart/Everest

**Carried**

The Committee members had a number of queries about the applications received and the Community Services Officer will follow up on these and report back to the Committee on 24 March. To question whether there is a local competition for:

- Ashburton College 1<sup>st</sup> XV boys
- Collegians Senior Women's Hockey Team
- Mid Canterbury Football

The Committee allocated initial funding to the teams and said they would revise this according to the outcome of the enquiries.

Following the meeting, Mrs Murdoch approached to ask if the following teams could also be questioned as to whether there was a local competition or whether they were choosing to play in an elite competition.

- Ashburton College Boys 1<sup>st</sup> XI Cricket Team
- Ashburton College Girls 1<sup>st</sup> XI Cricket Team
- Ashburton College Boys 1<sup>st</sup> XI Football Team

The meeting was adjourned at 11.35 am and resumed on Wednesday 24 March at 10.11 am, in Meeting Room 2.

---

**PRESENT:** Cr K Lowe (Chair), Mrs P Paterson, Mr M Urquhart, and Mrs M Hooper  
Also in attendance Community Services Officer

**APOLOGIES:** Cr J Everest, Mr B Jonas, Mrs C Murdoch

**Sustained**

***Schedule of Applications for Consideration***

This year we received 19 applications requesting a total of \$36,162.

A total of \$13,150 was available for distribution.

The Committee agreed that the funding be distributed as follows:

Ashburton Celtic Rugby Club U16 Team	\$1,400.00	500
Ashburton College Press Chess Team	\$348.00	Declined
Ashburton College Boys First Eleven Cricket Team	\$800.00	500
Ashburton College Girls First Eleven Cricket Team	\$500.00	500
Ashburton College Boys First Eleven Football Team	\$1,000.00	700
Ashburton College Senior A Netball Team	\$920.00	Declined
Ashburton College Rowing	\$6,080.00	1000
Ashburton College Boys First Fifteen Rugby Team	\$1,000.00	500
Ashburton College Girls Rugby	\$1,000.00	500
Ashburton Swim Team	\$5,980.00	800
Collegians Senior Women's Hockey Team	\$2,688.00	250
Methven Cricket Club 3 <sup>rd</sup> , 4 <sup>th</sup> and 5 <sup>th</sup> Grade Teams	\$1,390.00	500
Methven Netball Club	\$2,016.00	1000
Methven Rugby Football Club Inc	\$1,500.00	1200
Methven Junior Tennis Teams	\$1,040.00	700
Mid Canterbury Football	\$4,000.00	1000
Rakaia Hockey Club	\$1,000.00	500
Rakaia Netball Club	\$2,000.00	1000
Southern Netball Club	\$1,500.00	1000
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$36,162.00</b>	<b>\$12,150.00</b>

***Presentation of Funding***

The Committee agreed to hold the presentation evening for the successful applicants at 5.30 pm on Thursday 22 April in the Council administration office.

The meeting closed at 10.55 am.

## ASHBURTON DISTRICT COUNCIL REPORT

FILE NO: 1/1/13/1  
DATE: 20 May 2010  
REPORT TO: Council  
FROM: Youth Council  
SUBJECT: Youth Council Update Report and Minutes of Meeting (4/05/10)

---

### 4.19 YOUTH COUNCIL UPDATE & MINUTES OF MEETING 4/05/10

#### 4.19.1 BACKGROUND

The Ashburton District Council Youth Council was established in 2000 as a result of a Youth Forum and currently comprises 16 Youth Councillors. The current members are: Luke Howden (Chairperson), Stacey Smith (Vice Chair), Nick Evans, Izzy Ferguson, Tristan Gibson, Tara Jopson, Sara Kircher, Jazzlyn Leonard, George McDonald, Kate Moses, Shama Putaranui, Olivia Quinn, Henrietta Read, Sam Ruck, Blair Stevenson and Caitlin Warwood.

Councillors Jac Sparks and Robin Kilworth provide an essential link to Council and a wealth of information and support.

The Youth Council aims to make a difference and speak on behalf of our local youth.

#### 4.19.2 UPDATE

Since our last update to Council at a "Meet and Greet" in November 2009, we have grown to a full council of 16 youth councillors who bring ideas and enthusiasm, all led by our newly elected chairperson, Luke Howden, and vice chairperson, Stacey Smith, who we all know will do an amazing job at leading their peers.

##### **What have we been up to.....?**

In support of Youth Week (22-30 May) we have had a sausage sizzle at Harvey Norman with proceeds going towards the youth week activities and our 40 hour film challenge "SHOOT", which will be followed by the red carpet premiere at the Regent Cinema. We held a successful dance party in March at Base Youth Cafe with all profits going back into the youth cafe a purposeful endeavour which we believe provides a lot for our local youth. As well as these events the Youth Council helped out on Children's Day which was held at the Tinwald Domain.

##### **Upcoming events...**

We are hoping to hold a "Wearable Arts and New Designers" competition at Base Youth Cafe in October 2010. This event is different to our other events as we are trying to give a creative outlet for youth, giving them a chance to showcase their work and designs.

As we represent Ashburton District Council, as Youth Councillors we want to be able to speak more honestly for the youth of our district and to be able to provide more outlets, education and entertainment in a safe caring environment.

As a group we look forward to more successful events that appeal to all groups and cultures and to make the Ashburton District a better place for youth.

##### **Prepared By:**

BLAIR STEVENSON  
Ashburton Youth Councillor

##### **Approved by:**

J NAYLOR  
Community Services Officer



**MINUTES** of a meeting of the **ASHBURTON YOUTH COUNCIL** held on Tuesday, 4 May 2010, in Council Chambers, Ashburton District Council, commencing at 5.35 pm.

**PRESENT:** Sam Ruck (Chair), Nick Evans, Izzy Ferguson, Tristan Gibson, Luke Howden, Tara Jopson, Sara Kircher, Jazzlyn Leonard, George McDonald, Olivia Quinn, Henrietta Read, Stacey Smith, Blair Stevenson, Caitlin Warwood.

Also in attendance Cr Jac Sparks, Community Services Officer - Jo Naylor (minutes) and Katrina Pritchard

**APOLOGIES:** Cr Robin Kilworth, Kate Moses, Shama Putaranui **Sustained**

### ***Confirmation of Minutes***

"That the minutes of the Ashburton Youth Council meeting held on Tuesday 30 March 2010, be taken as read and confirmed."

Nick/Stacey

**Carried**

### ***Matters Arising***

#### **New Member**

The Youth Council welcomed Henrietta Read to the meeting.

A letter of thanks has been sent to outgoing member Georgia Robertson acknowledging and thanking her for her contribution to the Youth Council.

#### **Base Dance Party**

Jo has sent a cheque to Base Cafe and a letter of apology for the lack of help. She also thanked the adults for supervision.

#### **Sausage Sizzle**

Jazz advised that due to a misunderstanding of dates, the Sausage Sizzle at Harvey Norman did not go ahead on Saturday 24 April. It was instead held on Sunday 2 May and successfully raised \$86.00 to be contributed towards Youth Week activities.

### ***Matters for Discussion***

#### **Katrina Pritchard, Strengthening Families, Ashburton Safer Community Council**

Katrina Pritchard addressed the meeting and advised that she is currently in the process of assisting to put out an information pamphlet that is directed at help for youth. She reported that to have the cost covered by FACS funding she needed to consult with two youth groups. Katrina outlined the progress to date and asked how the Youth Councillors felt about the information on the pamphlet. Youth Councillors suggested that the pamphlets could also be put at GP's offices and the Ashburton Public Library. Katrina was grateful for the input.

#### **Election of Chair person and Vice Chair person for ADC Youth Council**

Nominations received for Chair person and Vice Chairperson for the Youth Council included Stacey Smith, Luke Howden, Tara Jopson, and Nick Evans. A show of hands revealed that Luke Howden was elected for the role of Chairperson and Stacey Smith for the position of Vice Chairperson.

## **Council meeting 20 May at Ashburton College**

Jo advised that the ADC Council meeting will be held at the Ashburton College on 20 May 2010. The Youth Council has been invited to present a report to Council and if time allows, speak to that report. Blair Stevenson offered to write a report.

## **Youth Week Subcommittee Updates**

### SHOOT

- Radio advert: Classic Hits have offered Youth Council a price of \$6 per spot to promote the registration of SHOOT followed by promotion of premier and dance party. The Youth Council agreed to pursue this. Luke will provide the advertising team with a brief to format an advert.
- Newspaper spread: Jo will write a piece to put in the Guardian's new Youth page.
- Costs: most costs will be covered with the grant and Youth Council funding. Agreed to include a registration fee of \$15 per person which will cover a copy of the DVD of the film, a certificate and morning /afternoon teas. BYO lunch.
- Location: Sam to speak to Mr Buckland at Ashburton College on Wednesday to endeavour to confirm drama room. Mr Clark and Miss Mac (teachers) are keen to help out and be involved.
- Poster: Luke showed his poster and website and changes were made.
- Promote the challenge through Mt Hutt College, the Intermediate, and other schools with Year 8's over 12 years.

### Premier night at Regent and Base

- Regent Theatre costs: David Favel has advised that the theatre will be provided free of charge if we just use it for half an hour between his other films. The theatre holds 80 people so numbers will be limited. To investigate the price of popcorn for each attendee.
- DJ Dave cost is \$200 plus GST for the night. Agreed to go ahead.
- Base Cost is \$140 plus GST. Agreed to go ahead.

### Radio

During Youth Week, Youth Council members have the opportunity to appear on the Classic Hits breakfast show with Hoops, from 7am – 8am. The roster for this, is as follows:

- Monday 24 May: Sam and Nick
- Tuesday 25 May: Stacey and Tara
- Wednesday 26 May: Luke and Izzy
- Thursday 27 May: Shama and Sara?
- Friday 28 May: Olivia and Henrietta?

Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday have been confirmed but Thursday and Friday are yet to be confirmed. Please advise Jo as soon as possible if you would like to fill the Thursday or Friday gap between 7am and 8am.

### Youth Council profiles for media

Sam advised that he has received some profiles and will follow up with getting more. We hope to include these in the Youth page of the Ashburton Guardian.

### Photo Competition

Sam has put up posters. Gabrielle Isaak has this competition under control.

### Multi cultural activities at Ashburton College

Sam updated the Youth Council on what activities were being provided at Ashburton College during Youth Week.

## **Scholarship**

Jo advised that she has approached the Democracy and Community Services Manager regarding setting up a scholarship for youth, should there be any funds left over at the end of the year. Although she has not had a confirmed decision, initial discussions have indicated that it is probably not likely to progress in the format desired by the Youth Council. Jo was advised that while it is a good idea, there was difficulty surrounding the issues of irregularity, excluding Youth Councillors and who could determine the recipients. It is also not usual practice for the Council to fund individuals. It is likely that a scholarship like this would have to be done through the Ashburton District Council, not the Youth Council.

The Youth Council agreed that they were keen to pursue this and will work on proposed criteria and a recommendation to Council.

## **Wearable Arts**

Caitlin reported to the meeting that she has received a lot of interest with regard to the Wearable Arts awards. At the last meeting the Youth Council agreed that it may be more beneficial to work towards a smaller, stand alone event later in the year.

Caitlin and Izzy have approached the appropriate teachers at school who are supportive of this event and indicated that they would be happy for students to use the rooms at school to create their entries.

They held a meeting on Monday and discussed the opportunity for kids to get creative and come up with a project to enter the event. Have suggested that the event has two major sections:

Wearable Arts: Fantasy theme possibly with sub sections, ie. Using recycled materials etc

Young Designer Showcase: For the more serious design entry. Young people have their opportunity to showcase their own creations.

Discussed having guest judges for the event.

The Youth Council agreed to hold this on Saturday 16 October 2010. This gives entrants time to develop their entries. The event, held at Base Café, will be followed by a Dance Party. Organisation of this will begin following Youth Week activities.

## ***Next Meeting***

The next meeting of the Ashburton Youth Council will be held on Tuesday 1 June 2010, in Council Chambers.

The next Youth Week Subcommittee meeting will be held on Thursday 13 May at Base Café at 5:30 pm.

The meeting closed at 6:59pm.