



# Ashburton District Council

## AGENDA

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

**Date:** Thursday 27 September 2007

**Venue:** Council Chamber  
5 Baring Square West  
Ashburton

**Time:** 1.30 pm

### MEMBERS:

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

B LESTER  
Chief Executive

21 September 2007

---

# AGENDA

---

	Page
<b>1 APOLOGIES</b>	
<b>OPENING PRAYER</b>	
– Pastor Rob Davison – New Life Church	
<b>2 NOTIFICATION OF EXTRAORDINARY BUSINESS</b>	
<b>3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES</b>	
3.1 Confirmation of Minutes of the 16/08/07 Meeting of Council	1
3.2 Matters Arising	
<b>4 REPORTS</b>	
4.1 Mayor	<i>Tabled</i>
4.2 Chief Executive	9
4.3 <b>Services and Operations Committee — 30 August 2007</b>	15
— Recommendation <i>Receive Minutes of Meeting</i>	
4.4 <b>Environmental Services Committee — 6 September 2007</b>	19
— Recommendation <i>Receive Minutes of Meeting</i>	
4.5 <b>Finance and Corporate Services Committee — 13 September 2007</b>	23
— Recommendation <i>Receive Minutes of Meeting</i>	
— Recommendation <i>Ashburton Bowling Club Lease</i>	
— Recommendation <i>Carry-over of Funds from 2006/ 07 Budget</i>	
4.6 <b>Ashburton District Speed Limits Bylaw – Adoption of Changes</b>	29
Covering Racecourse Road, East Street and Hendersons Road areas	
4.7 <b>Racecourse Road Development – Proposed Subdivision and Development of Land and Infrastructure</b>	31
4.8 <b>Closure of Stockwater Race – Mackies Road Area</b>	39
4.9 <b>Closure of Stockwater Race – Denshires Road South</b>	41
4.10 <b>Acton Stockwater Main – Irrigation Survey</b>	43
4.11 <b>Warrants of Appointment – Operations Department</b>	47
4.12 <b>Ashburton District Rural Fire Plan Review</b>	49



## ASHBURTON DISTRICT COUNCIL REPORT

**FILE NO:** 5/1/8/12  
**DATE:** 27 September 2007  
**REPORT TO:** Council Meeting  
**FROM:** Roading and Street Services Manager  
**SUBJECT:** Ashburton District Speed Limits Bylaw – adoption of changes

---

### **4.6 ASHBURTON DISTRICT SPEED LIMITS BYLAW – ADOPTION OF CHANGES**

#### **– Covering Racecourse Road, East Street and Hendersons Road Areas**

##### **4.6.1 SUMMARY**

Proposed changes to the speed limit bylaw were submitted to Council seeking approval to commence the special consultative procedure required to be followed when adopting changes to a Council Bylaw. This procedure has been carried out, and submissions on the proposed Bylaw changes were requested to be lodged with Council by 10 September 2007. There were no submissions received and Council can now proceed with the proposed changes to the bylaw.

Following adoption of the Bylaw changes by Council, changes to road signs required will be carried out.

##### **4.6.2 RECOMMENDATION**

“That the Ashburton District Speed Limits Bylaw 2005 be amended as follows:

- 1 The maximum speed limit on Racecourse Road from the intersection with West Street to a location 160 m north-west of the intersection of Belt Road is changed from 70 kilometres per hour to 50 kilometres per hour.
- 2 The maximum speed limit on East Street of 50 kilometres per hour is extended to the north east to include the Seafield Road intersection.
- 3 The maximum speed limit on Bremners Road for the first 40 metres to the north-east from the Seafield Road intersection is changed to 50 kilometres per hour.
- 4 The maximum speed limit for the first 144 metres of Seafield Road from East Street intersection is changed to 50 kilometres per hour.
- 5 The maximum speed limit on Hendersons Road for the 500 metres south-east of the Maronan Road intersection be set at 70 kilometres per hour.
- 6 The above amendments to the Bylaw shall become effective from Wednesday 3 October 2007.

### **4.6.3 BACKGROUND**

The proposed changes set out above to the Ashburton District Speed Limits Bylaw 2005 were reported to the 28 June 2007 meeting of Council, recommending that the special consultative procedure required to change a Council Bylaw be commenced, and this was approved by Council.

The proposed speed limit review was advertised in the newspapers as follows

Ashburton Guardian: 8, 11, 15 and 18 August 2007.

The Courier: 14 and 21 August 2007.

Copies of the proposed speed limit changes and associated reports were available for public inspection at the Council Office and at the Ashburton Public Library. Submissions were requested to be lodged with the Council on the appropriate submission form by Monday 10 September 2007.

There were no submissions received.

Council can now proceed to confirm the speed bylaw changes. The Bylaw amendments will be advertised following adoption of this report by Council.

The contractor has been briefed on work required and will install the new signage on the date set out in the resolution.

### **4.6.4 OPTIONS**

The options available to Council are:

- 1 To amend the bylaw
- 2 To not amend the bylaw

The first option is the preferred option. This will bring speed limits on local roads in line with those changed by Transit at the completion of the East St/West St intersection realignment, and improve safety on Hendersons Road at the plastic factory site.

### **4.6.5 STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS**

The amendments proposed to the Bylaw will permit regulation of speed limits by authorised persons under the Transport Act and Regulations.

### **4.6.6 CONSULTATION**

Under the Local Government Act 2002, special consultation procedures should be used to amend a bylaw. This has now been completed and no further consultation is required.

### **4.6.7 STRATEGIC LINKS**

The recommendation in the report is consistent with the LTCCP in improving road safety.

### **4.6.8 FINANCIAL**

The costs to carry out this bylaw amendment and road sign changes will be met from within existing road maintenance budgets. There are no financial implications arising from the recommendations in the report.

D H ROBERTSON  
**Roading and Street Services Manager**

## ASHBURTON DISTRICT COUNCIL REPORT

**FILE NO:** 5/0/21/4  
**DATE:** 27 September 2007  
**REPORT TO:** Council  
**FROM:** Operations Manager  
**SUBJECT:** Racecourse Road Development

---

### 4.7 RACECOURSE ROAD DEVELOPMENT – PROPOSED SUBDIVISION AND DEVELOPMENT OF LAND AND INFRASTRUCTURE

#### 4.7.1 SUMMARY

Council's Development Plan has identified areas of land already zoned residential for future development adjacent to Racecourse Road. The area of land bounded by Mill Creek, Davidson Street, Racecourse Road and Allens Road has been the subject of consultation with landowners with respect to an integrated approach to infrastructure development.

The purpose of this report is to:

- Provide information on the results of the consultation carried out.
- To recommend that Council's involvement in infrastructure development be limited to providing assistance to landowners when they decide to subdivide and to facilitate integration where possible.
- Based on an approach from a significant landowner seek, for the purpose of discussion with the developer Council's approvals regarding the proposed developments interface with and connections to existing public infrastructure.
- Seek Council's approval for the purposes of discussion with the developer to design and/or extend existing public services to service the proposed and future development.
- Outline funding arrangements for the approved extension of existing infrastructure.

#### 4.7.2 RECOMMENDATION

- “1. That involvement in infrastructure development be limited to providing assistance to landowners when they decide to subdivide and facilitate an integrated approach; and
2. That Council approves the following for the purposes of discussion with the developer and their subdivision concept design development:
  - i) one new entry/exit road off Racecourse Road and an extension of Hanrahan Street into the proposed development;
  - ii) a reduction in the workscope for the extension of the Ashburton potable water supply from that budgeted in the 2007/08 Annual Plan;
  - iii) the extension of the Ashburton potable water supply from Belt Road along Racecourse Road to Allens Road, along Allens Road to Middle Road and along Middle Road to the pumping and treatment facilities;
  - iv) Council facilitating the design of a wastewater pumping station and the pumping out of catchment wastewater from the proposed development and any future wastewater connections;

- v) the development of stormwater treatment and disposal systems that meet the requirements of the area of land which is the subject of the proposed development; and
- vi) the recovery of all costs associated with the servicing of the proposed development.”

### 4.7.3 BACKGROUND

The purpose of the Ashburton Development Plan is to present a broad basis for the future development of the district over the next 20 years. The plan was prepared after consultation with interested groups and the wider public.

The plan states with respect to residential land use that:

*The projected growth in population and changes to the demographic, people require consideration to be given to expanding residential land development areas and expanding the type of residential environment that is available to meet existing and future residential needs. Ashburton may also be able to attract new residents to town by offering a range of residential environments.*

The area of land adjacent to Racecourse Road bounded by Mill Creek, Davidson Street, Racecourse Road and Allens Road has been identified as an area for residential development.

Relevant information related to this area of land is summarised below:

- The total area of land is approximately 26ha.
- At the time of consultation there were 15 separate titles and 12 landowners.
- There are three lots that are small and do not lend themselves to an integrated structure plan approach. They can be serviced from public roads immediately adjacent to the potential development area.

Meetings with landowners have been held to:

- Discuss options and identify a preferred layout for a structure plan and possible policy and rules.
- Identify principles by which the subdivision could proceed, eg cost sharing and funding of land purchases and common assets such as infrastructural services.

A response form was provided to landowners seeking comment on the following:

- Do they wish to have any further involvement with Council on this project?
- Do they wish to be involved in a structure plan for the wider area that will control where infrastructure is to be installed at a future date?
- Do they wish to be involved in the planning and design of infrastructure for the wider area and recognise that costs associated with this work will be passed onto the landowners after agreement is reached?
- Do they wish Council to be involved in loan funding for the construction of infrastructure for the wider area and recognise the costs associated with this work will be passed onto the landowner after agreement is reached.

The results of this request for feedback are summarised below. Feedback was requested by 31 August.

- 15 letters were sent to 12 landowners.
- Three of the 12 landowners responded.
- The three landowners that responded indicated they did not wish to have any further involvement with the Council regarding this project for the following reasons:

- One is essentially a small lot, too small for consideration in the wider development
- One landowner has recently sold a significant proportion of their property
- One landowner, because they felt the wider area should be left as bare land as they appreciate the rural aspect and that it would not be in their best interests to be part of the wider group.

Based on the responses to the two meetings held and the two consultation processes carried out regarding an integrated approach to development and servicing, it appears that there is insufficient interest for Council to become involved in this development to a greater extent than it would for any other subdivision regarding the facilitation of servicing and structure planning.

*It is therefore recommended that Councils involvement in infrastructure be limited to providing assistance to landowners when they decide to subdivide and facilitate an integrated approach where possible.*

Subsequent to the latest meeting and consultation process we have been approached by a developer wishing to proceed with the development of their land within the footprint of the area identified. The development and proposal is broadly outlined below:

- The total area of land to be developed that is in their ownership is approximately 15ha. This is a significant proportion of the approximately 26ha potentially available.
- The development will be for approximately 125 lots.
- They are currently working on a subdivision scheme plan and a resource consent application for subdivision which is expected to be lodged during September. No applications have been received to date.
- Entrances to the development are proposed from Racecourse Road and the end of Hanrahan Street with internal roading alignment allowing appropriate connections for future access to the remainder of the development.
- The subdivision can be serviced for water provided the public water supply system is extended along Racecourse Road and Allens Road although not all of this infrastructure is required to service this development. The design work for this extension has been completed by Council and budget provision has been made in the 2007/08 financial year.
- Upgrading of the wastewater reticulation in the area may be required. The depth of existing wastewater mains is an issue but can be resolved by the construction of a pumping station. It is likely that the first stage of the development (50 lots) will not result in capacity issues.
- There appears to be insufficient soakage available for stormwater disposal. All stormwater runoff will have to be discharged into Mill Creek. The discharge is to be initially detained and then discharged at a rate not exceeding pre development flow rates.

A plan indicating a draft layout concept is attached.

Our assessment of the proposal is as follows:

### **Roading**

The developer intends to include roading access from the end of Hanrahan Street and an access road off Racecourse Road.

There were two entry/exit points included in the concept plans previously provided to landowners for discussion and consultation. The proposal is not inconsistent with this concept plan.

There are no technical issues relating to the extension of Hanrahan Street or a new entrance/exit point at Racecourse Road. At this stage it would be our intention to have only one entry/exit point from Racecourse Road with lots within this development having access to the internal roading network. Properties not part of this development will retain their existing access.

During discussions with the developer it was suggested that a Council owned lot between Davidson Street and the proposed development be purchased by the developer to provide access from Davidson Street. The developer has indicated that they will not be pursuing the purchase of this lot for an entrance/exit point.

*It is recommended that Council approves, for the purpose of discussion with the developers, one new entry / exit road off Racecourse Road and an extension of Hanrahan Street into the proposed development.*

All costs directly associated with the development are to be met by the developer and work is to be to Council standards and appropriate consultation is to be carried out and all relevant consents obtained before work commences.

### **Water supply**

The proposed development originally intended to make connection to the existing public water supply network in Racecourse Road, Davidson Street and Hanrahan Street. The existing pipework in each of these streets consists of “old” 100 diameter AC pipes. The proposed development will need to provide fire fighting capacity throughout the development which will exceed the capacity of the existing infrastructure.

As part of the future work on the “Allenton Pressure Zone” the existing main in Racecourse Road is programmed for extension to include a 200mm diameter pipeline from Belt Road to Farm Road and Carters Road and Allens Road as indicated on the attached plan. [Pages ] The pressure zone has been designed to allow for an average lot size in the serviced areas of 800m<sup>2</sup>.

Council will need to make a decision in principal regarding the construction of the new mains and the extent of the work to be carried out.

Design for this extension in its entirety has been completed and budget provision in the sum of \$1,486,373 has been made in the 2007/08 financial year.

*It is recommended that for the purposes of discussion with the developer the work scope be reduced and that the Ashburton water supply reticulation be extended on Racecourse Road from Belt Road to Allens Road, along Allens Road to Middle Road, and along Middle Road to the bore and treatment facility site.*

The developer would be required to reimburse Council for the cost of the capacity of the pipeline to service their development with the balance of costs to be recovered from subsequent connections.

Further options considered are outlined in section 4 of this report.

### **Wastewater**

The developer proposes a connection to the existing public wastewater network in Racecourse Road, Davidson Street and Hanrahan Street. The existing pipework in these streets is 150mm diameter. Hydraulic modelling of the relief sewer on the east side of Ashburton has identified that there is very little spare capacity in this sewer and the connection of the Company Road and South Mark developments will exceed available capacity.

The land slopes to Wakanui Creek from Racecourse Road this combined with the shallow nature of the existing infrastructure may require the development to convey wastewater to a pumping station prior to pumping into the public system.

The best location for a pumping station may be close to Hanrahan Street where wastewater will be pumped “out of catchment” into the pipeline in Hanrahan Street into Belt Road and then into the main in Middle Road bypassing the under capacity relief sewer on the east side of Ashburton.

The construction of a pumping station will allow for the provision of storage to mitigate any capacity issues. It should also be noted that full development is unlikely to occur immediately, Stage 1 has been indicated to include up to 50 lots.

*It is recommended that for the purposes of discussion with the developer Council facilitate the design of the pumping station required and that the wastewater be pumped “out of catchment” to avoid capacity issues in the relief sewer and that the reticulation and pumping station be sized to cater for potential future development”*

The developer would be required to reimburse Council for the cost of the capacity of the pipelines and pumping station including design costs with the balance of costs to be recovered from subsequent connections.

Further options considered are outlined in section 4 of this report.

### **Stormwater**

The proposed development area slopes from Racecourse Road towards Mill Creek and a number of existing overland flow paths traverse the development site and discharge into Mill Creek. It is likely that Mill Creek is the only practicable stormwater discharge option. Stormwater flows generated from within the site would need to be detained and slowly released into Mill Creek to ensure the creek is not overloaded and would require the construction of detention areas. This approach is likely to be consistent with Councils Ashburton Urban Stormwater Strategy which is currently being developed.

With regard to further development and stormwater disposal, there is only one other significant landowner located adjacent to Mill Creek, it is our view that this area when developed should deal with stormwater separately and in the same way as that proposed by the developer of the area of land which is the subject of this report. This will eliminate the need to provide conveyance of stormwater across another landowner’s development.

The developer will be required to ensure the existing flooding issues in Davidson Street will not be exacerbated. It should be noted it is our view that this issue will be reduced as a result of the development.

*It is recommended that for the purpose of discussion with the developer Council approve the development of stormwater treatment and disposal systems that meet the requirements of the area of land in the ownership of the developer.*

The developer will be required to obtain all necessary resource consents for stormwater collection, conveyance, treatment and disposal.

Further options considered are outlined in section 4 of this report.

#### **4.7.4 OPTIONS**

The following options have been considered when developing the recommendations in this report.

##### **Roading**

*Option 1: Approve the extension of Hanrahan Street and a new road access off Racecourse Road.*

This option is consistent with the concept plan that was the subject of consultation with landowners. The extension of Hanrahan Street is consistent with the current alignment and is not likely to result in significant public comment. The new access off Racecourse Road will be located and “buffered” by the developers land and is also not likely to result in significant public comment.

*Option 2: Not approve the extension of Hanrahan Street and allow access off Racecourse Road.*

Not allowing the extension of Hanrahan Street may require the developer to pursue access through the purchase of Lot 4, DP 33461 which is currently located between two residential properties in Davidson Street. The use of this lot for access is less desirable than extending Hanrahan Street. Mill Creek limits access opportunities to the south of the area to be developed.

**The recommended option is Option 1: For the purposes of discussion with the developer approve the extension of Hanrahan Street and a new access road off Racecourse Road.**

### **Water Supply**

*Option 1: Approve the connection of the development to the public water supply infrastructure in Racecourse Road, Davidson Street and Hanrahan Street.*

This option will potentially result in capacity issues and will not provide capacity for fire fighting.

*Option 2: Approve the extension of the public water supply infrastructure along Racecourse Road, Allens Road, Middle Road, Carters Road and Farm Road.*

This option will address capacity issues arising from existing infrastructure and will provide fire fighting capacity. The extension of the public infrastructure to the extent outlined in this option goes significantly beyond that required to meet demand arising from the proposed development. An extension of this scale would allow a larger number of properties to connect but cost recovery would be low compared with the expenditure to fund works west of Allens Road.

*Option 3: Approve a reduced work scope and extend the public water supply infrastructure along Racecourse Road, Allens road and Middle Road to the pumping and treatment facilities.*

The advantages of this option are as for Option 2, however there is less opportunity for properties west of Allens Road to connect to the extended public system. Reducing the work scope as outlined in this option reduces the financial implications for Council arising from funding works and timing issues relating to recovery of costs when new connections are made.

**The recommended option is Option 3: For the purposes of discussions with the developer approve a reduced work scope and extend the public water supply infrastructure along Racecourse Road, Allens Road and Middle Road to the pumping and treatment facilities.**

### **Wastewater**

*Option 1: Approve the connection of wastewater pipelines in Racecourse Road, Davidson Street and Hanrahan Street.*

This option will result in the possibility of overloading the relief sewer on the eastern side of Ashburton. It will be necessary to pump wastewater from the development into the existing infrastructure.

*Option 2: Approve the pumping of wastewater “out of catchment” and that the design of the pumping station and rising main be carried out by Council.*

This option will avoid the overloading of the relief sewer on the eastern side of Ashburton by pumping the wastewater “out of the catchment” into a part of the network that currently does not have significant capacity issues. Based on past experience it is our preference that Council designs the pumping station and rising main and recovers the costs.

The pumping station will be sized to cater for future connections and conveyance through wastewater infrastructure within the footprint of the development.

Note both of the above options require a pumping station.

**The recommended option is Option 2: For the purposes of discussion with the developer approve the pumping of wastewater “out of the catchment” and that the design of the pumping station and rising main be carried out by Council.**

### **Stormwater**

*Option 1: Design and construct conveyance, treatment and detention infrastructure to cater for the development and future development outside the footprint of the site.*

This option will require Council to fund stormwater infrastructure to cater for future connections outside the development site. It will also require conveyance of stormwater from outside the area across the development for discharge into the detention areas. It will be necessary for Council to recover costs when future connections are made.

*Option 2: Design and construct stormwater conveyance, treatment and detention infrastructure to only cater for development within the footprint of the landowner’s site.*

This option means that the developer will only consider stormwater collection, treatment and disposal from within the development footprint.

It will not be necessary for Council to fund any additional capacity for future connections. Other significant sites in the “wider area” should be able to manage their stormwater in a similar way.

**The recommended option is Option 2: For the purpose of discussion with the developer require the developer to design and construct stormwater conveyance, treatment and detention infrastructure to only cater for development within the footprint of the landowner’s site.**

#### **4.7.5 STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS**

The area of land to be developed is zoned residential in the District Plan. There are no district plan implications arising from the development, assuming the development complies with the District Plan.

There will be a subdivision consent required by the developer.

There will be resource consents required for stormwater treatment and disposal.

#### **4.7.6 CONSULTATION**

The area of land bounded by Davidson Street, Racecourse Road, Allens Road and Mill Creek has been the subject of considerable consultation regarding the possibility of preparing a development plan and taking an integrated approach to infrastructure development. The results of this consultation are included in this report.

Consultation will be ongoing with the developer and their service provider regarding servicing.

Further consultation will also be carried out with adjacent landowners regarding the integration of infrastructure.

The extension of the public water supply was the subject of consultation with the wider community during preparation of the 2007/08 Annual Plan.

There has been no specific consultation with the wider community regarding Councils involvement in extending other infrastructure.

#### **4.7.7 STRATEGIC LINKS**

This development is consistent with Council's Development Plan and the following community outcomes in the LTCCP:

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

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

*A community with a strong sense of identity and heritage, which welcomes new residents and encourages diversity.*

#### **4.7.8 FINANCIAL**

Budget provision in the sum of \$1,486,373 has been made in the 2007/08 financial year for the extension of the public water supply in the Racecourse Road area. The extent of the work being along Racecourse Road, Allens Road, Middle Road, Farm Road and Carters Road.

Reducing the workscope as recommended to include Racecourse Road, Allens Road and Middle Road to the pumping and future facilities will reduce the construction costs to \$768,090.

There has been no budget provision made for Council contributions towards additional capacity for future development. These costs will be identified when detailed design is complete and will be the subject of a further standalone report when and if required.

The estimated cost to design, tender and supervise construction of the wastewater pumping station is \$50,000. The developer will be required to pay a share of this cost.

The developer will be required to fund all costs associated with the provision of capacity to service their development. These costs will be in addition to payment of development contributions identified in the LTCCP.

A job number will be established to capture all staff costs associated with this project to ensure costs are recovered.

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

## ASHBURTON DISTRICT COUNCIL REPORT

FILE NO: SK-AF02  
DATE: 27/9/07  
REPORT TO: Council  
FROM: Assets Information Officer  
SUBJECT: Closure of Stockwater Race – Mackies Road Area

---

### 4.8 CLOSURE OF STOCKWATER RACE – MACKIES ROAD AREA

#### 4.8.1 SUMMARY

A section of stockwater race running from a junction above Mackies Road, running parallel to Farquhars Road, to a junction below Mitcham Road – a distance of approximately 5.1 kilometres, has been investigated for closure. Full support has not been obtained.

The purpose of this report is to recommend proceeding with closing of the nominated race.

#### 4.8.2 RECOMMENDATION

"That the special consultative procedure be commenced to close the stockwater race running from Lot 2 DP 22175 above Mackies Road, running parallel to Farquhars Road to a junction below Mitcham Road on Lot 1 DP 323353."
---

#### 4.8.3 BACKGROUND

This race was nominated as suitable for closure by staff.

In September 2006, a standard letter and survey form was forwarded to all concerned 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.

Full ratepayer support has not been obtained for the closure of this race. Preliminary investigations indicate that all properties opposed to its closure have “cost-effective” alternatives to the open stockwater race.

#### 4.8.4 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.

##### Option 2 – Race closure

Race is closed at a junction above Mackies Road situated on Lot 2 DP 22174, to a junction below Mitcham Road on Lot 1 DP 323353. Total effective closure is 5.1 kilometres.

Our preferred option is **Option 2**. This option is consistent with race rationalisation and water conservation, Council’s stockwater race closure guidelines and the Local Government Act 2002.

#### 4.8.5 STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS

The closure mechanism will be in accord with the special consultative procedure as outlined in the Local Government Act 2002.

#### 4.8.6 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 the property owners concerned.

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

	Total
Properties affected	7
Surveys returned	7
Supporting for Closure	4
Opposition to Closure	3

The result indicated three properties opposed to closure. Two opposing parties have ground water bores for irrigation purposes.

The other opposing property owner thought when completing the race survey form, the proposed closure was for a race on their property that served the house. This not the case as the house is served by another race, which is not affected by the proposed closure.

It is considered that an alternative supply of stockwater can be provided for to each of these properties is less than \$10,000.

The report (draft) was considered at the 19 September meeting of the Rural Water Subcommittee. The Subcommittee indicated support for the recommendation.

#### 4.8.7 STRATEGIC LINKS

The closure of inefficient stockwater races is consistent with Outcomes and Strategic Objectives outlined in the LTTCP. In particular;

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

*Strategic Objective a. Water, land and air are managed sustainably.*

Through identifying inefficient stockwater races and progressively closing them, Council is sustainably managing the finite water resource currently allocated. Council's Annual Plan also contains a target of 100 kilometres of stockwater race closure per year.

#### 4.8.8 FINANCIAL

This race closure is from junction to junction therefore the physical works to facilitate it are very minor. The costs of this work can be managed under existing budget provisions.

M C C McNALLY  
Assets Information Officer

## ASHBURTON DISTRICT COUNCIL REPORT

FILE NO: SK-AG02  
DATE: 27/9/07  
REPORT TO: Council  
FROM: Assets Information Officer  
SUBJECT: Closure of Stockwater Race – Denshires Road South

---

### 4.9 CLOSURE OF STOCKWATER RACE – DENSHIRES ROAD SOUTH

#### 4.9.1 SUMMARY

A section of stockwater race running from a junction above Denshires Road South, running parallel to Wrights Road, to the end of the race below Corbetts Road South – a distance of approximately 5.9 kilometres, has been investigated for closure. Full support has not been obtained.

The purpose of this report is to recommend proceeding with closing of the nominated race.

#### 4.9.2 RECOMMENDATION

"That the special consultative procedure be commenced to close the stockwater race running from Lot 2 DP 8998 above Denshires Road South, running parallel to Wrights Road to the end of the race on Lot 2 DP 300866."
--

#### 4.9.3 BACKGROUND

This race was nominated as suitable for closure by staff.

In May 2007, a standard letter and survey form was forwarded to all concerned 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**

Full ratepayer support has not been obtained for the closure of this race. Preliminary investigations indicate that all properties opposed to its closure have “cost-effective” alternatives to the open stockwater race.

#### 4.9.4 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.

##### Option 2 – Race closure

Race is closed at a junction above Denshires Road South, situated on Lot 2 DP 8998, to the end of the race on Lot 2 DP 300866. Total effective closure is 5.9 kilometres.

Our preferred option is **Option 2**. This option is consistent with race rationalisation and water conservation, Council’s stockwater race closure guidelines and the Local Government Act 2002.

#### 4.9.5 STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS

The closure mechanism will be in accord with the special consultative procedure as outlined in the Local Government Act 2002.

#### 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 the property owners concerned.

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

	Total
Properties affected	9
Surveys returned	7
Supporting for Closure	5
Opposition to Closure	2

The result indicated two properties opposed to closure. Both opposing parties have ground water bores for irrigation purposes.

It is considered that an alternative supply of stockwater can be provided for to each of these properties is less than \$10,000.

The report (draft) was considered at the 19 September meeting of the Rural Water Subcommittee. The Subcommittee indicated support for the recommendation.

#### 4.9.7 STRATEGIC LINKS

The closure of inefficient stockwater races is consistent with Outcomes and Strategic Objectives outlined in the LTTCP. In particular;

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

*Strategic Objective a. Water, land and air are managed sustainably.*

Through identifying inefficient stockwater races and progressively closing them, Council is sustainably managing the finite water resource currently allocated. Council's Annual Plan also contains a target of 100 kilometres of stockwater race closure per year.

#### 4.9.8 FINANCIAL

This race closure is from junction to junction therefore the physical works to facilitate it are very minor. The costs of this work can be managed under existing budget provisions.

M C C McNALLY  
Assets Information Officer

## ASHBURTON DISTRICT COUNCIL REPORT

FILE NO: SK-AC02  
DATE: 27 September 2007  
REPORT TO: Council  
FROM: Water Services Manager  
SUBJECT: Acton Stockwater Main – Irrigation Scheme Survey

---

### 4.10 ACTON STOCKWATER MAIN – IRRIGATION SCHEME SURVEY

#### 4.10.1 SUMMARY

Council has previously received enquiries from users of the Acton stockwater race network regarding the possible use of water from the main for irrigation purposes. Prior to undertaking any detailed investigation into the feasibility of this initiative, it was necessary to gauge the level of support through a survey of properties on the Acton race network.

The purpose of this report is to advise Council of the results of the survey and seek approval to undertake a pre-feasibility study into conversion of the Acton stockwater race network to an irrigation scheme.

#### 4.10.2 RECOMMENDATION

- “1. That Council agrees in principle, for the purposes of undertaking a pre-feasibility study, that the Acton water race network be used as a conduit to supply irrigation water;
2. That Council approves budget provision in the amount of \$7,500 to complete a pre-feasibility study; and that funding be met from the Stockwater Management Investigations budget area.”

#### 4.10.3 BACKGROUND

Council has received a number of enquiries over recent years from users of the Acton stockwater race network regarding the possible use of water from the main for irrigation purposes. It was considered important prior to undertaking any detailed investigation into the feasibility of this initiative, to gauge the level of support through a survey of properties on the Acton race network.

In July 2007, a survey was forwarded to all property owners on the network for an indication of support for the initiative. The results of this survey and consultation are summarised in the consultation section of this report. A plan showing the location of the survey area is appended to this report.

#### 4.10.4 OPTIONS

The options available to Council are set out below:

##### Option One – Do Nothing

Council resolves not to make the stockwater race available for irrigation purposes.

Option Two – Support Initiative, Proposed by Others

Council resolves to support the initiative by agreeing in principle to the use of the Acton stockwater race network to be used for irrigation purposes. Council would offer the race to interested parties to develop their own solution.

Option Three – Support Initiative, Proposed by Council

Council resolves to support the initiative by agreeing in principle the use of the Acton stockwater race network to be used for irrigation purposes. Council would undertake the pre-feasibility study.

The study will be limited to considering the broad aspects of an irrigation scheme. The work will include but not necessarily be limited to investigation and confirmation of:

- total water requirement
- area of servicing
- consenting implications
- restriction regimes that may apply
- storage requirements
- piped versus open channel
- rough order cost estimates
- impacts on stockwater from the point of view of availability and reliability

Our preferred option is **Option 3**. There is a high level of interest in this initiative with 81% of respondents indicating support. With Council’s involvement in the further investigation of the initiative and protection of the interests of existing stockwater users.

**4.10.5 STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS**

Resource Management Act 1991

The Acton stockwater race intake is subject to an application for resource consent renewal. This has not been advanced due to the current processing of Environment Canterbury’s Proposed Natural Resources Regional Plan (PNRRP).

National Water Conservation (Rakaia River) 1988

Any conversion of the Acton stockwater network to an irrigation scheme would require additional volumes of water from the Rakaia River and therefore will be subject to the Rakaia Water Conservation Order (RWCO).

**4.10.6 CONSULTATION**

A survey was sent to property owners on the network on 27 July 2007. (Please see attached survey form). Surveys were to be returned to Council by 24 August 2007. A total of 112 surveys were sent out of which 69 were returned. This equates to a 61.6% response rate.

The responses to individual questions have been collated and are summarised in the table below (Note: not all survey participants answered every question):

	Question	Number	% of Surveys Returned
Q1	If water was available in the Acton Main stockwater race (and network) for the purpose of irrigation, would you be interested in using it?		

	Interested	56	81%
	Not Interested	12	17%
	Not Indicated	1	1%
Q2	Would you be prepared to have a pond on your property if it was required for storage for your property?		
	Yes	46	66%
	No	8	11%
	Not Indicated	3	4%
Q3	Describe your Farming Operation		
	Dairy	5	7%
	Sheep, Beef, Cropping	10	15%
	Sheep, Cropping	12	17%
	Cropping	10	15%
	Other	16	23%
Q4	How many hectares is your farm?		
	<50 ha	4	
	50-99 ha	3	4%
	100-149 ha	2	3%
	150-199 ha	10	15%
	200-249 ha	12	17%
	250-299 ha	7	10%
	300-349 ha	4	5%
	350+ ha	6	8%
Q5	Do you have a groundwater bore (well) on your property for irrigation purposes?		
	Yes	50	72%
	No	8	12%
Q5a	Diameter of bore (mm)		
	150	1	1%
	200	3	4%
	250	2	3%
	300	45	65%
	375	1	1%
Q5b	Depth of Bore (m)		
	<25	0	0%
	25-50	3	4%
	50-75	14	20%
	75-100	14	20%
	100-150	17	24%
	150+	1	1%
Q6	Do you have an irrigation system on your property?		
	Yes	50	72%
	No	7	10%

Q7	If the Acton race network was to provide irrigation water, please indicate your likely requirements.		
	Total Rate (from 34 respondents)	1680 L/sec	

The results indicated that of the property owners that chose to respond, a clear majority (81%) were interested in using the Acton Main race network for irrigation purposes.

The results of the survey were considered at the 19 September meeting of the Rural Water Subcommittee. The Subcommittee indicated a desire to proceed to the next stage. The recommendation has been developed from a resolution passed at the meeting.

#### 4.10.7 STRATEGIC LINKS

The recommendations are consistent with Council Community Outcomes, in particular:

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

*Strategic 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.*

#### 4.10.8 FINANCIAL

The cost implications of the recommendations contained in this report are limited to the proposed budget provision of \$7,500 to meet the estimated cost of the pre-feasibility study. This can be met from existing budget provisions.

It is proposed to utilise the stockwater management investigations budget. This has a budget provision for the 2007/08 year of \$75,000.

A R GUTHRIE  
**Water Services Manager**

## ASHBURTON DISTRICT COUNCIL REPORT

FILE NO: 5/0/6  
DATE: 27 September 2007  
REPORT TO: Council Meeting  
FROM: Operations Manager  
SUBJECT: Warrants of Authority

---

### 4.11 WARRANTS OF AUTHORITY – OPERATIONS DEPARTMENT

#### 4.11.1 SUMMARY

This report seeks Council approval for the issuing of warrants of authority to staff in the Operations Department.

#### 4.11.2 RECOMMENDATION

“1. That **Bryan Pitt**, Water Ranger, be authorised under the seal of the Ashburton District Council to act as indicated below:

- Authority to enter private land under Sections 171-173 and 182 of the Local Government Act 2002.
- Authorised Officer under the Ashburton District Council Bylaw 1999.
- Litter Control Officer under Section 5 of the Litter Control Act 1979.

This warrant is issued pursuant to Sections 174 and 177 of the Local Government Act 2002.

2. That **Robert Stanley Rouse**, Operations Manager, **David Hedley Robertson**, Roading and Street Services Manager, **Anthony John MacPherson**, Roading and Street Services Contracts Engineer, **Rodger Wayne Harris**, Roading and Street Services Contracts Officer, be authorised under the seal of the Ashburton District Council to act as indicated below:

- Authority to enter private land under Sections 171-173 and 182 of the Local Government Act 2002.
- Authorised Officer under the Ashburton District Council Bylaw 1999.
- Litter Control Officer under Section 5 of the Litter Control Act 1979.
- Authorised Officer under Section 356 of the Local Government Act 1974.

This warrant is issued pursuant to Sections 174 and 177 of the Local Government Act 2002, Section 5(3) of the Litter Act 1979 and Section 356 of the Local Government Act 1974.

3. That **Andrew Roderick Guthrie**, Water Services Manager; **Barry John Marshall**, Water Services Engineer; **Maree Christina Crozier McNally**, Water Services Assets Information Officer; and **Mireea Vasile Tataru**, Water Services Field Assistant, be authorised under the seal of the Ashburton District Council to act as indicated below:

- Authority to enter private land under Sections 171-173 and 182 of the Local Government Act 2002.
- Authorised Officer under the Ashburton District Council Bylaw 1999.

These warrants are issued pursuant to Sections 174 and 177 of the Local Government Act 2002.”

#### **4.11.3 BACKGROUND**

Previous warrants require updating and new staff members are required to be warranted under the provisions of the Local Government Act 2002.

#### **4.11.4 OPTIONS**

Not applicable.

#### **4.11.5 STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS**

Council officers are required to be warranted to exercise all powers and duties including such power to enter land, conduct inspections, issue notices as provided by and for the purpose of the Acts and associated Regulations and Bylaws listed.

#### **4.11.6 CONSULTATION**

Not applicable.

#### **4.11.7 STRATEGIC LINKS**

Not applicable.

#### **4.11.8 FINANCIAL**

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

R S ROUSE  
**Operations Manager**

## ASHBURTON DISTRICT COUNCIL REPORT

**FILE NO:** 5/10/1/3  
**DATE:** 27 September 2007  
**REPORT TO:** Council  
**FROM:** Principal Rural Fire Officer  
**SUBJECT:** ADC Rural Fire Authority Rural Fire Plan Review

---

### 4.12 ASHBURTON DISTRICT RURAL FIRE PLAN REVIEW

#### 4.12.1 SUMMARY

A change to the Forest and Rural Fires Regulations in 2005 has required a change in the adoption procedure and format for rural fire authority fire plans.

Fire authorities must now approve their own plans and review them at regular intervals. Plans are divided into four sections; Reduction, Readiness, Response and Recovery. The Readiness and Response sections must be reviewed at two yearly intervals from the time of the initial adoption of the full Plan and the Reduction and Recovery sections must be reviewed at five yearly intervals.

The Plan sets out the policies and procedures of the fire authority under the following headings and in the following order:

- Reduction
- Readiness
- Response
- Recovery

Fire Plans must now be reviewed to the following time frames:

- Readiness and Response sections – not more than two yearly from the time of the initial adoption of the full Plan.
- Reduction and Recovery sections – not more than five yearly from the time of the initial adoption of the full Plan.

The current Plan was adopted by Council in 2005 and therefore the Readiness and Response sections are now due for review. This has been completed by the Principal Rural Fire Officer and a copy of the revised sections is attached to this report.

#### 4.12.2 RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL

“That Council adopts the revised Readiness and Response sections of the Ashburton District Council Rural Fire Authority Rural Fire Plan as presented.”

#### 4.12.3 BACKGROUND

Until June 2005 the Forest and Rural Fire Regulations 1979 and the associated Rural Fire Management Code of Practice were the documents which dictated how rural fire authorities prepared and adopted their rural fire plans.

Under this regime fire plans were divided into two separate documents (Part A – Action Plan, and Part B – Management Plan) and were approved by the Canterbury West Coast Regional Rural Fire Committee.

Part A was required to be updated annually before approval and Part B was required to be updated on a five yearly basis, linking in with National Rural Fire Authority audits of rural fire authorities.

In June 2005 the Forest and Rural Fire Regulations 2005 came into force, replacing the previous regulations, and carrying with it some changes to the way fire plans are to be adopted and formatted.

Fire Plans must now be reviewed to the following time frames:

- Readiness and Response sections – not more than two yearly from the time of the initial adoption of the full Plan.
- Reduction and Recovery sections – not more than five yearly from the time of the initial adoption of the full Plan.

The current Plan was adopted by Council in 2005 and therefore the Readiness and Response sections are now due for review. The Principal Rural Fire Officer has completed this review.

A copy of the revised sections of the Plan is attached to this report with the changes highlighted.

#### **4.12.4 OPTIONS**

The Readiness and Response sections of the Ashburton District Council Rural Fire Plan must be reviewed and adopted by the fire authority by September 2007.

#### **4.12.5 STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS**

The review and adoption is required by the Forest and Rural Fire Regulations 2005.

#### **4.12.6 CONSULTATION**

No specific public consultation is required.

#### **4.12.7 STRATEGIC LINKS**

Adoption of the reviewed Readiness and Response sections of the Fire Plan is consistent with Council's LTCCP.

#### **4.12.8 FINANCIAL**

There are no financial implications.

D GEDDES  
**Principal Rural Fire Officer**

## ASHBURTON DISTRICT COUNCIL REPORT

FILE NO: 3/7/4  
DATE: 27 September 2007  
REPORT TO: Council Meeting  
FROM: Council Working Party  
SUBJECT: Council Grant Scheme 2007/2008

---

### 4.13 COUNCIL GRANT SCHEME 2007/2008

**REPORT** and **MINUTES** of a meeting of the **COUNCIL WORKING PARTY**, to consider Grant Applications and School Holiday Programmes, held in the Council Chamber, 5 Baring Square West, Ashburton, on Thursday 13 September, 2007, commencing at 1.10 pm.

**PRESENT:** Councillors K Holmes (Chair), J Burgess, D Glass, R Kilworth, K Lowe, P Reveley, B Tasker, M Urquhart, N Brown and D Nelson.

Also in attendance the Administration Officer

**APOLOGIES:** His Worship the Mayor, B O'Malley; Councillors J Leadley and R Beavan **Sustained**

#### ***School Holiday Programmes***

Four applications were received with \$3000 available for distribution. The Working Party recommended that the following school holiday programme grants allocated for the 2007/2008 financial year.

No	Name of Applicant	Amount Granted
1	Ashburton Museum	750
2	Sport Mid Canterbury	1,000
3	Methven New Life Church	250
4	St David's Union Church	1,000

#### ***Schedule of Council Grant Applications***

Twenty one applications were received with \$35,000 available for distribution. The Working Party recommended that the following Council grants be allocated for the 2007/2008 financial year.

No	Name of Applicant	Amount Requested	Amount Granted
1	Methven Croquet Club	1,000	1,000
2	Royal New Zealand Plunket Society Methven Sub Branch	17,000	4,000
3	Rakaia War Memorial Community Centre	3,500	3,000
4	Hinds Bowling Club	5,000	2,000
5	Ashburton Resource Centre	2,000	1,000
6	Rakaia Pony Club	5,000	3,000

7	Methven & Districts Tramping Club Inc	1,158	1,000
8	Methven Public Library	4,000	4,000
9	Tinwald War Memorial Hall Society	1,300	1,000
10	Ashburton Art Gallery	10,000	3,000
11	Royal Forest & Bird Protection Society	5,995	Referred
12	Ashburton YATA Group	3,271	3,000
13	Ashburton Resource Centre on behalf of Ashburton Ethnic & Migrant Research Project	2,000	Declined
14	Hinds Reserve Board	3,600	1,800
15	Ashburton Learning Centre	3,000	2,200
16	Royal New Zealand Foundation of the Blind	3,000	Declined
17	Mid Canterbury Canine Obedience Club	953	Declined
18	Wakanui Hall Society	4,300	3,000
19	Ashburton Methodist Parish	17,360	Declined
20	Attitude – Youth Division of Parenting with Confidence Inc	750	Declined
21	Rakaia Anglican Parish – Dorie District	2,373	2,000

### ***Funding Conditions***

The Working Party agreed that funding for the organisation and projects listed below comply with the specified conditions.

No	Name of Applicant	Condition
5	Ashburton Resource Centre	Funding is for TV and fax only

### ***Declined Applications***

Funding for the following organisation and project cannot be provided through this scheme however the Working Party agreed that:

No	Name of Applicant	Comment
11	Royal Forest & Bird Protection Society	That the funding application be referred to the Property Manager.

## **RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL**

“That the report of the Working Party meeting held on 13 September, 2007, be received and the grants listed confirmed.”
---

The meeting concluded at 2.25 pm.

## ASHBURTON DISTRICT COUNCIL REPORT

FILE NO: 6/9/44  
DATE: 27 September 2007  
REPORT TO: Council Meeting  
FROM: Heritage Subcommittee  
SUBJECT: Council Grant Scheme 2007/2008

---

### 4.14 HERITAGE GRANT SCHEME 2007/2008

#### 4.14.1 SUMMARY

To allocate Heritage grants for the current financial year. The funding set aside in the budget was \$20,000 plus \$24,197 carried over from last year making a total of \$44,197 for allocation.

#### 4.14.2 CORRESPONDENCE

A letter of thanks for the Heritage Grants allocated in 2006 has been received from Mayfield Mt Somers Anglican Parish for the \$4,177 heritage grant for the interior woodwork of St Aidans Church, Hoods Road, Mt Somers.

An accountability form in respect of the 2006 Heritage Grants has been received from Peter and Julie Luxton, 21 Philip Street, Ashburton, for the \$834 heritage grant for the new barge board etc.

#### 4.14.3 RECOMMENDATION

- |   |   |            |  |            |  |            |  |            |
|---|---|------------|--|------------|--|------------|--|------------|
| <p>“1. That the Heritage grant application by A R Taylor and P W Wilson be declined as it does not meet the criteria for specialised maintenance.</p> <p>2. That the Heritage grant for the current year be allocated as follows:</p> <table><tr><td>St Marks Church, Elizabeth Avenue, Rakaia</td><td>\$5,000.00</td></tr><tr><td>Methven Public Library, Main Street, Methven</td><td>\$1,012.00</td></tr><tr><td>Ashburton College Menorlue Community Learning Centre</td><td>\$1,500.00</td></tr><tr><td>Methven Historical Society, Bank Street, Methven</td><td>\$1,888.00</td></tr></table> <p>3. That Longbeach Estate Ltd application be kept on hold until further information has been provided in respect to the Flourmill and Waterwheel restoration</p> <p>4. That the balance of the unallocated funding of \$34,797 be carried over.”</p> | St Marks Church, Elizabeth Avenue, Rakaia | \$5,000.00 | Methven Public Library, Main Street, Methven | \$1,012.00 | Ashburton College Menorlue Community Learning Centre | \$1,500.00 | Methven Historical Society, Bank Street, Methven | \$1,888.00 |
| St Marks Church, Elizabeth Avenue, Rakaia   | \$5,000.00                                |            |  |            |  |            |  |            |
| Methven Public Library, Main Street, Methven  | \$1,012.00                                |            |  |            |  |            |  |            |
| Ashburton College Menorlue Community Learning Centre  | \$1,500.00                                |            |  |            |  |            |  |            |
| Methven Historical Society, Bank Street, Methven  | \$1,888.00                                |            |  |            |  |            |  |            |

#### 4.14.4 BACKGROUND

On Thursday 13 September 2007 the Council’s Heritage Subcommittee met to consider applications made for Heritage Grants. Present were Cr Kilworth (Chair) and Tasker, Administration Officer, V Prendergast, and Assistant Planner C Yates. An apology was recorded for Cr Beavan.

The Subcommittee was mindful of the Council’s policy for Heritage grants, and in particular the following:

*“That the maximum individual grant be no more than 50% of the approved project or no more than \$5,000.”*

*Projects must relate to items scheduled in Appendix 3 of the District Plan as Category A Projects must provide for specialised maintenance”*

Six (6) applications were received:

1. St Marks Church, Elizabeth Avenue, Rakaia
2. Methven Public Library, Main Street, Methven
3. House at 50 Bridge Street, Ashburton
4. Menorlue Ashburton College, Walnut Avenue, Ashburton
5. Methven Museum Bank Street, Methven
6. Longbeach Station Flourmill & Water Wheel

**1. St Marks Church – District Plan Category A No. 22 internal and external protection. It is listed on the NZ Historic Places Trust Register**

The Subcommittee, on reading the documentation presented with this application, accepted that the proposal to re-roof the Church met the criteria for a heritage grant. A resource consent for this proposal had been granted by the Ashburton District Council supported by a letter from the Canterbury Region of the New Zealand Historic Places Trust.

The very nature of this work will make a significant contribution to the conservation of the building.

*“That Council approves a grant of \$5000 allocated from the District Council’s Heritage Reserve Fund to the Rakaia Anglican Parish c/o T Hurford, 40 Mackie Street, Rakaia.”*

*Cr Tasker / Cr Kilworth*

*Carried*

**2. Methven Public Library - District Plan Category A No. 46 internal and external protection. It is listed on the NZ Historic Places Trust Register.**

The Methven Public Library applied for a heritage grant to repair the front door of the Library. The Library proposes to fit a temporary new door whilst the original door is receiving specialist attention. There may be some additional work done to windows sills at the same time.

The property is owned by the Methven Library Committee Trust.

The Subcommittee, on reading the documentation presented with this application, accepted that the proposal met the criteria for a heritage grant and that it would make a significant contribution to the conservation of the building. The Subcommittee noted that the project total cost was estimated at \$1,800 and that the heritage grant request was for the full amount of the project cost (ie \$1,800). The Policy allows the Subcommittee to allocate up to 50% of the project. Planning Staff confirmed with Marjorie Collins by telephone that the project figure of \$1,800 was correct but it was exclusive of GST and Marjorie asked if the total amount of the project could be considered by the Subcommittee as being \$2,025. The Subcommittee accepted the project total amount as being \$2,025 and that the grant would be 50% of \$2,025 making the amount \$1,012.

The Subcommittee requested that an advice note be given to the Methven Public Library Committee to contact New Zealand Historic Places Trust in Christchurch to confirm that the products being used in the restoration work are suitable and recommended by the New Zealand Historic Places Trust advisors.

*“That Council approves a grant of \$1,012 be made to the Methven Public Library, allocated from the District Council’s Heritage Reserve Fund.”*

*Cr Tasker / Cr Kilworth*

***Carried***

**3. House at 50 Bridge Street - District Plan Category A No. 40  
External protection only.**

A R Taylor and P W Wilson, 50 Bridge Street, Ashburton, have made an application to uncover two small leadlighted windows that are visible from outside the house but have been covered with board on the inside. Mouldings will then need to be replaced in the lounge and the bedroom.

The Subcommittee considered this application but in view of the fact that the house is listed as having external protection only and the proposed work appears to be for internal work it was generally considered that application did not meet the criteria for a Heritage Grant for specialised maintenance.

*“That Council declines the application for 50 Bridge Street, Ashburton, on the grounds that it does not meet the criteria for Heritage Grants.”*

*Tasker/Kilworth*

***Carried***

**4. Ashburton College “Menorlue Community Learning Centre 27 Walnut Avenue Ashburton - District Plan Category A No. 25 internal and external protection.**

Ashburton College Menorlue Community Learning Centre, c/o Jeff Williamson, School Manager, 50 Taits Road, RD 2, Ashburton, has applied for a Heritage Grant to uplift carpet in main office and MacMillan room at Menorlue and replace tongue and groove flooring with like timber (rimu). The floor is to be borer treated.

The Subcommittee, on reading the documentation presented with this application, accepted that the proposal met the criteria for a heritage grant and that it would make a significant contribution to the conservation of the building.

*“That Council approves a grant of \$1500 for the Ashburton College Menorlue Community Learning Centre allocated from the District Council’s Heritage Reserve Fund.”*

*Cr Tasker / Cr Kilworth*

***Carried***

**5. Methven Historical Building (Museum) Bank Street, Methven - District Plan Category A No. 48 internal and external protection. It is listed on the NZ Historic Places Trust Register.**

The Methven Historical Building (Museum) c/o Mrs K McKendry, 17 Lochhead Crescent, Methven, applied for a heritage grant to do waterproofing to - fibre reinforced membrane to Parapet East side and top brick exterior, moss kill, deep clean, light water blast and Nuplex Damit 800 water proofing clear penetrating sealer.

The Subcommittee, on reading the documentation presented with this application, accepted that the proposal met the criteria for a heritage grant and that it would make a significant contribution to the conservation of the building.

The Subcommittee requested that an advice note be given to the Methven Historical Society to contact New Zealand Historic Places Trust in Christchurch to confirm that the products being used in the restoration work are suitable and recommended by the New Zealand Historic Places Trust advisors and that the work should be carried out by a suitably qualified person.

*“That Council approves a grant of \$1500 for the Methven Museum, allocated from the District Council’s Heritage Reserve Fund.”*

*Cr Tasker / Cr Kilworth*

*Carried*

**6. Longbeach Station Flourmill/Waterwheel - District Plan Category A No. 7 internal and external protection. It is listed on the NZ Historic Places Trust Register.**

The Longbeach Estate Ltd c/o Bill Thomas Longbeach Road R D 4 Ashburton applied for a heritage grant to seek assistance for the preservation of the Flourmill and waterwheel. The building is constructed with concrete block, board and battens, corrugated iron and has a timber second floor. The corrugated iron roof and timber floor are in a poor state of repair. Longbeach Estate are seeking help with the preservation and restoration of the Flourmill and the waterwheel. The building is on the site of a public road.

The Subcommittee, on reading the documentation presented with this application, accepted that the proposal meets the criteria for a heritage grant and that it would make a significant contribution to the conservation of the building.

The Subcommittee requested that the owners of Longbeach Estate be contacted and asked to supply more detail as to the proposed restoration programme for the Flourmill and waterwheel. It was further suggested that the New Zealand Historic Places Trust in Christchurch should be approached by Longbeach Estate to see if they would give assistance in formulating such a programme. In the meantime the application will remain on hold.

*“That Council request Longbeach Estate Ltd to provide further information, including the staging of the project and costings in respect to the restoration of the Flourmill and waterwheel. In the meantime, the Council will put the application to the Heritage Subcommittee during the 2007/2008 funding period on hold.”*

*Cr Tasker / Cr Kilworth*

*Carried*

**To Summarise**

Having regard to the particular policy matters noted above the Subcommittee considered that the following application was not eligible:

House at 50 Bridge Street Ashburton – Cat. A No. 40 (external protection only)

The Subcommittee considered the requests from the five eligible applicants and allocated the funds having regard to the cost of the project, the importance of the Heritage item and its accessibility by the public.

**4.14.5 OPTIONS**

The Council has the option to reallocate the funds in a different manner. The Subcommittee considers that its recommendation is soundly based and fair.

**4.14.6 STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS**

There are no known statutory implications. The allocations of the funds are at the Council’s discretion and subject to Council policy.

#### 4.14.7 CONSULTATION

Every owner of a Category A Heritage Building received a letter from this Council inviting them to apply for a grant. An advertisement was placed in the newspaper inviting applications for a heritage grants.

#### 4.14.8 STRATEGIC LINKS

The Council's District Community Plan 2006/2016 provides as follows:  
Page 160 Environmental Services District Planning -

Community Outcomes	Strategic Objective	How District Planning contributes
<i>A community with a strong sense of identity and heritage which welcomes new residents and encourages diversity</i>	<i>A community which recognises and preserves the cultural and social heritage of our district</i>	<i>As part of its district planning and resource consent activities, the Council has regard to issues relating to the preservation of heritage sites and features as required by Resource Management Act and the Local Government Act</i>

A Policy for Heritage Items scheduled in the District Plan of the Ashburton District Council was made in February 2001.

Within the document was the appointment of a Heritage Subcommittee from the Council to advise the Council on heritage matters affecting Council policy and to implement the Policy. This Subcommittee has the power to co-opt where appropriate.

Further, at a meeting on 15 August 2002, the Finance and Corporate Services Committee of the Ashburton District Council set out guidelines for considering heritage grants and these are as outlined below:

#### 4.14.9 HERITAGE GRANTS

Council makes provision in its annual budget for funds for the disbursement of heritage grants which shall be allocated annually in or about August of each year. The maximum individual grant from this source shall be no greater than 50% of the cost of the approved project and in any event shall be no more than \$5000. Council holds in reserve an amount to be determined from time to time to address requests for emergency funding made at other times of the year.

The criteria under which the Council makes the grants in respect to application for heritage have to comply with the following:

1. Projects which relate to heritage items that are scheduled in Category A of the District Plan
2. Projects which provide for specialised maintenance such as replacing matching cladding or replacing matching windows or other fittings in order to retain the heritage state of the item.
3. Projects which have provided a full project and finance plan (including copies of work schedule and quotes).

## **Considerations**

When considering applications the Council have to consider the following:

1. The relative heritage value of the scheduled heritage item in the District Plan
2. The contribution that the proposed work will make to the conservation of the scheduled heritage item.
3. The urgency of the work
4. The availability of Council funds
5. Other sources of funding available to the applicant
6. The amount of any previous assistance
7. Voluntary input
8. Accessibility of the heritage item to the general public
9. Such other matters Council considers relevant.

When considering applications the Council will not fund:

1. Retrospective works
2. Application that have not returned their accountability form from previous funding
3. Applicants that have not provided appropriate financial information
4. General maintenance such as re-painting

## **General**

Council requires applicants to provide formal certification/receipt of work completed.

Council recognises there may be occasions when an application would appear not to fit the above criteria; however this would not necessarily preclude it from consideration on its merit.

### **4.14.10 FINANCIAL**

The Council has \$20,000 plus \$24,197 carried over from last year making a total of \$44,197 for allocation.

It has allocated \$10,188.00 and recommended that the balance money of \$34,797.00 be carried over.

C C YATES  
**Assistant Planner**