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The purpose of local government:

(1) The purpose of local government is –
   (a) to enable democratic local decision-making and action by, and on behalf of, communities; and
   (b) to meet the current and future needs of communities for good-quality local infrastructure, local public services, and performance of regulatory functions in a way that is most cost-effective for households and businesses.

(2) In this Act, good-quality, in relation to local infrastructure, local public services, and performance of regulatory functions, means infrastructure, services, and performance that are –
   (a) efficient; and
   (b) effective; and
   (c) appropriate to present and anticipated future circumstances.

(Local Government Act 2002 – Amendment Act 2012)
ASHBURTON DISTRICT COUNCIL
Service Delivery Committee Meeting

**Timetable**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3pm (approx)</td>
<td>Meeting commences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 6.1</td>
<td>Wastebusters Deputation (Ian Beker)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ORDER OF BUSINESS**

1. Apologies
2. Extraordinary Business
3. Conflict of Interest Declarations
4. Minutes
   - Operations Committee – 5/02/15
5. Forward Programme

6. **Matters for Committee Decision**
   6.2 Resource Recovery Parks – Dimensional Limits on Materials
   6.3 Ocean Farm Operational Review – Terms of Reference
   6.4 Native Plantings at Ocean Farm
   6.5 District Water Investigations – Stockwater Supply via Irrigation Schemes
   6.6 Road Closure – Winslow Willowby Road
   6.7 Road Closure – Wheels Week Street Sprints and Autocross

7. **Activity Reports**
   7.1 General
   7.2 Library
   7.3 Ashburton Museum
   7.4 Parks and Open Spaces
   7.5 Stockwater
   7.6 EA Networks Centre
   7.7 Capital Projects
   7.8 Roading (subsidised)
   7.9 Roading (unsubsidised)
   7.10 Footpaths
   7.11 Drinking Water
   7.12 Wastewater
   7.13 Stormwater
   7.14 Solid Waste
   7.15 Contracts Awarded
   7.16 Methven Community Board

12 March 2015
Committee Minutes

4 Service Delivery Committee
Minutes of the Service Delivery Committee meeting held on 5 February 2015, commencing at 2.35pm in the Council Chamber, 5 Baring Square West, Ashburton.

Present
Mayor Angus McKay; Councillors Stuart Wilson (Chair), Neil Brown, Ken Cutforth, Russell Ellis, Donna Favel, Darryl Nelson, Martin Nordqvist and Alan Totty.

Also present
Councillors Don McLeod, Peter Reveley and Alasdair Urquhart.

In attendance
Group Manager Service Delivery, Assets Manager, Contracts Manager and Committee Secretary.

Staff in attendance for the duration of their reports – District Librarian, Open Spaces Manager, Capital Projects Manager, Sports Facility Manager and Museum Curator.

Two members of the public attended.

1 Apologies
Cr Rod Beavan Sustained

2 Notification of Extraordinary Business
Nil.

3 Conflict of Interest
The Mayor gave notice that as a member of the Methven Lions he would withdraw from discussion and decision on item 6.2.

4 Confirmation of Minutes
That the minutes of the Service Delivery Committee meeting held on 27 November 2014, be taken as read and confirmed.

Nelson/Ellis Carried

5 Forward Programme
• Ocean farm operations – scope of the review to be reported in March with the review completion anticipated in June.
• Opus report (stockwater)

That the Opus stockwater report be provided to the Committee on 19 March 2015.

Mayor/Reveley Carried

6.1 Extension of Solid Waste Kerbside Collection Contract to 30 June 2017
That the Committee approves in accordance with Option 3, the negotiation of an extension to the current contract C561 “The supply of services for the kerbside collection and disposal of recyclable materials, refuse bags and litter and litter bin refuse in the Ashburton District”, with the incumbent contractor Mainly Waste Ltd, with an expiry date of 30 June 2017.

Nelson/Totty Carried
6.2 Road Closure – Methven Motorcycle Mountain Thunder Race

1 That the following roads be closed to ordinary vehicular traffic from 6.00am to 6.00pm on Saturday, 4 April 2015 (Easter Saturday), for the purpose of allowing the Methven Lions Club to hold the Mountain Thunder Motorcycle Race:
   - METHVEN CHERTSEY ROAD, from Main Street to Mackie Street
   - MACKIE STREET, from Methven Chertsey Road to Barkers Road
   - BARKERS ROAD, from Main Street to Hall Street
   - HALL STREET, from Barkers Road to Main Street
   - STATE HIGHWAY 77 (MAIN STREET), from Lampard Street to Bank Street
   - KILWORTH STREET, from Main Street to Mackie Street
   - FOREST DRIVE, from McMillan Street to Main Street

2 That the fire hydrant lids be released at the end of the day’s event.

Nordqvist/Cutforth Carried

7 Activity Reports

That the reports be received.

Nelson/Nordqvist Carried

- Ashburton Heritage Centre
  The Mayor briefly reported on the visit that he and some of the immediate neighbours made to the museum yesterday.

- EA Networks Centre
  The Capital Projects Manager reported that a contract extension of five days has been agreed, without incurring a charge, to accommodate the filling of the pools. The pools are being filled overnight at a slower rate to reduce impact on the water supply.

- Tinwald Pool
  It was reported that the Children’s Day Committee have asked for the use of the Tinwald pool for the duration of the Children’s Day event on Sunday 1 March.

That subject to the agreement of the Tinwald Reserve Board, approval be given to offer the use of the Tinwald swimming pool free of charge for Children’s Day.

Favel/Ellis

The Sports Facilities Manager advised that the pool is not opened on Sunday until 4pm because of a shortage of staff. The proposed change to the pool’s hours of operation will incur staffing costs and staff resources will need to be confirmed.

AMENDMENT

That the Committee requests that the Tinwald Reserve Board be asked to offer the use of the Tinwald swimming pool free of charge for Children’s Day.

Mayor/Brown Carried

The amendment became the substantive motion.

- Capital Projects
  It was reported that the bank stabilisation work on Mill Creek has caused considerable damage to the landscaping in Turton Green. A number of the trees temporarily removed while the work was carried out have not survived. Replacement planting will be carried out when conditions allow.

The Committee adjourned for afternoon tea at 3.20pm and resumed at 3.34pm.

The Mayor and Cr Nelson left the meeting at 3.20pm.
Public conveniences

That the toilet block at Kyle Beach be demolished.

Cutforth/Ellis Carried

Cr Nelson returned to the meeting at 3.37pm.

• Town garden watering
The Open Spaces Manager responded to concerns that by watering during the day Council is not complying with its own water restrictions. Mr Askin advised that the gardens are watered on a rotational basis. Management of the watering also takes into account the considerable investment Council has made in the planting of trees and gardens.

The Group Manager of Service Delivery reported that the water restriction policy is to be reviewed within the next 12 months. Council would then have the opportunity to look at changes such as the cost of staff resources if the town gardens are watered in the evening.

• Methven Cemetery gates
The Open Spaces Manager reported that need for maintenance work on the cemetery gates is being addressed. Longer term work on the tidying of the Domain and cemetery entrances is planned and will be discussed with the Methven Community Board. The Open Spaces Manager will attend the Board meeting on 9 March.

• Headstone photography project
The Committee asked for an update on the headstone photography project through a report to the March meeting.

• Managed Aquifer Recharge (MAR)
The Assets Manager reported that ECan have asked for Council’s assistance with the managed aquifer recharge project in the Hinds catchment area by making available an unused portion of consented water from the Rangitata River and providing access to leased land at the corner of Timaru Track and Frasers Road.

The Committee supported the intent of the project but asked for more discussion on the implications of a water transfer agreement before it is progressed. A workshop has been scheduled for 19 February.

That the Committee supports in principle the Managed Aquifer Recharge pilot project.

Mayor/Totty Carried

Recommendation to Council

That Council makes available up to 500 litres / sec for use on the Managed Aquifer Recharge project for one year; with this period able to be extended.

Brown/Nelson Carried

That the resolution becomes a recommendation to Council.

Mayor/Favel Carried

A show of hands gave 5 for and 3 against and the motion was carried.

7.1.2 Tri-annual Performance Report

- A performance measure for festive lighting will be included in future reports.
- Refuse and recycling information will be provided in more detail in the next report.

• Minor township maintenance
Reference to South Street was removed and the report amended to show that soak pits are programmed for construction on South Town Belt at Rakaia.
• **Programme Development**
  The Group Manager Service Delivery reported that Councillors will be provided with a copy of the submission on the draft Regional Land Transport Plan before it is submitted. Input from the Council representatives on the road reference groups has been sought.

• **Footpath resurfacing**
  Clarification was sought on the how streets are identified for inclusion on the renewal programme and a request was made for the footpaths around the Event Centre to be upgraded.
  The Contracts Manager reported that all footpaths and kerb and channel work throughout the district has been inspected with the aim of resurfacing the worst areas over the next 2-3 years.

• **Water pipeline replacement Lampard St**
  The Committee heard that the 12 month trial has been positive and consideration is being given to extending work to other areas.

The meeting concluded at 5.13pm.
5 Forward Programme – Service Delivery Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>Report / Other</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 April</td>
<td>Rakaia Minor Township Maintenance Contract 2011-15</td>
<td>Assets Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tri-annual Performance Report #2</td>
<td>GM Business Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 June</td>
<td>Ocean Farm Review</td>
<td>GM Service Delivery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.1.1 Summary

The contract allows for a further 24 months of discretionary term in two 12 month blocks with the full contract term expiring on 30 June 2017. The contractor has the right under the conditions of contract to request an extension of service provision for each of these 12 month blocks to 30 June 2017.

- Envirowaste Ltd, who currently hold the contract (C589), have requested in writing to continue with the contract from 1 July 2015 to 30 June 2017.
- The contractor is presently meeting the requirements under the contract.
- There are currently no performance or contractual issues that could be considered reasonable enough to decline the contractor’s request for an extension of contract.
- Council at its discretion can grant a request for extension from the contractor.
- It is in Council’s interest to continue the services through 30 June 2017.
- The value of the work involved would require Council to go through a competitive tendering process to procure the provision of services required, should an extension not be granted.
- Declining the request would incur an avoidable expense to Council.

The purpose of this report is to seek Council approval of the extension to the contract, from 1 July 2015 to 30 June 2017.

6.1.2 Recommendation to Council

That Council approves Envirowaste Ltd’s request for an extension of contract (C589) from 1 July 2015 to 30 June 2017, in accordance with the conditions of contract for contract C589: the Supply of Management, Operations, Maintenance and Associated Services for Waste Management and Waste Minimisation Activities and Facilities 2010 to 2015.
6.1.3 Background

The current contract C589: The Supply of Management, Operations, Maintenance and Associated Services for Waste Management and Waste Minimisation Activities and Facilities 2010 to 2015 was won by Mastagard Ltd and commenced on 4 October 2010. Mastagard Ltd was purchased by Envirowaste Ltd in early 2014 and the contract was assigned to Envirowaste Ltd on 4 April 2014.

Envirowaste Ltd are a substantially larger waste management and recovery company with a wide range of resources and industry contracts currently held under their operational portfolio.

Key Points:
- Since the assignment of the Contract to Envirowaste Ltd, the additional resourcing and expertise now available has improved the organisation and performance of the contract measurably.
- The current contractual arrangements / timing allow for an alignment of all solid waste services to be tendered as an integrated operations and maintenance contract commencing 1 July 2017.
- Should Council opt to not to grant the extension to contract C589 beyond 30 June 2015, the value of the works involved would require Council to undertake a competitive tendering process to procure the necessary services.
- Ending contract C589 on 30 June 2015 would unnecessarily complicate the goal of tendering an integrated contract commencing 1 July 2017 and generate a significant avoidable expense to the ratepayer.
- There is no cost benefit to be achieved by ending contract C589 30 June 2015.

6.1.4 Options and Risks Considered

Option 1: End Contract C589 at 30 June 2015 and competitively tender for two years from 1 July 2015.

This option involves going out to market for the provision of services under the same levels of service for a period of two years commencing 1 July 2015 and expiring on 30 June 2017.

Risks
- There is a reduced timeframe to review services, prepare and undertake a competitive tendering process in a well-planned and considered manner.
- Some contractors may consider the investment in participating in a competitive tendering process and then resourcing a contract for a short period of two years will not net them a return worth competing for, only to have to go through the process again two years later.


Under this option, the contract for management of the waste management facilities would be under the same levels of service for a period of two years commencing 1 July 2015 and ending on 30 June 2017 with a further 7 – 9 years to align with the proposed wheelie bin service 1 July 2017.

Risks
- There is a reduced timeframe to review services, prepare and undertake a competitive tendering process in a well-planned and considered manner.
• The implementation of the proposed wheelie bin service in 2017, if contracted separately will impact on the operation and levels of service at the resource recovery parks, leading to a further variation to contract at that time.

• This option requires two separate tendering processes, increasing the cost of procurement and ongoing contract administration for these services.

Option 3: Grant a further two years of extension to the current contract.

Under this option, officers would notify the contractor that an extension of the existing contractual arrangements to continue through to 30 June 2017 has been granted by Council.

This then provides the opportunity to roll up all of Council’s solid waste services into one new integrated contract commencing 1 July 2017. The aim of an integrated contract is to gain efficiencies through the sharing of resources across the various areas of operations and reduce ongoing contract administration costs. Procurement costs are also reduced by running one tendering process for all areas of service required.

Risks

• The incumbent contractor has the right to end their involvement in Council’s solid waste operation’s at the expiry of the current contract term, Council would then have to find an alternative supplier at short notice

The preferred option is Option 3. Option 3 addresses Council’s need to provide services for the extension period and allows time for a well prepared competitive procurement process programed for the second half of 2016 for an integrated solid waste operations contract. This option also allows sufficient time to further explore user pays models for wheelie bin services.

6.1.5 Statutory Implications

The relevant acts of parliament are:

• Health Act 1956
• Local Government Act 2002
• Waste Minimisation Act 2008

The above statutes charge Local Authorities with the responsibilities outlined below:

• protect the public from nuisance,
• protect, promote, and maintain public health and safety,
• minimise the potential for harm to the environment,
• promote effective and efficient waste management and minimisation within the district

Under the Waste Minimisation Act 2008 Council is required to operate to a Waste Management and Minimisation Plan. Council has such a plan, the most recent version adopted in 2011.

6.1.6 Significance and Engagement

The recommendations considered in this report do not result in any changes to levels of service. On that basis the matter is not considered significant.

Approval of the recommendations contained in this report is consistent with outcomes and strategic objectives outlined in the LTP and annual plan. In particular;
Outcome 1: A thriving and diverse local economy
Strategic objective. Our district’s infrastructure and services meet our current and foreseeable future needs.

Outcome 2: Sustainable natural and built environments
Strategic objective. We understand the need to protect our natural environment and act to do so.
Strategic objective. Our community has access to information and services that promote environmental responsibility and sustainability.

This matter is operational in nature and as such engagement with the community is not considered necessary.

6.1.7 Financial Implications

The cost of extending the existing contractual arrangements is estimated to be $1,890,000 for the two years through to 30 June 2017.

If the extension was withheld and a new provider of services was to be found, additional tendering and establishment costs would need to be accounted for.

It is estimated an additional $240,000 over and above the current budget estimates could be required to cover the two year period to June 2017 if the contract extension were to be withheld.
6.2 Resource Recovery Parks - Dimensional Limits on Materials

6.2.1 Summary

The volumes of mixed demolition waste going straight to landfill has increased significantly over the last three years. Officers feel more can be done to incentivise demolition companies to divert more recoverable timber and other materials than is presently being achieved.

Officers are also concerned about protecting the asset life of the compactor and mitigating equipment failures in the compactor due to overloading. A length limit of 1.2 metres on timbers being disposed of into the pit and intended for landfill would significantly improve the current situation. This practice is a normal operational requirement at many other transfer stations around the country.

The aims of introducing an acceptable length limit on timber (1.2m):
- Incentivise demolition companies to separate out long lengths of timber for recovery
- Increase the rate of waste diversion on demolition timbers
- Protect the compactor from excessive loading from over length timber hidden in large loads
- Reducing maintenance costs and extending the life of the asset.

6.2.2 Recommendation

That the introduction of dimensional limits on waste material being received at that the Ashburton District resource recovery parks and drop-off sites be approved.

6.2.3 Background

The amount of demolition timbers disposed of into the pit and intended for landfill at the ARRP has increased significantly over the last three years. There are still a number of earthquake damaged buildings to be demolished in the Ashburton District. As the rate of earthquake demolitions decline over time, the waste stream from the demolition of these buildings will be replaced by an increase in construction waste as the rebuild continues. The current volumes of construction and demolition waste will remain at increased levels for the foreseeable future.

Hydraulic hose failures in the compactor have resulted from long and heavy timbers hidden within large loads of demolition waste being jammed in the equipment. These heavy materials add additional stresses leading to accelerated metal fatigue and breakdown frequencies.
There are currently two rates of fees and charges relating to demolition waste:
1. Residual waste at $221.75/tonne (intended for landfill)
2. Clean and sorted concrete waste and demolition waste at $136.00/tonne (intended for diversion).

The costs of transporting the increased in volumes of demolition waste to landfill is being covered by the fees collected from them. However, it is a reduction in onsite processing costs, plant maintenance and replacement costs and an increase in the level of diversion of C&D timbers from landfill that officers are seeking.

Key Points:
- It is not practical to pick apart large loads of demolition waste intended for landfill, in the pit when they are arriving in increased frequency.
- A significant volume of these timbers are unrecoverable due to contamination or machine damage and are too heavy and long for the compactor to process.
- Currently some loads have to be broken down further with machine on site before they can be compacted causing double handling and additional cost to Council.
- Having a dimensional limit will incentivise demolition companies to separate out long lengths of recoverable timber and take advantage of the lower fees and charges for clean and sorted material.
- Increased stresses on the compactor generate increased maintenance costs and reduce the life of the asset.

6.2.4 Options and Risks Considered

Option 1: Keep the Status Quo
No set limitations on the size and length of materials being received at the District’s resource recovery parks.

Risks:
- Accelerated fatigue on the compactor and increased levels of maintenance
- Shortened asset life
- Potential for increased down time due to equipment failure
- Increased on site processing costs

Option 2: Set Dimensional Limits on Materials
Under this option, dimensional limits will be placed on materials received at the District’s resource recovery parks and drop-off sites. Initially (and specifically) a dimensional limit shall be imposed on demolition waste timber received at the pit of 1.2 metres in length.

Risks:
- Demolition companies/contractors may complain about additional time costs to ensure material intended for landfill conforms to the requirement.

The preferred option is Option 2. Option 2 protects the plant on site from accelerated wear and tear, reduces maintenance costs, on site handling costs, and can be used to incentivise the demolition companies/contractors to separate out more recoverable timbers.
6.2.5 Statutory Implications

The relevant acts of Parliament are:

- Health Act 1956
- Local Government Act 2002
- Waste Minimisation Act 2008

The above statutes charge local authorities with the responsibilities outlined below:

- protect the public from nuisance,
- protect, promote, and maintain public health and safety,
- minimise the potential for harm to the environment,
- promote effective and efficient waste management and minimisation within the district

Under the Waste Minimisation Act 2008 Council is required to operate to a Waste Management and Minimisation Plan. Council has such a plan, the most recent version adopted in 2011.

6.2.6 Significance and Engagement

The recommendations considered in this report do not result in any changes to levels of service. On that basis the matter is not considered significant.

Approval of the recommendations contained in this report is consistent with outcomes and strategic objectives outlined in the LTP. In particular;

**Outcome 1: A thriving and diverse local economy**

*Strategic objective.* Our district’s infrastructure and services meet our current and foreseeable future needs.

**Outcome 2: Sustainable natural and built environments**

*Strategic objective.* We understand the need to protect our natural environment and act to do so.

*Strategic objective.* Our community has access to information and services that promote environmental responsibility and sustainability.

Details of the changes and the rationale for their introduction will be communicated to companies/contractors most likely to be affected.

6.2.7 Financial Implications

Increasing asset costs will be mitigated. Fees and charges and transport to landfill costs for residual waste will trend together in correlation to any increase in diversion realised by implementing option 2.
6.3 Ocean Farm Operational Review – Terms of Reference

6.3.1 Summary
At the 2 October meeting of the Service Delivery Committee, the Committee resolved that the operations of Ocean Farm be reviewed.

Before embarking upon the review it is necessary to confirm the terms of reference for the review to ensure the resulting work meets the Committee’s expectations.

6.3.2 Recommendation

That the Terms of Reference for the Ocean Farm Wastewater Disposal Facility - Operational Review, as appended to this report, be approved.

6.3.3 Background
There was discussion at the 2 October meeting of the Service Delivery Committee about Ocean Farm. The following is the complete minute from the meeting:

- Ocean Farm

The Committee agreed that it would be timely to review Ocean Farm which has been in operation for around six years. Information was sought on the farm operation and waste disposal. In making this request, the Committee did not provide work scope and a timeframe for this report.

That the operations of Ocean Farm be reviewed.

Brown/Favel Carried

Officers consider it important that the scope of the review be defined to ensure the final output meets the Committee’s expectations. Officers have developed a terms of reference document that summarises the expectations from the review.

6.3.4 Options and Risks Considered
There are three options available to the committee:

Option One: Do not proceed with a review

No review will be undertaken at this time.
Risks
• Opportunity to identify potential operational improvements will be lost.
• Improvements identified otherwise, may not be coordinated or may be incompatible with other aspects of the facility processes

Option Two: Carry out review as proposed – limited to Ocean Farm
The review will proceed in accordance with the terms of reference as appended to this report.
Risks
• Operations at Wilkins Road also impact on Ocean Farm, therefore limiting review to just Ocean Farm may miss additional opportunities to improve processes

Option Three: Extend the review to include Wilkins Road treatment facility
The terms of reference will be extended to include the Wilkins Road site. This will add the additional elements to be considered (e.g. primary and septage screening; pump station; aeration, facultative & maturation ponds, discharge screening and controls and telemetry).
Risks
• None Identified

The recommended option is Option Two. This provides a balance between identifying operational efficiencies at Ocean Farm and the cost of completing a significant operational review of both sites.

6.3.5 Statutory Implications
The Local Government Act outlines some requirements in regard to delivery of services. Section 17A of the LGA2002 sets out requirements for a local authority to “review the cost-effectiveness of current arrangements for meeting the needs of communities within its district or region for good-quality local infrastructure, local public services, and performance of regulatory functions.” Reviews carried out in response to this requirement are intended to be wider activity level reviews e.g. delivery of the wastewater service.

The review proposed has a relatively narrow focus and therefore there are no statutory implications arising from the recommendations contained in this report.

6.3.6 Significance and Engagement
The recommendations presented in this report do not result in any changes to levels of service. On that basis the matter is not considered significant. This matter is operational in nature and as such engagement with the community is not considered necessary. The outcome of the review may result in recommendations for operational changes and/or capital investment. These will be dealt with on a case by case basis. The level of significance and need for community engagement will be determined at that time.

Approval of the recommendations contained in this report is consistent with outcomes and strategic objectives outlined in the Annual Plan. In particular;

Outcome 1: A thriving and diverse local economy

Strategic objective. Our district’s infrastructure and services meet our current and foreseeable future needs.

Outcome 2: Sustainable natural and built environments

Strategic objective. We understand the need to protect our natural environment and act to do so.
6.3.7 Financial Implications

The cost of completing the review in accordance with the recommendations contained in this report is estimated to be in the order of $35,000 exclusive GST.

Should the Committee wish to consider extending the review to include the Wilkins Road site, it is expected due to the additional complexities of that site the total cost would rise to an estimated $55,000 exclusive GST.

There is no formal budget for the review but it is envisaged it can be managed within existing overall budget allocations under the Ashburton wastewater cost centre.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PREPARED BY</th>
<th>APPROVED BY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANDREW GUTHRIE</td>
<td>NEIL MCCANN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assets Manager</td>
<td>Group Manager Service Delivery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Background
Ocean Farm is situated at 215 Terrace Road and is the second of two sites containing wastewater treatment infrastructure for Ashburton. Wastewater from Ashburton, and Tinwald is conveyed to the first site at 388 Wilkins Road where it is screened, before passing through an aeration basin, facultative and maturation ponds. The treated wastewater is then conveyed 11km to Ocean Farm.
At Ocean Farm, the incoming wastewater is distributed through a wetland area to a storage pond before being irrigated to land. The irrigated land is in pasture and for approximately six months of the year operates as a cut and carry operation under contract. For the remainder of year the land is grazed - also under contract.
The sites have operated in their current form since mid-2008.
The Service Delivery Committee have resolved that a review be carried out on the operations of Ocean Farm. The committee was seeking more information on “…farm operations and waste (sic) disposal…” It was thought given the time the facility has been operating, it was appropriate to review the operation of the facility. For the review to be effective, it is important that terms of reference be developed covering the review.

Overall Objectives
The objective of the review is to investigate whether the facility is operating as originally intended and also identify operational changes or capital improvements that can possibly provide operational efficiencies, improve compliance management and/or reduce costs.

Scope
There are two aspects to the review. The first covers wastewater disposal (encompassing the management, treatment and disposal of wastewater from its entry into the Ocean Farm site to its eventual application to land). The second will consider the revenue generating side of the Ocean Farm.

Wastewater Disposal
The following elements will be considered:
• Distribution channel (& overflow swale)
• Wetland
• Storage pond (& overflow swale)
• Pumping system
• Irrigation system
• Controls & telemetry systems

Revenue Generation (Farm)
The following elements will be considered:
• Pasture / land / site management
• Harvest management / standing grass contracts
• Grazing operations and contracts
• Irrigation augmentation

The review will provide a brief overview of the current operation of each of the above elements. Each element shall be considered against its primary function within the Ocean Farm facility, industry best-practice, and any resource consent or contractual requirements (where applicable). The review will identify and record opportunities for improvements where those improvements are compatible with the overall purpose of the facility and likely to result in:

• Operational efficiencies
• Improved compliance and/or compliance management; or
• Reduced costs
• Increased revenue

Where improvements are identified and involve capital investment, an estimate of cost to implement will be prepared.

Expected Outcome and Deliverables
The results of the review will be provided in a single report. The report shall detail the review of each element, provide commentary on the current operation as it relates to that element any compliance issues or significant operational issues, detail improvements identified including cost estimates to implement, and provide a summary of recommendations.

Competency and Expertise Requirements
The majority of the review involves wastewater disposal and is highly technical in nature, although it is noted that the revenue generation aspect to the review may require the services of a rural/farm advisor. It is considered appropriate to utilise external specialist wastewater engineering skills to conduct and lead the review and bring in additional local rural / farm advisor expertise where necessary.

Conduct of the Work
The review will be overseen by the ADC Assets Manager.
It is proposed to negotiate provision of the services with Council engineering service provider (Opus). They have access to the specialist expertise required, and they will in turn engage an appropriate local rural/farm advisor (subject to ADC officer approval).
The work will necessitate structured interviews with key staff and contractor personnel. This will be arranged through the ADC Asset Manager as required.
It is envisaged external resources will be engaged late March. The review report to be available late June 2015.
**Reporting Requirements**

The resulting report will be reviewed by staff prior to being finalised and circulated to the committee. Depending on the final content of the report, it may be necessary to hold a workshop, prior to the report being formally received by the committee.

Any actions or recommendations arising from the review will be dealt with on a cases by case basis and falls outside of these terms of reference.
6.4 Native Plantings at Ocean Farm

6.4.1 Summary
During the Long Term Plan budget workshops, an initiative to plant unusable parts of the Ocean Farm wastewater treatment plant in natives was raised. Planting these areas at Ocean Farm will create pockets of biodiversity in the area, further enhancing the constructed wetland.

Before proceeding with any planting initiatives it is proposed to carry out a vegetation survey of the areas within the Ocean Farm site to determine the scale of any remnant vegetation and develop a planting plan.

The purpose of this report is to seek Committee approval to complete an ecological survey of the Ocean Farm site.

6.4.2 Recommendation
That an ecological survey of Ocean Farm be undertaken.

6.4.3 Background
At the Long Term Plan budget workshops, an initiative to plant unusable parts of the Ocean Farm Wastewater treatment plant in natives was raised. This would create pockets of biodiversity in the area, further enhancing the constructed wetland.

Ecologist Mike Harding recently completed the second stage of the Plains Dryland Vegetation Survey, which was received by Environmental Services Committee on 20 November 2014. The report did not cover the Ocean Farm site but identified remnant vegetation on Lower Beach Road, adjacent to the site. It is expected there will be remnant vegetation on Ocean Farm which would further enhance Council’s understanding of native vegetation in the district.

Mr Harding has provided an estimate of $3,200 (plus GST) to undertake a survey of the site and develop a planting plan. This will inform any applications for funding from other agencies.

Previous native plantings at the site for shelter purposes have been sourced using eco-sourcing which is considered best practice. It is expected that any additional planting will continue this practice. Future planting projects will be coordinated through the Ocean Farm Manager.

6.4.4 Options and Risks Considered
Option One – Do not proceed with the Ecological Survey
No ecological survey of Ocean Farm will be undertaken at this time.
Risks

- Council may be criticised for not taking the opportunity to advance biodiversity initiatives

Option Two – Proceed with the Ecological Survey

The ecological survey is completed using a specialised and experienced local consultant as presented in this report.

Risks

- None identified

The recommended option is **Option Two**.

### 6.4.5 Statutory Implications

The following legislation is relevant to this decision:

- Resource Management Act

The Ashburton District Plan is prepared under the RMA and contains the following:

Objective 3.2: Biodiversity “Protect, sustain maintain and/or enhance indigenous biodiversity and ecosystems by controlling and managing activities that have the potential to affect the life supporting capacity of soils, and water quality in the lakes, rivers and wetlands and significant nature conservation values.”

### 6.4.6 Significance and Engagement

Approval of the recommendations contained in this report is consistent with the Community Outcomes and Strategic Objectives outlined in the LTP and Annual Plan. In particular;

**Outcome 2: Sustainable natural and built environments**

**Strategic objective:** People can access and experience our natural environments

**Strategic objective:** We understand the need to protect our natural environment and act to do so

**Strategic objective:** Our community has access to information and services that promote environmental responsibility and sustainability

This project is also consistent with the following plans and strategies;

**Ashburton District Biodiversity Action Plan**

Objective 1: Identify the current state of biodiversity in the Ashburton District

**Action 1.2:** Commission an ecological survey of the Ashburton District Plains

Objective 2: First protect, then maintain and restore areas of significant biodiversity

**Action 2.1:** Use all collated biodiversity information, including survey results, to plan actions for years 2-5 that target areas needing urgent attention*

Objective 3: Engage with landowners in the identification, protection and enhancement of biodiversity

**Action 3.1:** Distribute information to landowners regarding biodiversity identification, protection, enhancement and regulation.

Objective 4: Integrate biodiversity principles into Council policy and practice

**Biodiversity Strategy for the Canterbury Region**

Goal 1: Protect and maintain the health of all significant habitats and ecosystems

Goal 2: Restore the natural character of degraded habitats and ecosystems
Goal 4: Enhance public awareness, understanding and support of biodiversity
Goal 5: Encourage, celebrate and support action by landowners and communities to protect, maintain and restore biodiversity
Goal 6: Improve the range and quality of knowledge and information about Canterbury’s biodiversity for its sustainable management

6.4.7 Financial

The total cost of the survey work has been estimated at $3200 (plus GST) and can be carried out within existing budgets.

The implementation of the planting plan is expected to be jointly funded with ECan through their immediate steps funding. An ecological report will add weight to the application.

Prepared By:
FLEUR MULLIGAN
Senior Policy Advisor

Approved by:
ANDREW GUTHRIE
Assets Manager
6.5 District Water Investigations – Stockwater Supply via Irrigation Schemes

6.5.1 Summary

The engineering service provider has been progressing discussions with the irrigation companies in the District to discuss commercial terms for the delivery of stockwater via the schemes. Further work has also been completed to confirm the legal mechanisms for the transfer of water rights including development of transfer agreements.

It is very apparent that the volume to be transferred is likely to be a contentious point of future discussions. To date these discussions have proceeded on the basis of theoretical values. Officers believe it important to provide credibility to the process that the basis for the volumes is robust and well-founded.

The purpose of this report is to provide a summary of the works completed to date and seek committee approval to consult with individual stockwater customers to determine their future need for the service and if applicable their actual water requirement.

6.5.2 Recommendation

1. That the report District Water Investigations – Supply via Irrigation Schemes, February 2015 (Opus) be received; and
2. That in accordance with Option 2 of this report, stockwater customers are individually consulted to determine future need of the service; and where necessary site specific options for alternate supply are developed, and discussed.

6.5.3 Background

Council is currently consented to take 6,256 L/s from the Ashburton River catchment for stockwater purposes. The proposed Land and Water Regional Plan contains a policy requiring Council to reduce these stockwater takes to less than 2,900 L/s by 1 July 2023.

A report titled Ashburton District Water Investigation, Stockwater Supply – Detailed Investigations, June 2014 (Opus) concluded that there is an opportunity for the District stockwater race network to be largely abandoned in favour of supplying stockwater by other means.

Factors which support such a change:

- A general shift in farming practices and expectations in respect of stockwater supply. Many properties now no longer use or want the open-channel stockwater network, and are using alternative supplies that they have established themselves.
• The change from open-race irrigation schemes to piped irrigation schemes over much of the district, thereby providing a possible alternative supply mechanism. There are a number of challenges with providing stockwater using a piped irrigation network, but irrigation schemes appear to be generally receptive to the idea.

• Increasing pressure from regulators to reduce the amount of water taken for the current stockwater network which is not an efficient means of delivering relatively small amounts of water over a large area. This means that obtaining consents is likely to become more difficult and expensive in future, and the amount of water permitted may be reduced.

The June 2014 report also considered options, costs and implications for closing the stockwater race schemes in Ashburton district in favour of other alternative supply means. This followed a survey of the stockwater users throughout the district in 2013. A number of options have been considered to provide stockwater service through alternative means. It appears that the most economic means will be a combination of:

• Supply via irrigation schemes for those properties without alternative supply that are located within the command area of existing and proposed piped irrigation schemes. There are a number of issues regarding this that would need to be worked through.

• Supply to some clusters of properties by restricted rural water supply schemes. These would likely use groundwater as a source of supply.

• Supply to remaining users by individual bores. We believe this will generally be less expensive per property than constructing larger schemes in most cases. Some properties may not be able to source an adequate supply due to poor groundwater resources in their area; the extent of this would not be known until wells are constructed.

In July 2014, the Committee approved the commencement of formal discussions with irrigation companies in the district to confirm the viability of supplying stockwater through those schemes. Since that time meetings have been held in August, October and November with the irrigation companies. The engineering service provider has also completed further analysis of the volumes of water to be transferred.

The model progressed to date is based on Council transferring existing water permits to the schemes to cover the stockwater required to service users within their command areas, plus an additional volume which could be used for irrigation. The latter would offset the schemes’ costs to provide stockwater, so that the transfer was cost-neutral to Council. Discussions have been based on a transfer of 10 times (a total of 385 L/s) the water required for stockwater (38.5 L/s).

The basis for this approach is as follows:

• For any given amount of stockwater actually consumed by stock, approximately 20 times this amount has to be conveyed through the open race network.

• Using a 10 times the actual use provides a 50:50 split of the total water that would otherwise have been required.

• This would allow 9 times the stockwater volume, to be used for irrigation and the other 10 times of the stockwater returned to the environment to help meet regulatory objectives.
Using this approach the transfer rates are as set out in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Number of Properties</th>
<th>Area (ha)</th>
<th>Stockwater Requirement (L/s)</th>
<th>Proposed Total Settlement (L/s)</th>
<th>Irrigable Area (ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashburton / Lyndhurst</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4,605</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrhill Chertsey</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>7,395</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valetta</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1,307</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>134</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,307</strong></td>
<td><strong>38.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>385</strong></td>
<td><strong>749</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In general, the schemes have indicated they are positive to the consideration of the proposal. However, informal feedback to date is that the volume of water proposed is not sufficient compensation to cover capital costs and maintenance for a stockwater service. The water would also have to be provided at high reliability to have value (i.e. 95% or better).

In order to determine whether the offer made to date is to be considered fair, an analysis on the value of water has been completed. This analysis is based on work carried out by Butcher Partners in 2012. The NPV is a weighted average based on a 30 year period (8% discount rate), calculated at $16,000/ha.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Proposed Settlement (L/s)</th>
<th>Non-Stockwater Transfer (L/s)</th>
<th>Irrigable Area at 4mm/day (ha)</th>
<th>Net Present Value of Water</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashburton Lyndhurst</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>$ 4,144,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrhill Chertsey</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>$ 6,656,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valetta</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>$ 1,184,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>385</strong></td>
<td><strong>347</strong></td>
<td><strong>749</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 11,984,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Given the scale of community asset value potentially shifting from Council to effectively private interests, there is concern that more information is required to confirm who will require stockwater in future. It is also necessary to determine what their options are when the network closes; and the actual costs that may be incurred by the irrigation companies if they feature in the options. Gathering this information is expected to take more time, but it will place Council in a stronger position if this information is better known.

6.5.4 Options and Risks Considered

The Committee has the following options available:

**Option One** – Confirm a transfer volume of 10 times the stockwater requirement

This would mean that no further information is collected and the discussion continues on the basis of the approach to date. The total amount to be considered for transfer (for stockwater and irrigation purposes) shall be no more than 10 times the calculated stockwater amount required to service customers in the command areas that do not have a cost-effective alternative to the stockwater network.

The discussions would proceed on the basis of a committee approved “upper limit”. Any formal counter offer would be returned to the committee for consideration.

**Risks**
- Community may be concerned at the scale of asset value transferring to private interests
- The offer may not be considered acceptable to the irrigation companies
- Council may have to reconsider options to utilise irrigation schemes

**Option Two** – Carry out comprehensive consultation with all stockwater customers

For this option, all stockwater customers would be consulted (where possible in person and on site) to determine the future need for the service. Options for alternate self-supply would be confirmed, and where necessary the feasibility of supply from the irrigation schemes would be determined.

**Risks**
- Delays may result in criticism from irrigation companies

**Option Three** – Ask irrigation companies to confirm capital & operational cost of service

Under this option, the irrigation companies would be asked to confirm their expected capital and operational costs to facilitate the provision of the stockwater service.

Once this information is made available, it can be equated back to a volume to determine a starting point for further discussion.

**Risks**
- May lead to protracted negotiations
- Irrigation companies may not be prepared to provide the information and withdraw from negotiations
- Council may have to reconsider options to utilise irrigation schemes

The recommended option is **Option Two**. This will provide significantly more certainty around the servicing task and place Council in a stronger position when it re-engages with the irrigation companies.

6.5.5 Statutory Implications

The statutory implications arising from matters contained in this report are set out below:

**Proposed Canterbury Land & Water Regional Plan – 18 January 2014**
The purpose of the Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan (“LWRP” or “the Plan”) is to identify the resource management outcomes or goals for managing land and water resources in Canterbury to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (“RMA”). It identifies the policies and rules needed to achieve the objectives, and provides direction in terms of the processing of resource consent applications.

The policy within the plan of most relevance to this report is the following:

13.4.1 In order to increase the amount of water in the river that is available to meet the proposed increased minimum flows, the taking of water for community stock water supplies from the Hakatere/Ashburton River will progressively decrease so that as soon as possible, but by no later than 1 July 2023, that taking will not exceed 2,900 L/s in total.

Local Government Act

The LGA does not contain any provisions regarding the requirements for a District Council to establish or maintain a stockwater network. Therefore, implications for ADC under the LGA are considered against any decision-making consultative requirements pursuant to Part 6. The extent to which the decision-making processes of the LGA apply, depends on whether the closure of the water race network and transfer responsibility for provision of stockwater to the irrigation schemes is ‘significant’ in terms of Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy (November 2014).

6.5.6 Significance and Engagement

The recommendations contained in this report are interim in nature and are not considered significant in terms of the need to engage with the wider community. The formal closure process of any area of the network will be the subject of consultation with stockwater customers and the wider community at the appropriate time.

Approval of the recommendations contained in this report is consistent with the Community Outcomes and Strategic Objectives outlined in the LTP. In particular;

Outcome 1: A thriving and diverse local economy.

Strategic Objective. Our district’s infrastructure and services meet our current and future needs.

Outcome 2: Sustainable natural and built environments.

Strategic Objective. We have safe and attractive built environments that meet our community’s needs.

6.5.7 Financial Implications

The cost implications arising from the recommendations contained in this report are associated with the engagement of appropriate resources to carry out the consultation with stockwater customers. This work is estimated at $80,000 exclusive GST, and will be outsourced in accordance with Council’s procurement policy.

The work will be funded from the Stockwater Investigations account. This has available budget provision in the amount of $200,000.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PREPARED BY</th>
<th>APPROVED BY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANDREW GUTHRIE Assets Manager</td>
<td>NEIL MCCANN Group Manager Service Delivery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.6 Road Closure – Winslow Willowby Road

6.6.1 Summary
To recommend the temporary closure of a road in the Winslow area to allow the Ashburton Car Club to hold the Winslow Willowby Road Standing Quarter Mile Sprint.

6.6.2 Recommendation
That the following road be closed to ordinary vehicular traffic from 9.30am to 5.00pm on Saturday, 16 May 2015 to allow the Ashburton Car Club to hold the Winslow Willowby Road Standing Quarter Mile Sprint -

Winslow Willowby Road, from Longbeach Road intersection to 500 metres from SH1 intersection.

6.6.3 Background
The Ashburton Car Club have applied for Winslow Willowby Road, from Longbeach Road intersection to 500 metres from the SH1 intersection, to be temporarily closed to allow them to hold the Winslow Willowby Road Standing Quarter Mile Sprint.

This application must be considered by Council under Paragraph 11(e) of the Tenth Schedule of the Local Government Act 1974, because New Zealand Motorsport, of which the Ashburton Car Club is a member, requires roads to be closed for motor sport events under the Local Government Act, as event participants may be under 16 years of age.

The Ashburton Car Club have been advised of the conditions of closure, which are as follows:-

- Courtesy approval from NZTA, as this is close to SH1 only – this has been received
- Approval from Service Delivery Committee
- No objections received after statutory advertisement placed. Objections closed on 6 March 2015 and no objections were received
- Service Delivery staff to inspect road within three days before and after event
- Road to be reinstated back to condition prior to event.
- Any road reinstatement or maintenance costs will be charged to the Ashburton Car Club
- Arrangement to be made for tidying and clearing the road and disposal of any litter
- Ashburton Car Club to arrange insurance – this has been done and copy received
- Ashburton Car Club to arrange for an approved Traffic Management Plan – this has been done and copy received
- Confirmation that the local community is in full support of this event being held – this has been received, both verbally and copy of notification letter
- All correct road signs and barricades are in place during the full period of the closure and promptly removed after the event.
• Safety marshalls to be on site throughout event and provided with distinctive safety clothing
• In the event that the weather is bad enough that it may cause damage to the road, organisers shall take all necessary steps to protect the road. This may require delaying or cancelling the event.

6.6.4 Options and Risks Considered
This event has been run annually and has been managed without incident for a number of years. The responsibility for risk free operation lie with the organisers and all contingencies are covered in the conditions of closure.
Emergency services are provided with copy of road closure information after approval has been given.

6.6.5 Statutory Implications
Clause 11 of the Tenth Schedule of the Local Government Act 1974 provides –
“That Council may, subject to such conditions as it thinks fit… close any road or part of a road to all traffic (e)… for any exhibition, fair, market, concert, film making, race or other sporting event or public function.”

6.6.6 Significance and Engagement
The Ashburton Car Club have held this event for a number of years and the local community are in support it being held. All affected property owners on the section of Winslow Willowby Road to be closed have a notification letter delivered.
No other local organisations are involved in this event.

Outcome #4: An enjoyable place to live
Strategic Objective: Our district has sport and recreation facilities that meet the district’s needs.

6.6.7 Financial Implications
There are no financial implications, except the cost of advertising

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PREPARED BY</th>
<th>APPROVED BY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KAYE DONALDSON</td>
<td>BRIAN FAUTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Support Officer - Applications</td>
<td>Contracts Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.7 Road Closure – Wheels Week Street Sprints and Autocross

6.7.1 Summary
To recommend the temporary closure of a roads in the Ashburton Riverside Business Estate, to allow the Ashburton Car Club to hold the annual Wheels Week Street Sprints and an Autocross. The autocross is to be held to celebrate the 25th anniversary of Wheels Week.

6.7.2 Recommendation

That the following roads in the Ashburton Riverside Business Estate be closed to ordinary vehicular traffic from 8.00pm, Friday 8 May 2015 until 8.00pm, Sunday 10 May 2015 to allow the Ashburton Car Club to hold the Wheels Week Street Sprints and Autocross –

- Smallbone Drive, from River Terrace to Robinson Street
- Robinson Street, from Smallbone Drive intersection to McNally Street
- Watson Street, from Range Street to Robinson Street
- McNally Street, from Range Street to the end of the street

6.7.3 Background
The Ashburton Car Club have applied for temporary road closures in the Ashburton Riverside Business Estate to allow them to hold the annual Wheels Week Street Sprint event. They also wish to hold an Autocross on the Saturday evening to support the 25 year anniversary of Wheels Week.

This application must be considered by Council under Paragraph 11(e) of the Tenth Schedule of the Local Government Act 1974, because New Zealand Motorsport, of which the Ashburton Car Club is a member, requires roads to be closed for motor sport events under the Local Government Act, as event participants may be under 16 years of age.

The Ashburton Car Club has been advised of the conditions of closure, which are as follows:-
- Courtesy approval from NZTA, as this is close to but not closing River Terrace (SH77) – this has been received.
- Approval from the Service Delivery Committee.
- No objections received after statutory advertisement placed. Objections closed on Friday, 6 March 2015 and no objections were received.
- Service Delivery staff to inspect roads within three days before and after event.
- Roads to be reinstated back to condition prior to event.
- Any road reinstatement or maintenance costs will be charged to the Ashburton Car Club.
- Arrangement to be made for tidying and clearing the roads and disposal of any litter.
- Ashburton Car Club to arrange insurance – this has been done with a copy received.
• Ashburton Car Club to arrange for an approved Traffic Management Plan – this has been done with a copy received.
• Confirmation that the local community is in full support of this event being held – this has been received.
• All correct road signs and barricades are in place during the full period of the closure and promptly removed after the event
• Safety marshalls to be on site throughout the events and provided with distinctive safety clothing
• In the event that the weather is bad enough that it may cause damage to the road, organisers shall take all necessary steps to protect the road. This may require delaying or cancelling the event.

6.7.4 Options and Risks Considered
This event has been run for twenty-six years and has been managed without incident.

The responsibility for risk free operation lies with the organisers and all contingencies are covered in the conditions of closure.

Emergency services are provided with copy of road closure information after approval has been given.

6.7.5 Statutory Implications
Clause 11 of the Tenth Schedule of the Local Government Act 1974 provides –
“That Council may, subject to such conditions as it thinks fit… close any road or part of a road to all traffic (e)… for any exhibition, fair, market, concert, film making, race or other sporting event or public function.”

6.7.6 Significance and Engagement
The Ashburton Car Club have held this event for twenty-six years and it is a well-known annual event that many look forward to. This is widely publicised and the well supported by the community.

Businesses in the affected area have been approached and letters signed to acknowledge their support and approval.

Other local organisations are involved over the weekend with marshalling, security, hot food etc.

**Outcome #4: An enjoyable place to live**

**Strategic Objective:** Our district has sport and recreation facilities that meet the district’s needs.

6.7.7 Financial Implications
There are no financial implications, except for the cost of advertising.
7 Activity Reports

7.1 General

7.1.1 Tinwald Corridor Study
The draft Programme Business Case report was reviewed by the working group on 10 March. The draft report will be the subject of a workshop discussion before the March Service Delivery Committee meeting and prior to going to Council for endorsement.

7.1.2 Staff
Sarah Paton commenced in the role of Booking Coordinator at the EA Networks Centre on 23 March.

7.1.3 Infrastructure Strategy
The draft Infrastructure Strategy was forwarded to Audit NZ late last year. It was intended to have their comments back in time for the strategy to be updated prior to circulation to Councillors, however this feedback has only recently been received. The version circulated to Councillors this week does not currently incorporate any changes required as a result of suggestions from Audit. There will be an opportunity to discuss the strategy at the workshop on the morning of 19 March. The final draft is intended to be adopted as part of other LTP documents on 9 April.

7.2 Library

7.2.1 Issues and Membership
The issues for January were down on January 2014, (24150 compared with 27184) but February 2015 just beat out last year’s issue figure total, (20402 as against 20122) which is heartening. Fiction still did well in all age groups, but non-fiction also came closer to last year’s total. E-audio has had a good take-up, which is pleasing.

7.2.2 Preparations for Kotui Library Computer System
The build-up to changeover to the Kotui library computer system began in earnest in the New Year. Data review, testing, and establishing procedures for circulation and cataloguing is detailed work that will ensure a smooth transition. Specialist training of staff will take place throughout March, in preparation for the “go-live” date of 16 April.

7.2.3 Children’s Library
The “Read and Grow” summer holiday reading challenge was a success, with over 200 prizes awarded to 180 children. Numbers were slightly down on last year, but the extraordinarily hot weather may account for that. Support from parents was enthusiastic.

This school year Ashburton Borough School is without a school library. The school has arranged regular class visits until their building programme is completed. St Joseph’s School have their library back again this year but still plan visits regularly, as does the Ashburton Christian School and Hampstead. A class from Chertsey visited during February.

7.2.4 Displays
A promotional display of the new Borrowbox e-books and e-audio was the sole display during January. In February, community displays represented Senior Net, Creative Fibre, and Volunteer Service Abroad.
7.3 Ashburton Museum

7.3.1 General
Numbers attending since 15 February (the day after opening) to 6 March (19 days) was 937.

Comments received, verbal and written, are overwhelmingly approving.

The number of out of town visitors, especially from overseas, seems to be much higher than in the old building. This may be due to the site, but also may reflect a rise in visitor numbers overall.

One school has visited, six more are booked in over the next few weeks. With one exception all are using the Heritage Education teachers from Timaru Museum. A lot of work has gone into showing teachers the new facilities.

The current short-term exhibition is “Small Stories”. The next one is a special exhibition for the centennial of the Ashburton Motorcycle Club.

7.4 Parks and Open Spaces

7.4.1 Public Conveniences
The old metal urinal at the Mayfield Domain toilets has been replaced with a new stainless steel model. Extra work has been done to protect the pipe work from vandalism and the Domain Board have painted the facility.

A cleaning company has deep cleaned the East Street, Domain playground and paddling pool toilets. An audit of all public conveniences has started.

7.4.2 Ashburton Domain
A special area for wedding ceremonies in the rose garden has been completed. This consists of a pergola with Timaru bluestone paving through the middle with ready lawn on the outside. A wedding party has already used the area.

7.4.3 Township Beautification and Sportsfields
Work at Baring Square East has started with the bricks being removed and replaced with turf. A new Timaru bluestone path has been laid. Some flowering cherry trees have been removed and there are other shrubs to be taken out to open up the area.

7.4.4 Rural Townships and Reserves
Four additional trees have been planted at the Methven Heritage Centre.

7.4.5 Cemeteries
Work has begun around the old villa house at the Ashburton cemetery to find the water and power cables in readiness for demolition.

The gates at the Methven cemetery have been cleaned by periodic detention workers.

7.5 Stockwater

7.5.1 Intakes
The Methven auxiliary intake was washed out by heavy rainfall in the back country. The Winchmore intake is running very low, hence low levels of water in Mill Creek. Water to the Dromore and Fairton areas is being supplemented by syphoning water from the Ashburton Lyndhurst Irrigation scheme.
7.5.2 Network
Problems getting water to the extremities of the stock water network continue to be encountered due to the lack of rainfall.
A steady number of race closure applications are being received.

7.5.3 District Water Investigations
A report updating the status of discussions with irrigation companies has been completed. This is the subject of a stand-alone report.

7.5.4 RDRML Appeal
This appeal point of concern to Council appears close to resolution. RDRML have stepped back from their proposal seeking further amendment of policy 13.4.1 in the PL&WRP and instead are seeking the inclusion of an advice note relating to Table 12 of the Plan. It has been reviewed and does not create any foreseeable difficulties for Council and on that basis we will support the approach. It is understood that Environment Canterbury also support the inclusion of the advice note.

7.6 EA Networks Centre
7.6.1 General
The EA Network centre is progressing well. Most of the senior staff have been appointed with only the administration remaining.
The gym equipment has arrived and is installed. All pools have been filled and testing has started. The facility is nearing completion and is on track. The fit-out of the stadium will be complete by 13 March, this will include the fitting of netball hoops and all other sports equipment.

Tinwald pool has closed for the season and a successful last day was held on Children’s Day (Sunday 1 March) where the turnout was great.

Staffing levels at the pools have been stretched but have been managed through the busy times.

7.7 Capital Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EA Networks Centre</td>
<td>This project is to construct a sports centre, with 4 courts in a stadium adjacent to the four pools. It includes two outdoor courts, a gym and café.</td>
<td>The contractor for the main building has performed well and is preparing the building for handover. The completion date is the 9 March 2015. The site works contract is substantially complete.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mill Creek Bank Stabilisation</td>
<td>This project consists of stream rehabilitation. The creek banks are stabilised with rock protection and timber retaining walls. The creek bed is cleared of all sediment and debris for a stone layered base. Landscape planting is undertaken on completion of the rehabilitation of the banks.</td>
<td>This project is on programme. Stage 5, from Turton Street to Allens Road has been appended to this contract to utilise the low rates. The original contract is due to be completed on 19 June 2015. Stage 5 will be a separable portion. The landscaping is programmed for first week of April.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Ashburton Borough Catchment Sewer**

This project is to construct a new 700mm diameter trunk sewer main from William Street/Dobson Street to the grit chamber in Trevors Road. This will replace the old 450mm diameter concrete main which is failing in places.

Five expressions of interest were received. These have been evaluated. The four successful contractors have been notified. The contract document was finalised and issued to the contractors on 9 March 2015. Tenders close on 27 March 2015.

---

**Ashburton Relief Sewer**

This project is to construct a trunk sewer main to relieve the sewers that are under capacity.

The original scope has been changed and an investigation is in progress to establish the possibility of a new river crossing at the end of Milton Road. This will also increase the area being serviced for wastewater.

---

**Ashburton Wastewater Pipeline replacement**

This project is for the replacement and size increase of two sewer mains. One in Walnut Ave between McLean Street and William Street. The second in Thomas Street from Falcon Drive to Creek Road.

The 375mm diameter sewer line replacement in Walnut Ave is complete. The footpath reinstatement was completed on 11 March 2015. Thomas Street has commenced with the 225mm diameter main and is due to be completed on 29 May 2015.

---

### 7.8 Roading (Subsidised)

#### 7.8.1 General

- **Roading Reference Groups**
  
  Meetings were held with the Southern Area and Northern Area road reference groups in February. Minutes of those meetings are attached. Pages 41-44

- **State Highway Work 2014/15**
  
  NZTA has advised the following work is planned:

  - Safety improvement work on SH1 between Dromore and Ashburton. This will be finished over this calendar year and includes lighting upgrade, undergrounding of power, widening at the passing lane (commencing 9 March), the installation of profile line markings (completed), tree removal and culvert extensions.
  
  - The installation of a new light pole at the Longbeach Road intersection with SH1, in association with the undergrounding of power lines by EA Networks.

#### 7.8.2 Sealed Pavement Maintenance

- **Pre Seal Repairs**
  
  Pre reseal repairs are completed.

- **Minor Township Maintenance Contracts**

  - **Methven**
    
    No reported vandalism for this month.

    The Methven Townsmen Contract C626 is due to end on 30 June 2015. The contract may be extended beyond the initial one year contract period subject to the satisfactory performance by the contractor.

  - **Rakaia**
The Rakaia Township Maintenance Contract C599 is due to end on 30 June 2015. Options for delivering this service are currently being investigated.

7.8.3 **Unsealed Pavement maintenance**

- **Grading**
  
  Over January and February grading has achieved approximately 77% of the average requirement. The lesser amount achieved is a result of the dry weather.

- **Spot Metalling**
  
  No maintenance metalling has been undertaken lately due to the dry weather. Further metalling is programmed for this month.

7.8.4 **Routine Drainage maintenance**

- **Haketere Potts Road**
  
  Resource consent from ECan has been granted. Groyne work upstream of the bridge is being organised with a contractor.

7.8.5 **Traffic Services**

- **Carriageway Lighting**
  
  The streetlight operations and maintenance contract C600 is due to end on 30 June 2015.
  
  A new tender document is being prepared. Tendering for the contract C634 is programmed for the last week of May 2015.

7.8.6 **Level Crossing Warning Devices**

  Northpark Road half arm barriers have been designed.
  
  The Lagmhor crossing vertical curve requires flattening to accommodate allowable changes in vehicle designs. We are assisting KiwiRail with this project.

7.8.7 **Emergency Reinstatement**

  No applications for funds to date have been made this year.

7.8.8 **Network and Asset Management**

- **Mid-South Canterbury Roading Collaboration Group**
  
  The Memorandum of Understanding has been signed and copies circulated to the member councils. A “Business Case” has been prepared for CEO consideration. This document sought advice as to the type of maintenance contract required by the districts.
  
  The development of a common maintenance contract to be tendered by each council is continuing with the aim to have a new contract commencing on 1 October 2015. Discussion is continuing on other aspects of possible collaboration.

- **Programme Development**
  
  Submissions on the draft Regional Land Transport Plan 2015 - 2025 have closed. The hearing has taken place. A summary document of all submissions and deliberations has been released.

- **Traffic Counts**
  
  The development of a multi-year programme for traffic counting has been completed. This work is important to underpin the one network road classification and internal asset management planning. The first year of the programme (covering this year) has been negotiated and awarded
to our current service provider. The balance of the programme will be competitively tendered prior to 30 June 2015.

- **Kerb and Channel and Footpath Condition Survey**
  The kerb and channel and footpath condition survey has now been completed. This was done as part of the ongoing improvement to RAMM data tables. The output from this work will assist in the development of accurate renewal programmes for these assets.

7.8.9 **Corridor Works Liaison Group**
The next meeting of the Corridor Works Liaison Group is scheduled for March. The coordinated schedule is continuing to be updated and now incorporates the installations of the large irrigation schemes across the district.

7.8.10 **Unsealed Road Metalling**
- **Pavement Treatments**
  Work under C624 is completed except for Surveyors and Hackthorne Roads.

7.8.11 **Sealed Road Resurfacing**
- **2013-14 Resurfacing Contract C620**
  This work has been completed and practical completion issued. On East Street there are minor defects to be repaired.

- **2014-15 Resurfacing Contract C628**
  The resurfacing contract this year also includes the construction and sealing of 16 seal-backs, primarily at roads intersecting the reseal lengths. The work is nearing completion.

7.8.12 **Drainage Renewals**
- **Major drainage control**
  Work was completed on 10 October. Further drainage work is incorporated in the rehabilitation and resealing contracts.

- **New and replacement kerb & channel**
  The 2014/15 programme contract C625, which includes the following separable portions:
  - Harrison Street, Bathurst Street to Allens Road, school side has been completed.
  - Allens Road, from Harrison Street to Middle Road, school side is expected to be completed on 13 March 2015
  - Wellington Street, from Oxford Street to Trevors Road, school side is expected to be completed on 28 March 2015.

7.8.13 **Pavement Rehabilitation**
- **Sealed Roads 2014/15**
  The 2014/15 programme has been tendered in three contracts.

  Contract No C631: includes sections in Forks Road, Racecourse Road and Walnut Avenue. Racecourse Road also includes a section of reseal. Walnut Avenue has been completed. The rehabilitation of Racecourse Road between Belt Road and Creek Road is completed. The reseal work between Creek Road and SH1 is expected to be completed by the end of March.
Contract No C632: Includes two sections of Thompsons Track which are to be completed as unsubsidised work. Work is nearing completion on the Braemar portion of the works and progressing well on the Rakaia portion, work is expected to be completed here by early April. Due to the lower than expected tender price the Rakaia project has been extend by an additional 760m.

Contract No C633: Includes sections on Ashburton Rakaia Gorge Road, Beach Road, Christys Road and Fords Road. Work is yet to start, completion is expected by the end of May.

7.8.14 Structure Component Replacements
All bridges and stock underpasses have been inspected and a full report received from our bridge consultants. Recommended repairs will now be included into the maintenance programmes.

7.8.15 Traffic Services Renewals
A number of signs have been removed, damaged or vandalised during the previous months which is an ongoing expense and a problem within the district. Replacement/repairs are ongoing.

7.8.16 Minor Improvements
- Approach Sealing
  Under the maintenance contract C603 the following work has been tasked:
  - Sealing an approach to the intersection of Springfield Road and Ashburton River Road has now been completed including roadmarking and signage.

  The resealing contract C628 includes the construction and sealing of 16 approaches to sealed roads.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Item</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bridge 14: Baxters Road</td>
<td>Programmed to be constructed by 30 June.</td>
<td>Design completed. Contract document to be prepared and contract let.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge 148: Poplar Road</td>
<td>To be replaced with a suitably sized culvert. Replacement is on hold pending result of monitoring programme</td>
<td>On further inspection this small bridge is still in good repair. 6 monthly monitoring will be instigated and the bridge will be included in the HPMV routes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge/Culvert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- New Lights
The installation of underground cables for the conversion from overhead to underground is completed for the bulk of Mt Somers. The removal of redundant overhead reticulation is underway.

Installation of underground cables on Ashburton Gorge Road East of the school is nearly completed which will enable the removal of a short section of 11kV line on Patton Rd.

Installation of underground cables on Ashburton Gorge Road between the School and Hoods Road associated with Schikker’s subdivision is still to be undertaken.

7.8.17 Community Programmes
- Crash Reports
A record of crashes that have occurred in the Ashburton district on state highways and local roads since the last report is appended. 

Pages 45-47
- **Road Safety Calendar**
  Entry Forms for the annual road safety calendar competition have been distributed to all the primary schools and before and after school care facilities in the district. Advertising is currently underway.

- **Mobility Scooter Forum**
  The 2015 Mobility Scooter Forum has been postponed.

- **Road Crash Day**
  Planning is underway for the 2015 Road Crash Day.

**7.9 Roading (Unsubsidised)**

7.9.1 Rehabilitation
As reported above, the rehabilitation of two sections of Thompsons Track is progressing well.

**7.10 Footpaths**

7.10.1 Footpath Resurfacing

- **2014 - 2015**
  The kerb and channel replacement and footpath resurfacing work for Ashburton, Methven, Rakaia, Fairton and Mayfield has been completed.

**7.11 Drinking Water**

7.11.1 DW-BE10 Water Pipeline Replacements 2014/15 – Ashburton, and Methven
Work is continuing along Eton Street between Nelson Street and Wakanui Road. The contractor remains on track to complete the works by the due date of 22 April.

7.11.2 General
The submersible pump (and motor) in Bridge Street Bore 1 (Ashburton) has been damaged, and needs to be replaced.

Officers are investigating a possible removal/replacement of an uncovered reservoir identified on the Montalto water supply. In its current form, it poses a risk to the 4-5 properties supplied via the reservoir.

Work is continuing on identifying high-volume water users on the Dromore water supply. A small number of properties on the scheme have been identified for installation of water meters to determine if the consumption is reasonable.

**7.12 Wastewater**

7.12.1 General
Some minor adjustments have been made to the new flow meters installed at the Trevors Road grit chamber (Ashburton). The flowmeters are on two of three pipelines that enter the site. The third flowmeter will be installed as part of the Ashburton borough catchment sewer main renewal project. This flow information will be critical for our planning for the river siphon project.

A pilot project to carry out localised sewer repairs is expected to commence in May. The project will be limited initially to sites in the Tinwald area.
The intention is to trial trenchless repair methods on localised pipe damage, junctions and laterals. The work will include a formal evaluation of the repair systems.

Sites are currently being investigated in Ashburton/Tinwald for the construction of a caravan waste disposal facility. The intention is to provide a more accessible public site to replace the current public facility in the Tinwald Domain.

7.13 Stormwater

7.13.1 SW-AM10 Mill Creek Bank Stabilisation 14/15
As a result of savings under the original contract, it has become possible to add in the section of Mill Creek from Turton Street to Allens Road (Section 5). This will be completed as a separable portion. Officers are negotiating the terms of the additional work, and confirming if the work can be completed within the original contract completion date of 19 June. However, it is likely that the completion date for the separable portion will be in July.

7.13.2 General
The Ashburton stormwater model report has been updated. Preparations are underway to make flood map information available within Land Information Memoranda (LIMs). This is expected to be available within the next few weeks.

7.14 Solid Waste

7.14.1 General
Officers have commenced planning for the review of the Waste Management and Minimisation Plan. The last plan was adopted 15 December 2011. Part of this work includes the completion of a waste composition audit.

The volumes of residual waste being received at the Ashburton RRP continue to be higher than last year. Most of this increase can be attributed to construction and demolition waste. This material is also creating some issues at the site and has led to a need to place dimensional limits on timber materials received in the pit. This is the subject of a standalone report.

Officers have been planning for the provision of waste management services through to the commencement of the wheelie bin service on 1 July 2017. In this case Council is well placed, with the contract covering management of the ARRP, having a discretionary extension available of up to two years. The contractor has formally requested the extension through to 30 June 2017. Approval of the requested extension is the subject of a standalone report.

7.15 Contracts Awarded

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Contract</th>
<th>Contractor</th>
<th>Date / Value</th>
<th>No of tenders</th>
<th>Engineer’s Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1C633</td>
<td>Sealed Road Rehabilitation, Rural; Ashburton District 2014/15</td>
<td>Fulton Hogan Ltd</td>
<td>24 Feb 2015</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$1,014,952.72 to $1,354,592.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,014,952.72</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,291,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1C633 is for the rehabilitation of 5,260m of sealed rural pavement at four sites within Ashburton District. Work involves minor drainage works, shoulder preparation and earthworks, undercutting failed pavement, metal course construction, first coat sealing, and miscellaneous works. The sections are on Arundel Rakaia Gorge Road, Christys Road, Beach Road and Fords Road.
7.16 Methven Community Board

The Methven Community Board met on Monday 9 March. One matter has been referred to the Committee for decision:

- Methven LED Lighting Proposal

  | That the Main Street, Methven LED lighting project proposal be approved by the Service Delivery Committee as a community initiative with ongoing power costs to be funded within Council’s street lighting budget. |
  | Totty/McLaughlin | Carried |

Installation of the LED lights is subject to NZTA approval and Council officers will seek confirmation of this.

Minutes of the Board meeting are attached. Pages 48-51

NEIL McCANN
Group Manager Service Delivery
Minutes (unconfirmed)

Community Road Reference Group – Southern Area

Minutes of a meeting of the Southern Community Road Reference Group held on 16 February 2015, commencing at 10.34am in the Council Chambers, 5 Baring Square West, Ashburton.

Present
Cr S Wilson (Chair), Cr A Totty, Messrs B Austin, D McConnell, J Crouchley and Mrs L Lovett.

In attendance
Cr N Brown
Messrs B Fauth (Contracts Manager), G Green (Contracts Engineer Rural), G Rhodes (Asset Management Engineer), Ms D Barron (Asset Management Officer) and Mrs C Drummond (Support Officer – Service Delivery).

1 Apologies
Messrs C Ross, W Schmack and T Smyth
N McCann, Group Manager Service Delivery

2 Confirmation of Minutes
That the minutes of the joint Community Roading Reference Groups, Northern and Southern areas meeting held on 29 October 2014 be taken as read and confirmed.
Totty/Austin

3 Levels of Service
Grading Schedule:
Mr Fauth advised that the grading schedule was sitting at 88% of the total for the period July to January. The dry summer conditions has lowered the percentage.

There was discussion on road grading over the holiday period, whether it continued or stopped during the holidays. Mr Fauth advised that while the contract grading did stop should an emergency arise staff were on call to respond. There is still doubt if the schedule is being stuck to.

Discussion moved onto the grading of road shoulder material onto the berms, who decides when and where this is done and the issues it creates for property owners who wish to mow their roadsides. Also ‘cut ins’ for road drainage create problems when keeping berms tidy.

Road counts:
Ms Barron provided information on how traffic counts had been previously programmed and carried out. She advised that it had previously been on an ad-hoc basis, however a whole of network approach has now been put in place over the next 5 years which aims to achieve a good representation of road types as well as gathering actual data for critical routes.

Information has been sought from local trucking companies to assist with locating ‘hot spots’ or low usage areas.

4 Roading Matters
Roading programme development:

The roading programme development has input from several areas including the maintenance contractor, traffic counts, RAMM data and condition rating of half of the network each year. The condition rating tests sections of road gathering statistical data on cracking, edge breaks etc.

Once the information has been put/ feed into the RAMM database, specialised software provides a report advising what needs:
- maintenance
- resealing
- rehabilitation

Then working within the available budget the programme is prepared. Visual inspections of sites are still undertaken at present.

Draft Regional Land Transport Plan 2015-2025:

Members were briefed on the RLTP which includes requests for projects and their funding from each local authority in the region. Council has prepared a submission to the plan.

South/Mid Canterbury Collaboration Group:

Mr Fauth explained that a Memorandum of Understanding has been signed between Waimate, McKenzie, Timaru and Ashburton District Councils for a single roading maintenance contract for each district. The contract will be tendered by each council with the aim to have a new contract for up to 5 years commencing on 1 October 2015. Each Council will have an engineer representative involved in the management of the contract to ensure consistency.

Roading Issues:
- Irrigation water on roads:-

Road safety is a major concern especially for unsuspecting road users, with damage caused to the road the next concern. Council requests public input of offender’s locations. A letter is then sent to the property owner reminding them to keep water off the road, Ecan are advised following a second offence.
- Roadside baleage:-

Council staff contact property owners where baleage is being stored on roadside berms. Safety is the major reason for requesting the bales be removed.

Entranceway seal policy:

This policy has been in place since 2001 but enforcement has only started in the last 18 months following the District Plan review. Staff are working with Federated Farmers to outline the policy for rural residents - all new entranceways to houses, dairy sheds and the like must constructed to the policy. Paddock entrances do not need to be sealed. All non-complying entranceways will need to be brought retrospectively up to standard over the next few years.

When Council undertakes rehabilitation work on roads around the district entranceways will be sealed as a matter of course. However when the work is a straight reseal, property owners will be approached on a cost share basis for the entranceway work to be carried out while the contractor is on site. Information is available on the ADC website.

5 General Business

There was discussion on repeated pothole repairs that do not last.

Concern was expressed about ‘wilding’ trees growing on some roadsides and the need for them to be removed before get too big.

6 Next meeting

The next meeting will be held late May/early June.

The meeting concluded at 12.45pm.
Minutes of a meeting of the Northern Community Road Reference Group held on 18 February 2015, commencing at 10.35pm in the Council Chambers, 5 Baring Square West, Ashburton.

Present
Cr N Brown (Chair), Cr Cutforth, Messrs M Wareing, P McFall, D Lovett (from 10.40am), P Webster and J Harmer.

In attendance
Cr S Wilson
Messrs B Fauth (Contracts Manager), G Green (Contracts Engineer Rural), G Rhodes (Asset Management Engineer), Ms D Barron (Asset Management Officer) and Mrs C Drummond (Support Officer – Service Delivery).

1 Apologies
N McCann (Group Manager Service Delivery)  Sustained

2 Confirmation of Minutes
That the minutes of the joint Community Roading Reference Groups, Northern and Southern areas meeting held on 29 October 2014 be taken as read and confirmed.  Brown/Cutforth  Carried

3 Levels of Service
Grading schedule:
Mr Fauth advised that the schedule has been updated and was being monitored. With the dry summer and lack of moisture it has been difficult to keep corrugations to a minimum. There was discussion on when complaints were received about particular roads and whether these complaints were inspected prior to sending a grader. The issue of poor drainage on roads and different treatments to deal with this was also discussed.

Road counts:
Ms Barron provided information on how traffic counts had been previously programmed and carried out. She advised that it had previously on an ad-hoc basis, however a whole of network approach has now been put in place over the next 5 years which aims to achieve a good representation of road types as well as gathering actual data for critical routes. There was some discussion on timing of counts and the change in farm production and how this can affect this has on roads. Information has been sought from local trucking companies to assist with locating ‘hot spots’ or low usage areas. It was suggested that public weighbridges could also provide some information.

4 Roading matters
Reseals:
Mr Fauth advised that reseals areas are identified from the RAMM database using all the data collected, traffic counts, condition ratings, roughness testing (every second year) maintenance costs etc. Once areas are identified they are inspected and evaluated for work. Reseal work is expected to have a life of 25 to 30 years. Subsidy funding for this work is sought from NZTA.
Draft Regional Land Transport Plan 2015-2025:

Members were briefed on the RLTP which includes requests for projects and their funding from each local authority in the region. Council has prepared a submission to the plan.

South/Mid Canterbury Collaboration Group:

Mr Fauth explained that a Memorandum of Understanding has been signed between Waimate, McKenzie, Timaru and Ashburton District Councils for a single roading maintenance contract for each district. The contract will be tendered by each council with the aim to have a new contract for up to 5 years commencing on 1 October 2015. Each Council will have an engineer representative involved in the management of the contract to ensure consistency.

Roading Issues:
- Irrigation water on roads:-
  Road safety is a major concern especially for unsuspecting road users, with damage caused to the road the next concern. Council requests public input of offender’s locations. A letter is then sent to the property owner reminding them to keep water off the road, Ecan are advised following a second offence.
- Trees shading roads:-
  An ongoing problem that Council is working on. Where trees are creating a safety issue, property owners are approached with a request to remove them.
- Temporary roadside fencing:-
  An ongoing problem with the expansion of dairying throughout the district. The use of plastic standards is acceptable, however steel standards are very dangerous.
- Roadside baleage:-
  Council staff contact property owners where baleage is being stored on roadside berms. Safety is the major reason for requesting the bales be removed.

Entranceway seal policy:

Mr Fauth explained that this policy has been in place since 2001 but enforcement has only started in the last 18 months following the District Plan review. Staff are working with Federated Farmers to outline the policy for rural residents - all new entranceways to houses, dairy sheds and the like must constructed to the policy. All non-complying entranceways will need to be brought retrospectively up to standard over the next few years.

When Council undertakes rehabilitation work on roads around the district entranceways will be sealed as a matter of course. However when the work is a straight reseal, property owners will be approached to see if they will pay for the entranceway work to be carried out while the contractor is on site. Information is available on the ADC website.

5 General Business

There was discussion on the difficulty some of the longer heavy vehicles experience when negotiating intersections. This can cause damage to road signs etc.

There was a suggestion that contractors be reminded to be aware of where they park their equipment especially in the vicinity of intersections as this can block the view for other road users.

6 Next meeting

The next meeting will be held late May/early June.

The meeting concluded at 12.05pm.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>SIDE ROAD</th>
<th>DAY</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>CRASH DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>CRASH FACTORS</th>
<th>CONTROL</th>
<th>ROAD</th>
<th>LIGHT</th>
<th>WEATHER</th>
<th>JUNCTION</th>
<th>INJURY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>05/10/2014</td>
<td>LINE RD</td>
<td>URRALL ROAD</td>
<td>SUN</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>CAR1 NBD on LINE ROAD lost control turning right, CAR1 hit Cliff Bank, Fence on right hand bend</td>
<td>CAR1 lost control due to road conditions, windscreen or rear window misted/frosted. ENV: road slippery (frost or ice), entering or leaving private house / farm</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Ice/</td>
<td>Snow</td>
<td>Dark</td>
<td>Fine</td>
<td>Driveway N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/10/2014</td>
<td>HAVELock ST</td>
<td>GRigg ST</td>
<td>THU</td>
<td>1840</td>
<td>CAR1 SBD on HAVELock ST hit parked veh, CAR1 hit Parked Vehicle</td>
<td>CAR1 too far left/right</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Twilight</td>
<td>Fine</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/10/2014</td>
<td>SEASIDE RD</td>
<td>BONNINGTONS RD</td>
<td>WED</td>
<td>2130</td>
<td>CAR1 WBD on SEASIDE ROAD lost control turning left, CAR1 hit Ditch</td>
<td>CAR1 lost control when turning, attention diverted</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Dark</td>
<td>Fine</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/10/2014</td>
<td>CLARK ST</td>
<td>HARRISON ST</td>
<td>SAT</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>VAN1 EBD on CLARK ST lost control; went off road to left, VAN1 hit Fence</td>
<td>VAN1 alcohol test above limit or test refused, lost control, showing off wheelspins etc</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Dark</td>
<td>Fine</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/11/2014</td>
<td>RIVER RD</td>
<td>WAKANUI SCHOOL RD</td>
<td>SAT</td>
<td>1630</td>
<td>SUV1 NBD on RIVER ROAD lost control; went off road to left</td>
<td>SUV1 too fast for conditions, lost control on unsealed road, new driver showed inexperience</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Bright</td>
<td>Fine</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>MINOR2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/11/2014</td>
<td>WINSLOW RD</td>
<td>SWAMP RD</td>
<td>SAT</td>
<td>2130</td>
<td>CAR1 EBD on WINSLOW ROAD lost control; went off road to left, CAR1 went Over Bank, Other</td>
<td>CAR1 alcohol test above limit or test refused, too fast on straight, lost control end of seal, new driver showed inexperience</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Dark</td>
<td>Fine</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>MINOR1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/11/2014</td>
<td>ARUNDEL RAKAIA GORGE RD</td>
<td>HEENANS RD</td>
<td>SUN</td>
<td>1755</td>
<td>CAR1 NBD on ARUNDEL RAKAIA GORGE ROAD lost control turning right, CAR1 hit Fence on right hand bend</td>
<td>CAR1 alcohol test above limit or test refused, too far left/right, lost control when turning</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Bright</td>
<td>Fine</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/11/2014</td>
<td>EAST ST</td>
<td>BURNETT ST</td>
<td>TUE</td>
<td>1618</td>
<td>CAR1 NBD on EAST ST hit CAR2 manoeuvring</td>
<td>CAR1 didnt see/look behind when reversing/manoeuvring, misjudged speed of own vehicle</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Bright</td>
<td>Fine</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/11/2014</td>
<td>ANNE ST</td>
<td>LAGHMOR RD</td>
<td>FRI</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>SUV2 turning right hit by oncoming CAR1 NBD on ANNE ST</td>
<td>SUV2 failed to give way when turning to non-turning traffic, didnit see/look when required to give way to traffic from another direction ENV: entering or leaving private house / farm</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Overcast</td>
<td>Fine</td>
<td>Driveway</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/11/2014</td>
<td>LAGHMOR RD</td>
<td>ANNE ST</td>
<td>THU</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>VAN1 WBD on LAGHMOR ROAD hit CAR2 turning right onto LAGHMOR ROAD from the left</td>
<td>CAR2 failed to give way when turning to non-turning traffic ENV: dazzling sun</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Bright</td>
<td>Fine</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>T Type Junction N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/11/2014</td>
<td>TREVORS RD</td>
<td>NELSON ST</td>
<td>THU</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>CAR1 entering/leaving driveway hit PEDESTRIAN walking on footpath</td>
<td>CAR1 failed to give way at driveway, didnt see/look behind when reversing/manoeuvring ENV: entering or leaving private house / farm</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Bright</td>
<td>Fine</td>
<td>DriveWay</td>
<td>MINOR1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/11/2014</td>
<td>WINSLOW RD</td>
<td>SWAMP RD</td>
<td>SUN</td>
<td>1308</td>
<td>CAR1 EBD on WINSLOW ROAD lost control; went off road to right, CAR1 hit Fence</td>
<td>CAR1 too fast on straight, lost control</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Bright</td>
<td>Fine</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>MINOR1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/11/2014</td>
<td>WILSONS RD</td>
<td>WAKANUI SCHOOL RD</td>
<td>FRI</td>
<td>939</td>
<td>CAR1 SBD on WILSONS ROAD lost control turning left</td>
<td>CAR1 lost control when turning ENV: road slippery (frost or ice), heavy rain</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Ice/</td>
<td>Snow</td>
<td>Overcast</td>
<td>Heavy Rain</td>
<td>Unknown N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/12/2014</td>
<td>MOORE ST</td>
<td>CASS ST</td>
<td>MON</td>
<td>924</td>
<td>CAR1 NBD on CASS ST hit CAR2 crossing at right angle from right</td>
<td>CAR1 failed to give way at stop sign, didnit see/look when required to give way to traffic from another direction</td>
<td>Stop Sign</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Bright</td>
<td>Fine</td>
<td>X Type Junction N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/12/2014</td>
<td>PUDDING HILL RD</td>
<td>ARUNDEL RAKAIA GORGE RD</td>
<td>THU</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>CAR1 WBD on PUDDING HILL ROAD missed inters or end of road, CAR1 hit Traffic Sign</td>
<td>CAR1 lost control, service brake failed ENV: heavy rain</td>
<td>Stop Sign</td>
<td>Wet</td>
<td>Overcast</td>
<td>Heavy Rain</td>
<td>X Type Junction N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ASHBURTON DISTRICT ROAD CRASHES**

This report has been produced with information obtained from the New Zealand Transport Agency.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>SIDE ROAD</th>
<th>DAY</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>CRASH DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>CRASH FACTORS</th>
<th>CONTROL</th>
<th>ROAD</th>
<th>LIGHT</th>
<th>WEATHER</th>
<th>JUNCTION</th>
<th>INJURY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>06/12/2014</td>
<td>HEPBURNS RD</td>
<td>RUNDLES RD</td>
<td>SAT</td>
<td>1240</td>
<td>CAR1 EBD on HEPBURNS ROAD hit SUV2 doing driveway manoeuvre</td>
<td>SUV2 didnt see/look behind when reversing/ manoeuvering ENV: entering or leaving private house / farm</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Bright</td>
<td>Fine</td>
<td>Driveway</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/12/2014</td>
<td>CATHERINE ST</td>
<td>HARLAND ST</td>
<td>SAT</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>CAR1 NBD on CATHERINE ST lost control but did not leave the road, CAR1 hit Post Or Pole</td>
<td>CAR1 alcohol test above limit or test refused, lost control, showing off wheelspins etc</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Bright</td>
<td>Fine</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/12/2014</td>
<td>ULLUNDI RD</td>
<td>BAKER RD</td>
<td>THU</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>CAR1 WBD on ULLUNDI ROAD lost control but did not leave the road, CAR1 hit Fence</td>
<td>CAR1 too fast on straight, lost control ENV: road surface deep loose metal</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Dark</td>
<td>Fine</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/12/2014</td>
<td>WAKANUI BEACH RD</td>
<td>SEASIDE RD</td>
<td>FRI</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td>VAN1 SBD on WAKANUI BEACH ROAD lost control turning right on right hand bend</td>
<td>VAN1 alcohol test above limit or test refused, too fast entering corner, lost control when turning</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Twilight</td>
<td>Fine</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/01/2015</td>
<td>RACOURSE RD</td>
<td>HEPBURNS RD</td>
<td>TUE</td>
<td>836</td>
<td>SUV1 NBD on RACOURSE ROAD overtaking hit OTHER2 turning right</td>
<td>SUV1 overtaking vehicle signaling right turn, failed to notice indication of vehicle in front, misjudged intentions of another party ENV: fog or mist</td>
<td>Give Way</td>
<td>Sign</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Overcast</td>
<td>Mist</td>
<td>T Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/02/2015</td>
<td>RAKAIA BARRHILL METHVEN RD</td>
<td>VAUGHANS RD</td>
<td>THU</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>CAR1 EBD on RAKAIA BARRHILL METHVEN RD hit obstruction, CAR1 hit Fence, Slip Or Flood</td>
<td>ENV: road obstructed (flood waters)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Wet</td>
<td>Dark</td>
<td>Fine</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/02/2015</td>
<td>MOORE ST</td>
<td>WILLIAM ST</td>
<td>SAT</td>
<td>2335</td>
<td>CAR1 NBD on MOORE ST hit parked veh, CAR1 hit Parked Vehicle</td>
<td>CAR1 alcohol test above limit or test refused, too far left/right</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Dark</td>
<td>Fine</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/02/2015</td>
<td>WAKANUI RD</td>
<td>TREVORS RD</td>
<td>TUE</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>CAR1 NBD on TREVORS ROAD hit TRUCK2 crossing at right angle from right</td>
<td>CAR1 failed to give way at give way sign</td>
<td>Give Way</td>
<td>Sign</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Bright</td>
<td>Sun</td>
<td>X Type</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE HIGHWAYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>SIDE ROAD</th>
<th>DAY</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>CRASH DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>CRASH FACTORS</th>
<th>CONTROL</th>
<th>ROAD</th>
<th>LIGHT</th>
<th>WEATHER</th>
<th>JUNCTION</th>
<th>INJURY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13/10/2014</td>
<td>1S/430/2.01</td>
<td>MANCHESTER ST</td>
<td>MON</td>
<td>1024</td>
<td>CAR1 WBD on SH 1S hit VAN2 turning right onto SH 1S from the left</td>
<td>VAN2 failed to give way at stop sign, didnt see/look when required to give way to traffic from another direction</td>
<td>Stop Sign</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Bright</td>
<td>Fine</td>
<td>T Type Junction</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/10/2014</td>
<td>1S/416/13.535</td>
<td>WALNUT AVE</td>
<td>THU</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>TRUCK1 NBD on SH 1S hit rear end of CAR2 stop/slow for queue</td>
<td>TRUCK1 failed to notice car slowing</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Bright</td>
<td>Fine</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/10/2014</td>
<td>1S/416/13.901</td>
<td>WILLS ST</td>
<td>SAT</td>
<td>1140</td>
<td>CAR1 SBD on SH 1S hit rear end of CAR2 stop/slow for queue</td>
<td>CAR1 failed to notice car slowing, attention diverted by scenery or persons outside vehicle</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Bright</td>
<td>Fine</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/10/2014</td>
<td>1S/416/13.114</td>
<td>QUEENS DR</td>
<td>THU</td>
<td>1612</td>
<td>CAR1 NBD on SH 1S hit SUV2 U-turning from same direction of travel</td>
<td>CAR1 suddenly braked  SUV2 didnt see/look behind when changing lanes, position or direction, blind spot</td>
<td>Stop Sign</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Bright</td>
<td>Fine</td>
<td>T Type Junction</td>
<td>MINOR1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/11/2014</td>
<td>1S/416/13.234</td>
<td>WALNUT AVE</td>
<td>SAT</td>
<td>1650</td>
<td>CAR1 NBD on SH 1S WEST ST hit CAR2 crossing at right angle from right</td>
<td>CAR1 failed to give way at give way sign, didnt see/look when required to give way to traffic from another direction</td>
<td>Give Way</td>
<td>Sign</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Bright</td>
<td>Fine</td>
<td>Roundabout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/11/2014</td>
<td>1S/416/14.112</td>
<td>HAVELOCK ST</td>
<td>FRI</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>TRUCK1 SBD on SH 1S hit rear end of CAR2 stop/slow for signals</td>
<td>TRUCK1 following too closely, failed to notice car slowing</td>
<td>Traffic Sign</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Dark</td>
<td>Fine</td>
<td>X Type Junction</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/11/2014</td>
<td>1S/430/2.512</td>
<td>AGNES ST</td>
<td>SAT</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>CAR1 SBD on SH 1S hit CAR2 crossing at right angle from right, CAR2 hit House Or Bldg</td>
<td>CAR2 alcohol test above limit or test refused, failed to give way at stop sign</td>
<td>Stop Sign</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Bright</td>
<td>Fine</td>
<td>X Type Junction</td>
<td>MINOR1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Incident Description</td>
<td>Weather</td>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/11/2014</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>WITHELLS RD</td>
<td>CAR1 SBD on SH 1S lost control but did not leave the road, CAR1 hit Ditch</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Fine</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/11/2014</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>MOORE ST</td>
<td>CAR2 turning right hit by oncoming SUD1 NBD on SH 1S</td>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>Fine</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/11/2014</td>
<td>1730</td>
<td>JANE ST</td>
<td>CAR1 WBD on SH 1S hit CAR2 U-turning from same direction of travel</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Wet</td>
<td>Overcast</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/11/2014</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>WINSLW WILLOWBY RD</td>
<td>TRUCK1 WBD on SH 1S overtaking CAR2, CAR2 hit Ditch</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Bright</td>
<td>Fine</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>SERIOUS2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/12/2014</td>
<td>1309</td>
<td>RACECOURSE RD</td>
<td>CAR1 SBD on SH 1S lost control on straight and hit TRUCK2 head on</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Bright</td>
<td>Fine</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>MINOR1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/12/2014</td>
<td>1130</td>
<td>SOUTH ST</td>
<td>TRUCK2 turning right hit by oncoming CAR1 WBD on SH 1S</td>
<td>Give Way</td>
<td>Overcast</td>
<td>Fine</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>MINOR1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/12/2014</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>WINCHMORE DROMORE RD</td>
<td>TRUCK1 NBD on SH 1S hit rear end of BUS2 stopped/moving slowly</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Wet</td>
<td>Overcast</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>MINOR1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/12/2014</td>
<td>1510</td>
<td>PENDARVES RAKAIA RD</td>
<td>SUV1 NBD on PENDARVES RAKAIA ROAD hit CAR2 crossing at right angle from right</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Wet</td>
<td>Light Rain</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>MINOR1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/12/2014</td>
<td>1156</td>
<td>SOUTH ST</td>
<td>VAN1 NBD on SH 1S hit rear end of CAR2 stop/slow for queue</td>
<td>Give Way</td>
<td>Bright</td>
<td>Fine</td>
<td>T Type Junction</td>
<td>MINOR1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/12/2014</td>
<td>1740</td>
<td>TILSONS RD</td>
<td>CAR1 EBD on SH 1S lost control; went off road to right, CAR1 hit Fence</td>
<td>Give Way</td>
<td>Bright</td>
<td>Fine</td>
<td>X Type Junction</td>
<td>MINOR1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/12/2014</td>
<td>1155</td>
<td>QUEENS DR</td>
<td>CAR1 SBD on SH 1S hit rear end of VAN2 stop/slow for queue</td>
<td>CAR1</td>
<td>Bright</td>
<td>Fine</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/01/2015</td>
<td>1042</td>
<td>TANCRED ST</td>
<td>CAR1 EBD on SH 1S hit rear end of CAR2 stop/slow for queue</td>
<td>Give Way</td>
<td>Bright</td>
<td>Fine</td>
<td>T Type Junction</td>
<td>MINOR1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/01/2015</td>
<td>1704</td>
<td>GRHAM ST</td>
<td>VAN1 SBD on SH 1S hit CAR2 U-turning from same direction of travel</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Overcast</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/01/2015</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>FRISBYS RD</td>
<td>SUV1 NBD on SH 1S hit rear end of CAR2 stopped/moving slowly, SUV1 hit Fence</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Dark</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>MINOR1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/02/2015</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>SAUNDERS RD</td>
<td>CAR1 NBD on SH 1S hit rear end of CAR2 stop/slow for signals</td>
<td>CAR1</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Twilight</td>
<td>T Type Junction</td>
<td>MINOR1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/02/2015</td>
<td>1334</td>
<td>HAVELOCK ST</td>
<td>CAR1 WBD on SH 1S hit rear end of CAR2 stop/slow for signals</td>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>Wet</td>
<td>Overcast</td>
<td>X Type Junction</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/02/2015</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>ISLEWORTH ST</td>
<td>TRUCK1 NBD on SH 1S lost control but did not leave the road, TRUCK1 hit Guard Rail</td>
<td>Give Way</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Fine</td>
<td>T Type Junction</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/02/2015</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>HATFIELD OVERDALE RD</td>
<td>CAR1 NBD on SH 1S hit rear end of CAR2 stopped/moving slowly</td>
<td>CAR1</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Fine</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Minutes

Methven Community Board

Minutes of the Methven Community Board meeting held in the Mt Hutt Memorial Hall and Heritage Centre Board Room, Main Street, Methven, on Monday 9 March 2015, commencing at 1.31 pm.

Present
Liz McMillan (Chair), Hamish Gilpin, Sarah Lock, Sonia McAlpine, Dan McLaughlin, Cr Martin Nordqvist and Cr Alan Totty.

In attendance
Mayor Angus McKay, Group Manager Service Delivery, Senior Policy Advisor, Senior Communications Advisor (2.30pm), Open Spaces Manager, Business Support Officer (minutes).

Four members of the public attended the meeting.

1 Apologies
Cr Nordqvist (lateness) Sustained

2 Extraordinary Business
Nil.

3 Conflicts of Interest
Nil.

Cr Nordqvist attended the meeting at 1:33pm.

4 Correspondence
Richard Sheppard and OJ Dodson from Cinema Paradiso attended the meeting in relation to their letter to the Community Board. They are proposing to initiate a project for the installation of LED lighting along Main St, Methven. To date they have visited 31 businesses, all of which have pledged $50 financial support for the project.

The proposal is to suspend rope lighting on stainless steel cable parallel to the road (not across) with metal ties and water proof fittings. To date sufficient funds have been pledged to purchase 660m of lights, enough to complete one side of Main street, from the Methven Heritage Centre to South Belt.

EA Networks has confirmed that they will install these lights free of charge as a community donation. The Mayor suggested that the ongoing power costs for the LED lighting be absorbed in the Council’s street lighting budget. The lights would only be operational during the winter months. Messers Dodson and Sheppard do not believe that any residents would be affected by the additional light. The Board gratefully accepted the offer.

The Chair advised that there is approximately $400 in a community fund, raised for the purpose of tree lighting. The Chair will investigate whether this could be contributed to the fund.

Recommendation to Service Delivery Committee

That the Main Street, Methven LED lighting project proposal be approved by the Service Delivery Committee as a community initiative with ongoing power costs to be funded within Council’s street lighting budget.

Totty/McLaughlin Carried
5 Confirmation of Minutes (1:51pm)

That the minutes of the Methven Community Board Meeting held on 26 January 2015 be taken as read and confirmed.

Totty/Gilpin Carried

Matters Arising from the Minutes

- Welcome to Methven covers: Staff received confirmation this morning from Mr Don Breach that Methven Lions have agreed to support the production of 500 Welcome to Methven covers. The covers will now be sent for production. The board is extremely appreciative of this support.

- KidsMethven: Liz McMillan has met with a representative of Rhino Ramps who has measured up the proposed skate park area and recommended a cost effective way forward. The area will require fencing between the skate area and the Chorus access-way, a concrete pad, and planting to distinguish between the footpath and skate area. He has recommended smaller portable pieces in the first instance to get the park up and running. It was suggested that KidsMethven could make a submission to the Long Term Plan and apply to other funding organisations for assistance.

- Fallen trees in the cemetery: The Mayor, Mr Gilpin, Mr McLaughlin, Group Manager Service Delivery and Open Spaces Manager will visit the cemetery following this meeting to clarify a plan going forward to tidy the fallen trees. Concerns were raised from the town drive and the initial discussion of road side trees. An update will be provided to the next meeting.

6 Activity Reports

That the activity reports be received.

Nordqvist/Lock Carried

- Roading and Street Services

Appreciation was extended for the installation of the no entry sign on Lampard St.

Concern has been voiced in the community with the speed in which farm vehicles, in particular tractors, are travelling through town. While the size of the vehicles may give the appearance of excessive speed, and the law allows them to travel 50kmph, the Board would like to investigate options to encourage the reduction of the speed of such vehicles. Several contractors have been contacted but with transient staff, it is difficult to get the message to all drivers.

The Board questioned if ADC’s Viasis speed display unit could be utilised to increase the awareness of the speed in which tractors and heavy vehicles are travelling through town particularly during harvest time.

Council officers were asked to check whether there is funding available to install the speed display unit infrastructure on Forest Drive. The Group Manager Service Delivery will report back to the Board’s April meeting.

The Board is interested to know about the next speed limit review, so as to ensure that Barkers Rd is included in this review. In the previous review, the 50km sign was moved out, however housing has now extended into the 70km zone, and the Board would like to see the 50 km limit moved further out.

The Board would also like information on the progress of the designation of the “second entrance” to a road.
- **Waste Management**
  The Board is pleased to see an advert in the Snowfed for a part time (one hour per day, Monday to Saturday) position at the recycling yard. This position has been vacant for over a year.

- **Water Services**
  Level 2 hosing restrictions are still in place.

  *The Senior Communications Advisor attended the meeting at 2:30pm.*

- **Community Relations**
  Council approved the Provisional Local Alcohol Policy which is now open to appeal to ARLA. The provisional policy included a one way door for licensed premises in Ashburton, but not in rural communities.

  Methven Community Day – this went well and the street lighting presentation came about from this community day. The Board is appreciative of the staff and groups that attended the day. There was a good attendance for the Rajah statue unveiling.

- **Chair’s Report**
  The Chair attended the Community Board Executive Committee (CBEC) meeting in Wellington to present the bid for the 2017 Community Board Conference. Mike Reid, Principal Policy Advisor at LGNZ has emailed the Chair to advise that CBEC policy requires expressions of interest to be sought from other South Island Community Boards. He has circulated an additional email to those boards, advising that the Methven Community Board has already expressed an interest in hosting the conference and seeking additional expressions by 31 March 2015. The Chair will be advised of any further expressions of interest in early April.

  Best practice awards entries have been extended to 12 March 2015. The Senior Policy Advisor and Chair will look at whether an entry can be placed for these 2015 awards. It has been suggested that the skate park be a focus for the 2017 awards if the Community Board were to support this project.

- **Parks and Open Spaces**
  The Open Spaces Manager advised that the PD workers have begun cleaning the cemetery gates. It is hoped this work will be completed shortly.

  The town centre is looking tidy with improvements around the medical centre. Open Spaces staff are in Methven 1 - 2 times per week.

  The Welcome to Methven sign at the eastern entrance to the town looks much tidier following the cleanup. This garden will be planted when conditions allow. The Board suggested that the western entrance could benefit from being replanted as well.

  Mr McLaughlin has plans for the signs if the Board should decide to get another one for Barkers Rd.

7 **Matters for Board Decision**

The Methven Community Board has $6000 available for distribution to projects which benefit the Methven community through the discretionary budget. Applications for funding can be made to the Board from community members or from the Board members directly.
That the Methven Community Board approves $300 from the discretionary budget for Methven Community Board Community Day expenses.

Nordqvist/McLaughlin Carried

That the Methven Community Board approves $302.68 from the discretionary budget for the Rajah the Wonder Dog plaque.

Lock/McAlpine Carried

The proposal to install 'aged' signs near Methven House will be reconsidered when matters of ownership and Council funding have been clarified.

8 Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Methven Community Board will be held on Monday 20 April 2015, in the Mt Hutt Memorial Hall and Heritage Centre Board Room, commencing at 1.30 pm.

The meeting concluded at 2.59pm.

Dated this 20th day of April 2015 _________________________________ CHAIR
**Service Delivery Committee Delegations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Committee</th>
<th>Council Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate to</td>
<td>Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate Committees</td>
<td>Community Road Reference Group (South-west district).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative Basis</td>
<td>Committee constituted by Council as per schedule 7, clause 30 (1)(a), LGA 2002. Committee delegated powers by Council as per schedule 7, clause 32, LGA 2002.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>Eight Councillors and Mayor (ex officio)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quorum</td>
<td>Five</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegations</td>
<td>Council delegates to the Service Delivery Committee all of the duties and decision-making powers within the following areas of responsibility:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Amenity provision including:
  - Cemeteries
  - Conservation works
  - Public conveniences
  - Public swimming pools
  - Walkways
  - Parks and reserves

- Roads and utilities including:
  - Land drainage
  - Refuse collection and disposal
  - Recycling
  - Roading, footpaths and bridges
  - Sewerage reticulation and disposal
  - Street lighting
  - Traffic control
  - Water supply
  - Trade Waste
  - Stockwater

- Community services including:
  - Library
  - Recreation
  - Art Gallery and Heritage Centre

- Policy, planning and strategic direction with regard to:
  - Cemeteries
  - Public conveniences
  - Recreation, parks and reserves
  - Refuse and recycling
  - Roads and Footpaths
Water supply
Wastewater
Stockwater
Library

All the duties and responsibilities listed above must be carried out in accordance with the relevant legislation including:

- Burial and Cremation Act 1964
- Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002
- Drainage and Plumbing Regulations 1978
- Gas Act 1992
- Health (Drinking Water) Amendment Act 2007
- Health Act 1956
- Infrastructure (Amendments Relating to Utilities Access) 2010
- Land Drainage Act 1908
- Land Transport Act 1998
- Land Transport Management Act 2003
- Litter Act 1979
- Local Government Act 1974
- Local Government Act 2002
- New Zealand Library Association Act 1939
- Public Bodies Contracts Act 1959
- Public Works Act 1981
- Reserves Act 1977
- Telecommunications Act 2001
- Transport Act 1962
- Utilities Access Act 2010
- Walking Access Act 2008
- Waste Minimisation Act 2008

Limits to Delegations

Matters that must be processed by way of recommendation to Council include:

- Amendment to fees and charges relating to all activities

Powers that cannot be delegated to committees as per the Local Government Act 2002 and sections 2.4 and 2.5 of this Delegations Manual.

Delegated authority is within the financial limits in section 7.1 of this Delegations Manual.
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1 Executive Summary

In June 2014, a number of options were considered for potentially closing the stockwater race schemes in the Ashburton District. With a number of irrigation schemes now having piped networks or considering piping, supplying stockwater through the schemes is a timely opportunity for consideration to the Ashburton District Council (ADC). If a significant proportion of stockwater can be delivered in a more efficient way by the irrigation companies, it would make an important contribution towards achieving regional regulatory objectives to reduce the impact of water abstractions on sensitive rivers.

ADC has proposed to transfer some of their existing water permits to the schemes to cover the stockwater required to service users within their command areas, plus an additional volume of water which could be used for irrigation. The latter would offset the schemes’ costs to provide stockwater, so that the transfer was cost-neutral to ADC. Meetings have been held with the irrigation companies to determine what volumes would be required for this to proceed. At this stage, an initial proposal of a transfer of 10 times (a total of 385 L/s) the water required for stockwater (38.5 L/s) has been made.

The premise for this proposal is that ADC’s stockwater network uses approximately 20 times the actual volume needed for stockwater, and 10 times the actual use is a 50:50 split of this water between the schemes and ADC. This would allow 9 times the stockwater volume needed, to be used for irrigation and the other 10 times of the stockwater returned to the Ashburton River to help meet regulatory objectives.

In general, the schemes have indicated they are positive to the consideration of the proposal. However, informal feedback to date is that the volume of water proposed is not sufficient compensation to cover capital costs and maintenance for a stockwater service. The water would also have to be provided at high reliability to have value (i.e. 95% or better).

Resource consents would be required to transfer the water from ADC to the irrigation companies. The transfer of the stockwater component would be relatively straightforward, but the transfer of water for irrigation use will require new consents. Informal discussions with Environment Canterbury suggest that an application may be successful on the basis of the existing allocation of water; the small volume of water proposed to be transferred in comparison to total abstraction rates across the District; and because the ‘greater good’ objective is to reduce abstractions to increase river flows.

Key to a successful consent application will be the support of the Ashburton Zone Committee, and RDR Ltd. will also need to be brought on board by agreement with the irrigation schemes to convey and deliver the water.

Legal advice in respect of the Local Government Act (LGA) is that the proposal would be subject to the special consultative procedures. Together with the resource consent processes, these will need to be undertaken and completed before the legal agreements can be enacted, and the physical works and actual transfer can take place.

To progress this project, Council initially need to confirm what terms they are prepared to accept, and consider the following in particular:

- The volume of water which is considered fair recompense to the irrigation schemes
Any other compensation that might be considered to make the deal attractive enough to proceed

What their options are to meet the regulatory objectives if agreement cannot be reached.
2 Introduction

The purpose of this report is to provide a progress update on the District Water Investigation. In particular, it summarises the discussions to date with some irrigation companies in the Ashburton District regarding the potential transfer of stockwater supply responsibility from ADC to them.

This proposal would require a transfer of some of ADC’s water permits to these stockwater companies to enable them to provide the service via their established and proposed piped networks, and to compensate them for this by way of providing additional water in a way that is cost-neutral to ADC (i.e. a one-time deal with no ongoing costs or responsibilities accruing to ADC).

This report sets out:

- A summary of discussions with the irrigation schemes
- A preliminary assessment of the proposed volumes of water to be transferred and the irrigation schemes’ initial responses
- Resource Consent and LGA requirements
- A programme for implementation.

2.1 Background

In June 2014, Opus International Consultants Limited (Opus) presented the results of a study that considered options, costs and implications for potentially closing the stockwater race schemes in the Ashburton District. A number of options were considered to provide stockwater through alternative means including:

- Supply via irrigation schemes for those properties without alternative supply that are located within the command area of existing and proposed piped irrigation schemes
- Supply to some clusters of properties by restricted rural water supply schemes
- Supply to remaining users by individual bores.

The most economic means of providing water through alternative mechanisms will require a combination of the above. However, several risks and challenges were identified in the provision of stockwater services particularly with respect to:

- Incomplete user information
- Willingness of irrigation companies to provide stockwater
- Effect of poor water quality on small pipes used for stockwater
- Expectations of users
- Regulatory issues
- Costs
- Groundwater availability.
One of the recommendations of the study was that ADC begin formal talks with irrigation schemes to confirm the viability of supplying stockwater within their areas and discuss commercial terms. With a number of irrigation schemes now having piped networks or considering piping, and extension of command areas, supplying stockwater through the schemes is an attractive opportunity available to ADC. If a significant proportion of stockwater can be delivered in a more efficient way by the irrigation companies, it would make a significant contribution towards achieving regional regulatory objectives to reduce the impact of water abstractions on sensitive rivers (e.g., the Ashburton River).
3 Meetings with Irrigation Schemes

Several meetings were held with the irrigation schemes. It was also recognised that Rangitata Diversion Race (RDR) Ltd. would ultimately need to be approached to facilitate the physical conveying of the water. RDR Ltd. were made aware of this project, but further work on this aspect would not progress until there was some certainty over the volumes and locations required.

The meetings are summarised below.

3.1 Preliminary Meeting

In August 2014, an initial meeting was held between ADC, Opus and representatives of the four main irrigation schemes:

- Ashburton Lyndhurst Irrigation Limited (ALIL)
- Barrhill Chertsey Irrigation Limited (BCIL)
- Mayfield Hinds Irrigation Limited (MHIL)
- Valetta Irrigation Scheme (VIS).

The purpose of this meeting was to ascertain the schemes’ collective appetite for providing a stockwater service, and to identify any technical challenges to providing such a service alongside or together with irrigation water. The minutes of the meeting are attached in Appendix 1.

Stock drinking water is required on a year round basis as opposed to irrigation water which is generally only supplied during the irrigation season. The provision of water outside the irrigation period was not considered a constraint by the schemes due to system design which allowed for smaller flows. BCIL advised that they already provided stockwater to some users on a year round basis, while ALIL were in the process of installing smaller take-off pipes to facilitate a separate stockwater supply. However, individual property owners would require on-property storage to allow for maintenance of the irrigation network during the year.

It was noted that the schemes would need to make it clear to customers that the piped stockwater would not be suitable for potable supply, otherwise the schemes would need to comply with the requirements of the Health Act and associated Drinking-Water Standards.

A potential concern also discussed was the risk of problems due to sediment in the water clogging small pipes and valves which may create maintenance issues. However, the schemes advised that they did not find or expect to find that this was a problem, noting that the water passes through the RDR and other ponds which help settle out most of the sediment.

The general consensus of the schemes was that any concerns regarding water quality, maintenance and the provision of a 24 hour, year round service would not impede their effective provision of stockwater service.

At this meeting, it was proposed that ADC would transfer some of their existing water permits to the schemes. The volume would be sufficient to cover their stockwater requirement, plus an additional volume of water which could be used for irrigation. The latter would offset the schemes’ costs to provide stockwater, so that the transfer was cost-neutral to ADC. This approach was
accepted in principle by the schemes, and it was agreed that follow up meetings would be held with each scheme to develop the detail of which customers would need to be supplied with water, and what volumes of water would be required and potentially transferred.

3.2 Follow Up Meetings

Two rounds of follow-up meetings were held in October and November 2014 between Opus and the irrigation schemes:

3.2.1 Round 1 Meetings

In October 2014, Opus met with each of the irrigation schemes to work through each of the command areas and identify those properties who were irrigating shareholders and already had connections to the irrigation network; and to identify those that could be supplied with stockwater by the schemes. Minutes of these meetings are attached in Appendix 2. In some cases the delivery of stockwater would require additional network infrastructure. The service delivery mechanism would ultimately be up to the individual scheme, and could include restricted or full-pressure supply (the flows were considered small in comparison to the irrigation flows). Restricted supplies would require additional on-farm infrastructure (e.g. tanks and booster pumps).

A general concern was the capital costs associated with stockwater provision and the need for the transfer of water volumes to be sufficient to cover these costs. Although some of the additional infrastructure could be provided within existing easements, additional easements with associated costs may also be required. ALIL was also concerned that a number of properties did in fact have alternative supplies, although had indicated otherwise on the survey returns.

VIS do not currently supply stockwater to any farms as they have no storage and do not receive water from RDR Ltd. in the winter. They were of the view that irrigation shareholders should not subsidise any properties that would only use the scheme for taking stockwater. Likewise, ALIL has no agreement in place for winter stockwater supply to customers.

BCIL were keen to explore further opportunities to provide stockwater through existing proposals to extend their command area, and also to other potential future extensions. This offered a significant opportunity for stockwater to be supplied to a considerable number of additional properties through future BCIL extensions. The Spaxton Water Scheme was identified as another potential opportunity by BCIL who considered there was capacity to deliver stockwater to farms within this scheme. It is understood the Spaxton Stockwater Limited has written to the Council on this matter.

MHIL expressed that although they are not yet ready to pipe any part of their network, they were keen to be kept informed of progress with discussions between ADC and the irrigation schemes.

In general, the first round of these meetings was productive and the schemes appeared positive about becoming stockwater service providers. Following this round of meetings, sufficient data was available to make an initial assessment of water transfer volumes.
3.2.2 Proposed Transfer Volumes

The proposed transfer of stockwater was estimated based on supplying 250 L/ha/day (gross farm area) to those who currently have no alternative water supply. This amount is approximately equivalent to a consumption of 71 L/cow/day at an average stocking rate of 3.5 cows/ha (which is the published 2013/14 DairyNZ statistic for Canterbury). No specific allowance is made for shed use, but the average would include any non-dairy or non-milking users and the stocking rate is based on effective area rather than farm area.

An additional volume of water that could potentially be used for irrigation was also estimated. The rationale for this amount was as follows:

- Approximately 20 times the water actually required for stockwater is used to deliver stockwater under the current system of open races (which are typically in the order of 5% efficient).

- Any transfer of water needed to provide a win-win outcome, i.e. a win for the irrigation companies (to compensate them for taking up the responsibility and costs associated with supplying stockwater service), and a win for the environment (through reduction of abstraction for stockwater from sensitive river catchments).

- A 50:50 split of this water was proposed, such that half of the water currently used to supply core users within the irrigation schemes could be transferred to the schemes, equivalent to 10 times the stockwater transfer actually required (i.e. 90% of this water transfer would then be available for other use such as irrigation). The other half of the water would be surrendered back to the environment.

The proposed transfer rates are set out in Table 1 (note that these exclude MHIL).

Table 1: Proposed Rates of Transfer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Number of Properties</th>
<th>Area (ha)</th>
<th>Stockwater Requirement (L/s)</th>
<th>Proposed Total Settlement (L/s)</th>
<th>Irrigable Area (ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALIL</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4,605</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCIL</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>7,395</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1,307</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>13,307</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>749</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the proposal, the reduction in water required for supplying users without alternatives is 385 L/s. The actual reduction is likely to be higher than this, as savings of water will be also be achieved through the rationalisation process as other races would also be closed (e.g. those races presently supplying users who have alternative supplies).

3.2.3 Round 2 Meetings

A second round of meetings was held in November 2014 to discuss the volumes of water required. MHIL were not included in this round as their proposed piped scheme had not been approved by shareholders and they were not in a position to be able to provide the service.
required. However, MHIL were kept informed of the general nature of the potential water transfers. Minutes of these meetings are attached in Appendix 3. Note that volumes proposed in the minutes differ to those set out in this report and subsequently put forward to the schemes, as a result of a GIS review.

Since the Round 1 meetings, Opus had made an assessment of the volumes of water to be transferred (as described in the preceding section) for initial discussion to obtain feedback from all parties.

At the meetings, representatives from the irrigation schemes provided some initial thoughts and responses. Similar comments were noted by the schemes’ representatives:

- Whether the reliability of the water transferred for irrigation use would be the same for the stockwater reliability: *This issue is discussed further in the following sections.*

- How the schemes should bill for the stockwater provision, particularly for those who are not shareholders: *The schemes were advised that billing methods would be up to them; ADC would no longer have any involvement in the provision of or compensation for stockwater supply services.*

- The flows proposed may not be sufficient to cover capital costs to connect the stockwater, to keep the water running through winter, and to extend and maintain any lines, particularly on the extremities of existing networks: *This was an issue that the schemes needed to consider further for themselves in the context of their operational and cost structures.*

- How the water would be physically provided to the schemes: *The assumption is that RDR Ltd. would be able to provide the water at any location along the RDR, although that would require further agreement and work once the volumes and locations were clarified.*

The outcome of the Round 2 meetings was that the schemes’ boards would consider the proposed water volumes for formal comment and feedback.

### 3.2.4 Feedback from Schemes

A limited amount of feedback has been received from the irrigation schemes to date. What has been received is in email form and repeated below:

- **ALIL:** *The...important point that I think needs more consideration is the volumes of water involved. No volumes were referred to in this draft agreement so I am assuming that we are still talking about 10 times the required volume for stockwater.... From our initial investigations into network upgrades I think we would need 20 times the volume in order to make it economically viable for us, particularly if ADC expect us to absorb the cost of additional pipework to deliver to non ALIL shareholders and all the easements required.*

  *This is a great opportunity for ADC to rid themselves of the responsibility of upgrading and maintaining some huge areas of stockwater delivery systems at a dramatically reduced cost to other alternatives, whilst still returning significant volumes of water to the environment. If the irrigation schemes are to carry this burden into the future then they need to be fairly compensated for the additional capital cost and the ongoing repairs and maintenance costs.*
The reliability of the water is also very important to us. We would like the current reliability of the takes to be maintained through the transfer process.

- **BCIL**: We did have a discussion in the office late last year and the conclusion was that we needed to be careful that the value of the water made available covered both the short term capital outlay of delivery of stock water, plus any ongoing operating cost that may not be recoverable from direct charges. The feeling was that 20 times the stock water volume may be a better fit and we can discuss a process of providing costings. Things like easements, offtake metering, capacity in our networks etc need to be considered. Our Barrhill to Dromore line is certain now and we can build that in to the discussion.

- **VIS**: The board are happy to accept the transfer proposal but I am still trying to get a finished quote for the installation [relating to the installation of additional pipe to connect some consumers].

Although MHIL were not part of the Round 2 meetings, their view is aligned with that of ALIL and BCIL. MHIL also note that they are currently in a Registration of Interest process for irrigation expansion into the Ruapuna area above their existing scheme network. They advise that development could occur in the next 18 months and completing a transfer of stockwater would assist in promoting this project (at least in the Ruapuna area).

The key issue from these meetings is whether the proposed volume of water is considered sufficient compensation for the schemes. The value of water to the schemes is a combination of the volume and the water reliability. We have made an approximate assessment of the value of the water to the schemes as detailed below.

### 3.2.5 Economic Value of Water

The schemes have stated that the volume of the water to be transferred for irrigation use needs to generate enough additional farm income to fairly compensate their costs to provide a stockwater service. On this basis, we have estimated the Net Present Value (NPV) of the water proposed for transfer. This NPV estimate is based on the economic analysis completed by Butcher Partners as part of the Water Investigation Project in November 2012.

The NPV is a weighted average based on a 30-year analysis period and an 8% discount rate, calculated at $16,000/ha. This has then been applied to the area that could potentially be irrigated based on an average application rate of 4 mm/day. The NPV assumes that the water reliability is 95% or better; this is a critical factor in the value of the water.

**Table 2: Economic Value of Water to be Transferred**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Proposed Settlement (L/s)</th>
<th>Non-Stockwater Transfer (L/s)</th>
<th>Irrigable Area at 4mm/day (ha)</th>
<th>Net Present Value of Water</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALIL</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>$4,144,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCIL</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>$6,656,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIS</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>$1,184,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>385</strong></td>
<td><strong>347</strong></td>
<td><strong>749</strong></td>
<td><strong>$11,984,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To be an attractive proposition, the NPV figure would need to fairly compensate the schemes to cover their capital and operating costs associated with establishing and running a stockwater supply system for the next 30 years.

### 3.3 Proposed Transfer Agreements

In February 2015, with the exception of MHIL, each of the schemes was provided with a draft copy of a proposed transfer agreement for their consideration. The schemes have been advised that these proposed legal agreements have not been viewed by ADC at this stage. The proposed agreement is attached in Appendix 4 of this report. Formal feedback from the schemes on the draft agreements has yet to be received.
4 Legal Mechanisms

As part of this study, Opus has been asked to confirm the legal mechanisms for the transfer of consented volumes of stockwater to the irrigation schemes for both stockwater and irrigation use and to assess the legislative risks concerning these processes.

The proposed transfer of water will need to be addressed through the transfer of resource consents and will probably be subject to the consultative procedures of the LGA as it is considered a significant decision.

4.1 Resource Consents

4.1.1 Stockwater Consents

The ability for the irrigation schemes to supply stockwater to those currently without alternative supply, can be achieved through a transfer of the resource consents held by ADC. ADC holds a number of consents with respect to the overall stockwater network which not only enable the taking of water, but also provide for the associated works in river beds and the diversion and discharge of water to facilitate the service. The sources from which water is authorised to be taken are set out in Table 3. In addition to that below, water is also sourced via RDR Ltd. at a rate of 230 L/s. The relevant consents held by ADC are:

- CRC012031.1: To dam, divert, take and use surface water to supply the Methven-Lauriston Stockwater Scheme
- CRC012114: To dam, divert, take and use surface water to supply the Montalto-Hinds Stockwater Scheme
- CRC012123: To dam, divert, take and use surface water to supply the Mount Somers-Willowby Stockwater Scheme, (consent incorrectly refers to Methven-Lauriston)
- CRC012126: To dam, divert, take and use surface water to supply the Winchmore-Rakaia Stockwater Scheme.

Table 3: Consented Water Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water Source</th>
<th>Rate (L/s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashburton River North Branch</td>
<td>1300 (or 1800)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashburton River South Branch</td>
<td>1955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashburton River tributaries</td>
<td>1310 (or 810)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashburton River springs: Winchmore</td>
<td>790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinds River catchment: Limestone Creek</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various Springs and Drains</td>
<td>851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ashburton Catchment Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>6256</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangititata River and catchment</td>
<td>1115/849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rakaia River: Acton Irrigation Scheme</td>
<td>680</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The majority of the irrigation schemes obtain most of their water from the RDR which sources water primarily from the Rangitata River at Klondyke, diverting water to Highbank on the Rakaia River. A smaller supplementary intake on the South Ashburton River is also used by RDR Ltd. when the Rangitata abstraction is restricted. ALIL also sources 6% of its water from the Ashburton River, while BCIL sources the majority of their water from the Rakaia River via the Highbank Power Station and through water swap arrangements with RDR Ltd.

4.1.2 Transfer of Stockwater

The transfer of part of ADC’s water permit to the irrigation schemes to take stockwater is classified as a restricted discretionary activity pursuant to both the operative Natural Resources Regional Plan, 2012 (NRRP) and under the regional rules of the proposed Canterbury Land and Water Plan (pLWRP). The only exception is that the transfer of water within the Hinds/Hekeao Plains Area is currently proposed as a prohibited activity and Council has submitted against this proposed rule.

The conditions to which the stockwater permits are subject would remain the same, such that the provision of the stockwater would not be subject to any conditions requiring cessation during low flows. Accordingly, the stockwater provision will retain the same reliability of supply.

The transfer rules are subject to the point of abstraction remaining with the same catchment. Therefore, current stockwater abstractions from the Central Canterbury Alpine Rivers, that is, the Rangitata and Rakaia Rivers must remain within that catchment, as do abstractions from the Ashburton Catchment, i.e. the Ashburton and Hinds Rivers.

The proposed transfer of stockwater from ADC to the irrigation schemes is set out in Table 4.

### Table 4: Proposed Transfer Rate of Water for Stockwater

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Irrigation Scheme</th>
<th>Proposed Rate of Stockwater Transfer (L/s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALIL</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCIL</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIS</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Transfer</strong></td>
<td><strong>38.5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the irrigation schemes would hold the resource consents to take water for stockwater, the provision of the water would need to be facilitated through RDR Ltd. who manage the infrastructure, and convey and distribute irrigation water to these schemes. This will likely require a further agreement between RDR Ltd. and the irrigation schemes to facilitate the provision of the stockwater.
RDR Ltd. sources their water primarily from the Rangitata River, but some water is also taken from the South Branch of the Ashburton River. ADC is consented to take water from the Rangitata River, the South Branch of the Ashburton River and via the RDR. Therefore, a transfer of water for stockwater use for a total rate of 38.5 L/s can be accommodated within the same catchment.

Given the consideration of the relevant policies and rules with respect to the transfer of stockwater, it is considered the risks of not obtaining a successful transfer for stockwater are negligible.

4.1.3 Transfer of Water for Irrigation Use

The basis of the transfer proposal is that additional water would be transferred to compensate the irrigation schemes for taking on the provision of stockwater services in their areas. The expectation is that this additional water could be used for irrigation and the income from this used to fund the stockwater service and any initial capital expenditure.

The consents held by ADC are for the purpose of providing stock drinking water, treated domestic and community drinking water, and essential domestic and community use. As the intended use of the additional water to be transferred is for a different use, new consents would need to be applied for and ADC’s consented abstraction rates would need to reduce accordingly to reflect the reallocation of water.

An Assessment of Environmental Effects would need to be submitted in support of any consent application to show that the use of water for irrigation is efficient and reasonable. As RDR Ltd. and BCIL hold resource consents for land nutrient management across the Ashburton District, it is assumed that the only resource consents that would need to be applied for are those to take and use water.

The proposed transfer of additional water from ADC to the irrigation schemes to be used for purposes other than that currently authorised, are at the following rates:

Table 5: Proposed Transfer Rate of Water for Irrigation Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Irrigation Scheme</th>
<th>Proposed Rate of Additional Water Transfer (L/s)</th>
<th>Proportion of Total Consented Abstraction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALIL</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCIL</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>2.4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIS</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0.4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>347</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.3 %</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The irrigation schemes have made it clear that provision of the additional water subject to the normally expected and relevant minimum flow regimes does not present an attractive proposition, as the water at that level of reliability would hold little value in comparison to the costs to provide the stockwater service.

The overall objective of the proposed transfer is to meet Policy 13.4.1 of the pLWRP to reduce ADC’s stockwater abstractions from the Ashburton River. The transfer of water to the
irrigation schemes presents a real opportunity for achieving water savings for the Ashburton River and at little cost to the Ashburton district community. The irrigation schemes cover a vast area of the District (refer Appendix 5) and with the dispersed nature of the stockwater need, the future piping of irrigation networks and the extension of existing piped schemes, is a significant opportunity that needs to be realised as part of the regulatory framework.

Transferring water to the irrigation schemes on the same reliability as the current stockwater is a non-complying activity under the pLWRP. However, as the water is already allocated, albeit for an alternative use, the effect on river flows, instream values and other abstractors would not change.

Early informal discussions with Environment Canterbury indicate that the proposal may be reasonably justified in light of the fact that ultimately, the objective is to rationalise the stockwater network to increase river flows, particularly in the Ashburton River in accordance with pLWRP policy.

The positive effect of ultimately reducing abstractions from the rivers, is that it not only benefits the river environment but also provides higher reliability for other abstractors as minimum flows would be reached less often. Additionally, the total transfer of water for irrigation use would represent a small proportion of the existing stockwater abstraction across the District. At 4.3%, it may be considered acceptable in light of ultimately returning almost 2.5 cumecs of water to the Ashburton River. Environment Canterbury has indicated that at the volumes currently being proposed, it would be within ‘the margin of error’ of the existing total abstraction.

As the proposal is intended to meet a policy that originated from the Ashburton Zone Committee, Environment Canterbury has advised that their support would be key to the granting of a successful consent application.

4.1.4 Water Conservation Orders

A resource consent application to take and use water for irrigation will need to consider National Water Conservation Orders (WCO). These exist for the Rakaia and Rangitata Rivers. ADC is authorised to take water from the Rakaia River to service the Acton Irrigation Scheme. This abstraction will continue on the same basis, and subsequently will not be considered for transfer. Therefore, only the Water Conservation (Rangitata River) Order 2006 is relevant here.

The Rangitata WCO provides for the abstraction of water subject to water flow restrictions. However, where there are exceptional circumstances, the WCO provides for the granting of an abstraction that would otherwise not comply with the flow restrictions, provided that it would not compromise the preservation and protection of the outstanding characteristics and features of the River.

ADC is currently authorised to take approximately one cumec from the Rangitata River for stockwater purposes without river flow restrictions. Given the ultimate need to provide a more efficient stockwater service to benefit the District’s rivers, the exemptions set out in the Order should be considered in any consent application to take water from the Rangitata River for irrigation, and in tandem with potential agreements between RDR Ltd. and the irrigation schemes as to how the water is conveyed and delivered.
4.2 Local Government Act

Legal advice was sought as to ADC’s responsibilities pursuant to the LGA. Although it does not deal with stockwater specifically, it does contain a number of provisions relating to ‘water races’. The LGA has a number of implications for the transfer of water to the irrigation schemes.

The LGA does not contain any provisions regarding the requirements for a District Council to establish or maintain a stockwater network. Therefore, implications for ADC under the LGA are considered against any decision-making consultative requirements pursuant to Part 6. The extent to which the decision-making processes of the LGA apply, depends on whether the partial closure of the water races to transfer the provision of stockwater to the irrigation schemes is ‘significant’ in terms of ADC’s Significance and Engagement Policy (November 2014).

Legal advice is that it is a matter for the full Council to decide whether any proposal satisfies the criteria for significance in accordance with the policy. The legal advice is that the proposal to partially close the water races would seem to satisfy the significance criteria, with the size of the network and its importance to the rural community being important factors. The advice is based on the following:

- The proposal is likely to have a significant effect on the delivery of ADC’s policy and strategies, as it is a key strategy to address water efficiency in accordance with the pLWRP
- The proposal will ensure the most efficient use of the District’s water resources for the purpose of providing stockwater, with surplus water available for other purposes, providing benefits for the District
- The proposal to transfer water to the irrigation schemes and any alternative provision, will give rise to network rationalisation and a reduction in stockwater requirements currently served by an open race network.

Where a proposal meets the significance criteria, it is usual practice for the proposal to be subject to the special consultative procedures set out in section 83 of the LGA.

As they do currently, any easements for land access required to facilitate the supply of stockwater through the irrigation schemes will need to be obtained by the schemes who will not have the benefit of the LGA powers.

4.3 Bylaws

Chapter 15 of the ADC Bylaws sets out a number of provisions relating to the alteration and maintenance of water races, the supply of water, water quality, access and annual charges. Section 156 of the LGA provides that, when making, amending or revoking any bylaws, ADC must also use the special consultative procedures where the change meets the ADC’s Significance and Engagement Policy or where there is likely to be a significant impact on the public.

Given the purpose of the Bylaw as defined within the Bylaw itself, it is not anticipated that any changes to the Bylaws are required to facilitate the proposed transfer of stockwater.
4.4 Stockwater Race Closures, Guidelines and Policy Document

For completeness, reference is included here to the Stockwater Race Closures, Guidelines and Policy Document, 2011. The Guidelines state:

A cost effective alternative for the purposes of these guidelines is an alternative having where the total cost for all investigation, consenting and construction equal to or less than $15,000 per individual rateable property.

The above is relevant to the proposed transfer of water as ADC will need to identify those properties who meet this threshold and therefore are no longer required to be provided with the stockwater service by ADC. These properties would then not be required to be delivered water by the schemes as part of any transfer arrangements. Alternatives to existing ADC supply may include existing provision of irrigation water to the property or the use of an existing well on the property. Some properties may already have resource consents to take water and may be able to supply stockwater from existing sources.
5 Implementation

The transfer of water is subject to two separate legislative processes; the consultative procedures defined through the LGA and the resource consent process under the Resource Management Act, 1991 (RMA). The transfer process will also involve a number of steps including consultation with the Ashburton Zone Committee and RDR Ltd., with final Council approval required before the transfers can be enacted.

The consultative procedures to propose closure of a race would require a minimum realistic timeframe of four months allowing for notification, submission and hearing processes. This process may also help identify the stockwater requirements for the 25% of customers who did not respond to the stockwater survey conducted in April/May 2013. The special consultative process requires ADC to prepare a statement of proposal along with any supporting information deemed necessary for effective public understanding; and make it publically available; and then provide an opportunity for persons to be heard (with at least one month from the time of advertising), before making any final decision about the proposal. Our expectation is that this process will identify a number of strong objectors to the proposed removal of low-cost, Council-controlled stockwater supply.

Once a decision is reached through the consultative procedures and there is certainty that the stockwater service can be provided through the irrigation schemes, the transfer of water will need to be authorised under the RMA. If the proposal to transfer water to the schemes, can be supported by the Ashburton Zone Committee and appropriate pre-application consultation is undertaken with Environment Canterbury to identify any other consultation requirements or concerns, ADC can significantly reduce the risk of a notified application. If non-notified, the application must be processed within 20 working days. If notified, the application may take up to six months to process under the Resource Management Amendment Act, 2013, which takes effect from 3 March 2015.

The process of transferring water can be demonstrated by the flow chart set out in Figure 1 below, while a Gantt Chart setting out an indicative programme for completing this process is shown in Figure 2. Note that this is subject to significant uncertainty in respect of the resource consent application and consultative phases, and should not be construed as pre-supposing that the project would proceed in the form assumed, or at all (this being at ADC and the irrigation companies’ discretion).
Figure 1: Implementation Flowchart
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- Consultative Process
- Public Consultation
- Resource Consent Process
- ECAn consent application
- Council Approval
- Agreements Enacted

- (this) Report
- Formally advise RDR Ltd. of intentions
- Advise Zone Committee
- Volumes confirmed
- Negotiate & agree conveyancing terms with RDR Ltd.
**Figure 2: Proposed Programme**
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6 Conclusions

A preliminary meeting with the main irrigation schemes in the Ashburton District was held in August 2014 to ascertain their appetite for providing a stockwater service and to identify any technical challenges in doing so. ADC proposed to transfer some of their existing water permits to the schemes to cover the stockwater required in the schemes’ command areas, plus an additional volume of water which could be used for irrigation. The latter would offset the schemes’ costs to provide stockwater, so that the transfer was cost-neutral to ADC. This approach was accepted in principle by the schemes.

Subsequent meetings with the individual schemes in October and November 2014 identified those properties to which stockwater would need to be supplied and from this, the volume of water required to serve these properties was quantified.

In determining an additional volume of water to transfer to the schemes to cover their capital and maintenance costs, the proposal was made based on 10 times the actual volume needed for stockwater. The proposal was based on the concept that ADC’s stockwater consents to deliver the stockwater is approximately 20 times the actual stockwater requirement. Based on this and the need to return water to the Ashburton River, a 50:50 approach such that half of the water currently used to supply core users within the irrigation schemes could be transferred to the schemes and the other half of the water would be surrendered back to the environment.

In general, the schemes are positive to the proposal and are proactively considering options to provide a service to those on the extremities and beyond their existing command areas. Discussions to date have identified the following main concerns for the schemes:

- The need to ensure proper compensation to cover capital costs and maintenance for a stockwater service
- The ability to take and use water for irrigation on the same reliability as for the existing stockwater abstraction.

ALIL and BCIL have advised that the proposed transfer volumes for irrigation use is insufficient and expect that double the proposed volume would make the proposal economically viable. However, the schemes have yet to undertake detailed investigations into the likely costs of providing the service. The irrigation schemes are currently in possession of a draft legal agreement for their consideration.

The proposal will require resource consents to transfer water. The transfer of stockwater for the same use would be subject to the same consent conditions and without subject to flow restrictions. It is expected that obtaining these consents would be relatively straightforward.

The transfer of water for irrigation use will require new consents. Informal discussions with Environment Canterbury to date suggest that an application may be reasonably justified on the basis of the existing allocation of water, the small volume of water proposed to be transferred in comparison to total abstraction rates across the District and because the ‘greater good’ objective is to reduce abstractions to increase river flows.
Key to a successful consent application will be the support of the Ashburton Zone Committee. RDR Ltd. will need to be brought on board by agreement between themselves and the irrigation schemes to convey and deliver the water.

Legal advice in respect of the LGA, is that it is a matter for the full Council to decide whether any proposal satisfies the criteria for significance in accordance with the policy. The legal advice is that the proposal to partially close the water races would seem to satisfy the significance criteria and therefore, would be subject to the special consultative procedures.

The LGA consultative procedures and resource consents processes will need to be undertaken and completed before the legal agreements can be enacted, and before the physical works and actual transfer can take place.

To progress this project, Council initially need to confirm what terms they are prepared to accept, and consider the following in particular:

- The volume of water which is considered fair recompense to the irrigation schemes
- Any other compensation that might be considered to make the deal attractive enough to proceed
- What their options are to meet the regulatory objectives if agreement cannot be reached.
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Appendix 1: Minutes of Scoping Meeting
In attendance:

Andy Guthrie  ADC
Dave Askin  ADC
Greg Birdling  Opus International Consultants
Sri Hall  Opus International Consultants
John Wright  Barrhill Chertsey Irrigation (BCI)
Hamish Tait  Mayfield Hinds Irrigation Scheme (MHIS)
Alistair Morrison  Valetta Irrigation Scheme (VIS)
John Van Polanen  Ashburton Lyndhurst Irrigation Ltd (ALIL)

Introduction and Context

Recent report: Stockwater Supply – Detailed Investigations, is the strongest signal to the community yet regarding ADC’s proposals to dismantle the stockwater network.

The purpose of these meetings is to negotiate ADC transfer of the provision of the stockwater service to the irrigation schemes.

Outcome would be to achieve a common understanding regarding potential delivery of stockwater.

Schemes consider that as the stockwater network would be the same as the irrigation network and would use the same water, they would not contemplate a different pipeline to service the stockwater.

Planning Background:
- Key Driver – CWMS and over-allocated Ashburton River with new policy in Proposed LWRP to reduce stockwater abstraction from the River; abstraction not to exceed 2,900 L/s by July 2023.
- Strategic study in 2012 to identify any unrequired water that could be made available through water efficiency improvements. Losses equate to 82%.
- Despite race closures over recent years, water abstraction has not reduced as need to deliver water to the ends of the network.
- Potential to combine with irrigation networks identified by potential constraints for delivery.
- Stockwater survey in 2013 with 75% responses and mapped against irrigation schemes.
- Concept level investigations earlier this year to determine opportunities to provide water through irrigation schemes or through restricted rural water supply schemes.

Technical Discussions

Water Quality and Maintenance

- General perception of users is that the water quality from the RDR is better than from the stockwater races (may be true bacterial quality rather than suspended solids content).
• BCI is already providing stockwater to some users year round, using their head ponds as storage.
• ALIL are installing smaller (DN50) take-off points at each irrigation turnout to facilitate separate stockwater supply.
• Some users have settling pond + filters + UV to provide acceptable water quality for use in their cowsheds. Users that are only feeding troughs use the water untreated. VIS do not presently have any users taking water for cowshed use.
• Maintenance in the RDR has not been an issue due to the ponds, and there is usually some flexibility to get some water into the irrigation head ponds if required.

24/365 Service

• Those already taking stockwater typically take 0.5 L/s year round. BCI do not have many pressure reducing valves on the main network so have no issue with small flows, ALIL will have more PRVs but these would have smaller bypass PRVs which would reduce wear on the main valve.
• Meters appear to be registering at least some of the stockwater take although their accuracy is reduced at low flows. Since irrigation water is charged per cubic metre and the irrigation volumes dwarf stock usage, there is little or no concern over potential loss of revenue for this.
• Individual property owners would ideally provide on-property storage to allow for maintenance of the irrigation network.

Consenting and Legal Implications

• Initial thoughts that transfer of stockwater for stockwater only requires simple paperwork. Transferring stockwater for stockwater and irrigation use would require new resource consents but should be achievable. RDR thinks this may be more difficult to achieve given Water Conservation Order.
• Schemes would prefer to have the opportunity to buy the water but it will only have value if it can be provided for under the same priority as the stockwater currently.
• Need to explore proposed structure with ECan – in the context of returning almost 2.5 cumecs to the river, would the provision of small quantities of irrigation water at the same priority as stockwater, be acceptable?
• Need to consider LGA, Health Act implications and easements.
• The schemes would need to be clear that they are not providing potable water, otherwise they will be required to comply with the Health Act. This should be in the supply agreements. There may be implications if cowshed use includes handwashing etc for employees.
• Through the LGA, races must be closed through a consultative procedure – customers need to agree to it. However, Council has tested this and doesn’t think it will be an issue but need to check given the scale of the network. Winchmore closed in November and customers there have moved to self-supply.
• Option of rating for the stockwater service and charging back to irrigation companies is not preferred by Council – ADC intends to remove the rate. Potentially it could be collected on behalf the schemes, but this creates additional paperwork and administration for the schemes.
• Council can restrict potable supply but can’t turn off the supply if there is non-payment as due legislation prevents this. However, this would probably not apply to stockwater use.
• Schemes are currently using easements for access.
Cost Recovery/Sharing

- Council’s preferred position is that the value of the water transferred for irrigation use would offset any costs to provide stockwater. Overall the arrangement would be cost-neutral to Council.
- As part of race closure policy, each customer will have to be surveyed and provided with options as to whether they would want to connect with the irrigation scheme provision or an alternative service.
- ALIL will know by November if they are putting in a piped scheme from Barrhill to Chertsey – this would potentially pick up a lot of the people at the bottom of this network. ALIL are open to extending the pipework beyond the scheme boundary.
- Those at the bottom of MHIS could be provided for, but at a cost.
- Seems to be some interest to pipe the top of MHIS in the Shepherds Bush Rd area. However, piping the main scheme area was recently set aside for three years, while they focus on scheme growth and continue to look at options. The properties in the MHIS area are not Ashburton River catchment in any case, so may suit to focus on BCI/ALIL/VIS in the first instance to meet zone objectives.

Next Steps

- Explore framework with ECan and confirm implications for resource consents.
- Consider LGA provisions.
- Set up second meeting with the schemes – one day to cover individual and combined meetings.
Appendix 2: Minutes of Round 1 Meetings
Objective of meeting was to consider properties within the scheme area that could be supplied with stockwater by the scheme and identify those properties which could potentially be provided with stockwater but would require additional infrastructure, such that this service is no longer provided by Ashburton District Council (ADC).

Concern by ALIL as to who pays where infrastructure is provided to properties to enable them to access water, but where that opportunity is not taken up i.e. the water is not used. ALIL also concerned with costs associated with any easements so pipes may be better in road reserve.

In terms of on-farm infrastructure, current thinking is that restricted supply would be provided with consumers providing a tank and any on-farm infrastructure required (e.g. booster pump, pipes).

Are ALIL prepared to put in the pipes to pick up others who are currently not shareholders? For ALIL this depends on negotiations to swap water to cover costs of putting infrastructure in. ALIL do not want to borrow money to do this and want to be able to pay for the infrastructure straight away.

ALIL has not yet considered whether it would charge a connection fee to supply on farm tanks.

Currently there is no agreement in place for winter stockwater supply to consumers. It is acknowledged that some people tap into the network for stockwater, but they are not supposed to. ALIL would only use what is in the ponds but maintenance and frost protection needs to be covered.

Pond volume needed is more than 1 GL. It is preferable to keep the ponds topped up by RDR. There is presently no agreement with RDR to keep ponds topped up. RDR could effectively move the water required from the various Council stockwater intakes as can’t have the ponds running empty due to maintenance issues. There is possibility to bring water in through the South Branch (e.g. Methven Auxiliary).

Next step is to calculate the quantities required to be supplied and prepare agreements.

Next stage following this piece of work, ADC would need to send a letter to customers saying they propose to transfer water to the irrigation companies to supply stockwater. This requires a consultative procedure. Although 25% of customers did not respond to survey, they should be captured through the consultative procedures.
Objective of meeting was to consider properties within the scheme area that could be supplied with stockwater by the scheme and identify those properties which could potentially be provided with stockwater but would require additional infrastructure, such that this service is no longer provided by Ashburton District Council (ADC).

There is a need to understand who are the shareholders (i.e. who already has connections) and whether BCI foresee any potential difficulty in supplying stockwater to farms.

Where farms are identified as a ‘Shareholder’ this means that they are currently an irrigating shareholder as oppose to a farm owner who holds shares but not currently irrigating.

BCI are taking a proactive view and looking at what they can do within existing easements. BCI are viewing this proposal as an opportunity to remove the races for irrigators and to get some water to fund the ‘add ons’ i.e. those who could be easily supplied. It is evident that due to the spread-out pipe network, BCI could supply stockwater to a considerable number of farms. However, BCI are also interested in pursuing those that fall within the areas where they are looking to extend their network and there are a number of these. Potential future extensions need to be kept in mind. Where is the prize in the water? Other farms are now also being delivered water as a result of the new/extended network – not just irrigation, but also stockwater as a result of easements.

John Wright is also involved in the Spaxton Water Scheme and they are also interested in whether there is something in it for them. To the north of Methven, a number of farms are signing up to Spaxton and there is capacity to deliver stockwater to these farms. Council have already transferred some water from the Pudding Hill intake for this scheme.

There isn’t a need for BCI to upgrade primary infrastructure. Volumes to be supplied for stockwater is within the margin of error. BCI assume they can get water into RDR and then into their ponds. RDR have pointed out that Cracroft is not being fully used by ADC and could supply stockwater throughout winter with this alone. Variation 2 of the LWRP mentions water for recharge could come from ADC as a solution for nitrates. Is water then available for stockwater?
Objective of meetings was to consider properties within irrigation scheme areas that could be supplied with stockwater and identify properties which could potentially be provided with stockwater but would require additional infrastructure, such that this service is no longer provided by Ashburton District Council (ADC).

Key message from MHIS is that although they are not yet ready to pipe any part of their network, they are still keen to help, particularly at the top of the scheme (east of Mayfield) and would dearly like to access some of ADC’s water to enable that part of the scheme to proceed. Piping of this scheme is still a ‘maybe’. MHIS are considering development at the top of the scheme first before moving down the scheme. MHIS have completed concept design and have now engaged Aqualinc to consider reliability. They hope to go back to farmers early next year to see if they are interested, but it will be limited.

RDR have allocated new water which some irrigators use. There is a lot of water not used in the shoulders but would need storage. If water could be reduced from Cracroft, the water could be swapped.

As MHIS are a few years away yet from piping their scheme, ADC’s focus must be the Ashburton catchment as a priority. However, ADC could also look at those at the bottom of the network.

MHIS noted that races to property # 4892 have been cut, so they may already have alternative stockwater supply.

Property # 4641 cannot intensify under LWRP. Therefore, any investment in infrastructure needs to be funded. If the farm’s access to the races for stockwater is removed, they will not be able to access any water. It is difficult for them to justify investment if they cannot intensify.

Either ADC sorts out those at the end of the scheme or park the scheme altogether while they focus on the Ashburton River.

Some people have irrigation bores but only use them as back up supply, therefore power costs will also be an issue. However, ADC could consider those that already have a well under their bylaw threshold for race closure where the supply of stockwater from the well would require infrastructure such as a tank and pump and where these costs are under the threshold.

If MHIS could get access to 400-500 L/s at the top end of the scheme and market that out, it could kick that project along. This would be seen as a huge benefit provided they could get the water to use it for irrigation with the highest irrigation priority. While priority of transferred water was discussed with ECan and considered in principal achievable, subject to the effects on other users and potential benefit to the river of returning water, it does depend on the quantities and the details.

Properties could be checked against Stockwater Race Rangers’ knowledge and against ECan information for water permits and used wells.

Concept design for MHIS is based on the potential that it could be extended in the future. However, they might have to consider putting in smaller pipes initially and replacing them with larger pipes later as they extend the network. Pressure is a min of 40 metres head. Proposal does not pick up the smaller farms as they don’t agree with it.

MHIS need to negotiate with ADC as to how the stockwater is provided through a quantity of additional water. Access to A grade water (top irrigation priority) is key.

Between Hinds and Mayfield, there are a number of properties who are more traditional farmers and will not be able to intensify their farms due to LWRP and will therefore be reliant on water races for stock drinking water. They will only be able to intensify if they come under the scheme.
Variation 2 of LWRP considers a 45% loss of nitrogen from the catchment in the next 10 years. This will require massive investment or destocking of properties. Concern that less infiltration from race closure means less recharge and therefore less dilution of nitrates – leading to impacts on waterways.

Next steps are for Opus to define the quantities of water needed to supply stockwater across the schemes and draft agreements to transfer water. There will need to be a conversation with RDR to see if they are happy to shift the water around.
Objective of meeting was to consider properties within the scheme area that could be supplied with stockwater by the scheme and identify those properties which could potentially be provided with stockwater but would require additional infrastructure, such that this service is no longer provided by Ashburton District Council (ADC).

There is a need to understand who are the shareholders (i.e. who already has connections) and whether Valetta foresee any potential difficulty in supplying stockwater to farms. There seemed to be a misconception that large volumes would be required due to the large races running through the Valetta scheme. Opus clarified that although there are large volumes of water running in the races through the scheme area, only 5% of water is used for stockwater drinking purposes, and much will be from the Brothers intake which supplies a large area beyond the Valetta scheme.

Valetta do not currently supply any stockwater to any farms as they have no storage and do not receive water from RDR in the winter. Settling ponds hold 280,000 m$^3$ but operators do not like the ponds lowered as these cause issues with the intakes. However, they would have no issue if RDR can top ponds up through winter as a result of a water swap.

Valetta’s design flow varies between 4-5mm/day. Valetta are concerned that irrigation shareholders should not subsidise any stockwater-only users. So any initial costs would need to be recovered via some deal with Council and ongoing costs from the stockwater users.

Opus will need to work out the quantities needed for the stockwater demand for the properties identified who could be provided with stockwater.

Also need to identify those properties who meet ADC’s bylaw threshold for the provision of stockwater i.e. that where the cost of alternative infrastructure falls below the threshold, that ADC are no longer required to provide the service. ADC are currently looking to raise this threshold. However, where there is no other source of water and costs would exceed specified threshold, ADC would look to alternatives. Alternatives include the provision of a piped supply through the irrigation schemes or the sinking of a well for groundwater to supply small district schemes. Another option might be to supply water from existing unused wells rather than drill new wells. However, first priority is to provide stockwater through the schemes.

Valetta are concerned to ensure that they are properly compensated by ADC to make it worthwhile. Agreements will need to be drawn up to reflect this. Landowners who wish to access stockwater would need to also consider paying a fee.
Appendix 3: Minutes of Round 2 Meetings
9am, 12 November 2014
Ashburton Lyndhurst Irrigation Limited (ALIL): Jess Dargue (JD)
Opus International Consultants: Greg Birdling (GB) and Sri Hall (SH)

Purpose of Meeting
SH: Purpose of meeting is to confirm stockwater requirement and explain how the numbers are derived.

Quantity of Stockwater and Transfer
GB: Based on discussion of previous meeting held 16 October, stockwater requirement for ALIL area for those who currently have no alternative access to stockwater is 8 L/s based on 54 properties and 2,770 ha. This rate is based on a restricted supply of 250 L/ha/day equivalent to a stocking rate of about 3.5 cows/ha. If supply is not restricted, it might affect the tail end of the scheme. An additional transfer of 80 L/s is proposed for irrigation use and this is equivalent to 156 ha of irrigable area.

GB: It is proposed as a starting point to offer ten times 8 L/s to facilitate the provision of stockwater. This is based on the fact that the open races are only 5% efficient. Based on this portion of use, the approach proposed allows 50% of water used to be returned to surface water and 50% to be allocated for irrigation schemes, thus achieving a win-win scenario. How water is delivered is up to ALIL.

JD: ALIL is concerned with the need to consider costs to run water through the winter and the long term running/maintenance costs. ALIL is interested in the water savings that will no longer be needed to enter the races when they are closed. Amount of water that ADC use to deliver the stockwater to these properties may be double the amount proposed.

GB: Although Council may hold a water permit for say 1,200 L/s e.g., at Methven Auxiliary, they rarely take the water at that rate, so it is questionable whether the water is available/reliable.

Timeframe
GB/SH: The approval to transfer water should only go through Council the one time and this is subject to consultative procedures in respect of the Council’s significance policy. If Council can get a change of use to their stockwater to include irrigation then they will sell it as Council needs to consider how they will fund separate stockwater schemes.

JD: How will we deal with the 25% that didn’t respond to the survey?

GB: The consultative procedures will help to determine what the requirements are for these users. Any identified in this process will need to be considered by Council and a decision made as to who might get covered by the schemes. Properties will require infrastructure to receive the stockwater. Therefore, ALIL will need to define the costs as part of the negotiations.

GB/SH: We expect to have draft agreements prior to Christmas; special consultative procedures will take a minimum period of three months to allow for advertisement/notification and submissions.

JD: How do we deal with farmers who want to access a race for a pond within their garden?
GB/SH: Although not provided for through ECan’s resource consents, it will be provided for within ADC’s bylaws. This will come out of the consultative procedures and is a matter for Council to address and not a concern for ALIL.

Easements
JD: ALIL concerned with difficult property owners.

GB: Council doesn’t have easements as they are covered by the Local Government Act. Any work on private property would need an easement but this should only affect those on the extremities of the scheme. If infrastructure could be run alongside the road, it would be part of the ADC corridor.

Board Meeting
JD: Next board meeting 25 November.

Methven Auxilliary Water Swap Proposal
JD: ALIL are also interested in a water swap at the top of the scheme.

GB/SH: Difficult to know what ADC might be able to offer until we know what stockwater could be provided.

JD: ALIL would have a pond and pipe it down but wouldn’t close the race. Instead, they could take the water from RDR further down towards Methven for stockwater. Only a water swap is proposed and therefore ALIL is not seeking any more water. As the requirement drops they would take less out of the Ashburton River. ALIL need to finalise the design and can’t put it on hold any longer past January. ALIL are seeking approximately 1cumec from the Ashburton North Branch and would require work on the intake. This would allow ALIL to reduce the take on the South Branch and RDR wouldn’t need to take as much water.

GB/SH: Council would need to change the use of the water permit to allow this to happen and there may be issues for ECan as this will be a new permit.

All: Recommendation that ALIL should formally write to ADC and Opus can review.
10.30am, 12 November 2014
Barhill Chertsey Irrigation (BCI): John Wright (JW)
Opus International Consultants: Greg Birdling (GB) and Sri Hall (SH)

Purpose of Meeting
SH: Purpose of meeting is to confirm stockwater requirement and explain how the numbers are derived.

Quantity of Stockwater and Transfer
GB: Based on discussion of previous meeting held 16 October, stockwater requirement for BCI area for those who currently have no alternative access to stockwater is 14.7 L/s based on 73 properties and 5,068 ha. This rate is based on a restricted supply of 250 L/ha/day equivalent to a stocking rate of about 3.5 cows/ha. An additional transfer of 147 L/s is proposed for irrigation use and this is equivalent to 285 ha of irrigable area.

GB: It is proposed as a starting point to offer ten times 14.7 L/s to facilitate the provision of stockwater. This is based on the fact that the open races are only 5% efficient. Based on this portion of use, the approach proposed allows 50% of water used to be returned to surface water and 50% to be allocated for irrigation schemes, thus achieving a win-win scenario. BCI need to consider if this is reasonable compensation for picking up the stockwater users.

JW: First thoughts is that the proposed rates will be barely enough.

GB: Issue of reliability has come up in previous meetings as to whether the additional water will have the same reliability as the current stockwater.

JW: If the water is not reliable, it will have no value for BCI as they can get water from elsewhere. They can get 7 cumecs out of the Rakaia which will be more reliable than water out of the end of the Ashburton, so why would BCI bother unless it had high reliability.

Timeframe/Process
GB/SH: We expect to have draft agreements prior to Christmas; special consultative procedures will to close races take a minimum period of three months to allow for advertisement/notification and submissions – this will be the responsibility of the Council. Council will also need to find out who wasn’t caught by the survey. Then ECan will need to be approached with firm numbers.

JW: Perhaps this should be worked through with the Mayor and at a higher level with ECan. ECan need to consider if water will be provided on the same reliability as stockwater or irrigation water. There is a cost to connect the water and to extend the lines. Is there enough value in the water? Is there a lot more water available? The prize for the community is high.

GB/SH: A transfer of a higher quantity of water for irrigation water would make it more difficult for ECan to justify/support at a high level of reliability.

JW: Is shutting down the intakes feasible?
GB: The main races will need to remain open until those at the bottom of the network can be provided with alternative stockwater supply. However, some of the little races can be shut.

JW: There are lines with vested interest to get them closed re Klondyke main and Spaxton. BCI could easily pick up the new area (past Methven) and have the new network running by September next year. Has Council considered how the schemes will bill for stockwater?

GB: It will be up to the schemes how they make the connections, and the terms and conditions to which the service will be provided. As part of the consultative procedure, these information may need to be known and it may be that the terms are the same as for they bylaw currently.

JW: there is a need to understand, what the value and the cost of the stockwater.

GB: AS BCI are actively extending their network, Council will need more input from BCI over time.

JW: BCI can take 5 cumecs from the Rakaia running full time with a generator throughout the year. However, ECan are resisting giving use rights for stockwater from the irrigation supply due as they want to define a volumetric limit for the stockwater. Potentially transfer Acton?? Therefore, 10 times the water to be transferred is based on water delivered, not on the water saved. BCI will have more confidence on December 3rd regarding the new command area.

GB: Council could take a hard line and increase the bylaw cap for alternative stockwater.

JW: Where do we anticipate the water will be available?

GB: Likely in the RDR but we have had no discussions with them yet. Water could come in through the Ashburton intake and made up by Rangitata River water which could probably be achieved through Cracroft. Council will need an agreement with RDR then schemes would need to speak to RDR as to how they get the water.
10am, 12 November 2014
Valetta Irrigation Scheme: John Stocker (JS)
Opus International Consultants: Greg Birdling (GB) and Sri Hall (SH)

Purpose of Meeting
SH: Purpose of meeting is to confirm stockwater requirement and explain how the numbers are derived.

Timeframe
GB/SH: The transfer of stockwater requires Council agreement. It is likely to be subject to consultative procedures which will take a minimum period of three months to allow for advertisement/notification and submissions. There may be other properties who did not respond to the survey that Council need to consider as part of the transfer. Due to the processes required we do not expect that there will be any change in the system for at least year and there is no fixed timeframe by which the water must be transferred.

Quantity of Stockwater and Transfer
GB: Based on discussion of previous meeting held 16 October, stockwater requirement for VIS area for those who currently have no alternative access to stockwater is 3.2 L/s based on 16 properties and 1,122 ha. This rate is based on a restricted supply of 250 L/ha/day equivalent to a stocking rate of about 3.5 cows/ha. It is Council recommendation that the supply is restricted with individual storage so that the rest of the scheme isn’t affected by peak flows, but the mode of supply would be up to VIS. The numbers include those who may already have consents and therefore there is still some room to move for VIS as Council wouldn’t adjust the transfer volume as a result.

GB: A transfer of 32 L/s is proposed for irrigation use and this is equivalent to 63 ha of irrigable area. This additional transfer is considered compensation for ongoing costs of providing stockwater. VIS may need to consider an annual charge for those who aren’t shareholders to address fairness – an issue raised by JS previously. There will also need to be an agreement between the Council and RDR for conveyance of water. However, this rate is ten times the required stockwater rate and is proposed as a starting point. This is based on the fact that the open races are only 5% efficient. Based on this portion of use, the approach proposed allows 50% of water used to be returned to surface water and 50% to be allocated for irrigation schemes, thus achieving a win-win scenario.

JS: Need to consider stocking rates for a dairy farm and runoff blocks (which could be higher). Also need to consider the cost of piping as this will be substantial for those on the extremities and VIS don’t know what these will be. Do VIS need to get a consultant on board now to help define costs and exactly how much water is needed? Or will ADC provide this information?

GB: Council won’t know the exact figures until they have been through the consultative procedures but recommended that JS takes the numbers back to the board and let the board consider whether they want the Council to look into this further before commencing negotiations.

JS: It is assumed that the stockwater has 100% reliability as oppose to the reliability provided by RDR.

GB/SH: Conversation with ECan is based on water being provided with the highest/best reliability for irrigation, but not the same reliability as the current stockwater.

GB/SH: If the costs are more than the benefit from 30L/s, then VIS need to come back to us.

Board Meeting
JS: Next board meeting 19 November.
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THIS DEED is dated the day of 2015

PARTIES

ASHBURTON DISTRICT COUNCIL ("Council"); and

[insert name] at [insert place] ("Transferee")

BACKGROUND

A. The Council proposes dismantling part of the existing stock water network and transferring the provision of water to irrigation scheme providers in the Ashburton District.

B. The parties have been discussing terms and conditions relating to the partial transfer from the Council of certain water permits it holds to the Transferee. The Council wishes to transfer partially its rights under the water permits to the Transferee on the terms set out in this Deed.

C. In addition to the transfer of the water permits, should the transferee wish to use all or some of the water for a different purpose, such as irrigation, then an application for a change of conditions and/or a new water permit, may be required. If this is required, the Council intends to make an application to the relevant consent authority in order to achieve this at the same time as the transfer.

D. This Deed is subject to the conditions set out in clause 3 being satisfied to the Council’s satisfaction

TERMS OF THIS DEED

1. Interpretation

1.1. In this document the following terms have the following meanings unless the context requires otherwise:

1.1.1. “Settlement Date” shall be the date [insert number] Working Days after the date of this Deed is confirmed in all respects.

1.1.2. “Water Permits” means resource consents for the damming, diverting, taking and using of surface water for the purposes of using it as water for stock, more particularly described in resource consent number(s) [insert resource consent details].

1.1.3. “Working Day” means any day of the week other than:
1.1.3.1. Saturday, Sunday, Waitangi Day, Good Friday, Easter Monday, Anzac Day, the Sovereign’s Birthday and Labour Day or a day designated a public holiday that occurs on a Saturday or Sunday; and

1.1.3.2. A day in the period commencing on the 24th day of December in any year and ending on the 5th day of January in the following year, both days inclusive; and

1.1.3.3. The day observed as the anniversary of any province in which the property is situated.

1.1.3.4. A working day shall be deemed to commence at 9.00am and to terminate at 5.00pm.

1.2. In this document (unless the context requires otherwise):

1.2.1. The singular includes the plural and the plural includes the singular.

1.2.2. Headings shall be ignored in interpreting this Deed.

1.2.3. A reference to a person includes a partnership or a company.

1.2.4. A reference to a person includes (where applicable) its successors, personal representatives and permitted assigns.

1.2.5. A reference to writing includes a reference to printing, typing and all other methods of reproducing words in a visible form.

2. Transfer of Water Permits

2.1. If all conditions in this Deed are met subject to the satisfaction of the Council, the transfer of the Water Permit, more or less as per the attached form, is on the basis that the transferee is the occupier of the site for which permit is granted and that water is for the same use. The Transferee acknowledges and agrees that if the purpose for which the permit is stated to be exercised (stock water supply) changes, in whole or in part, to irrigation, then this will require either an application to the relevant consent authority to change the conditions of the permit, and/or an application for a new permit.

2.2. It is further agreed that the maximum abstraction rates shall be as follows:

2.2.1. [insert volume] litres per second.

2.3. Where the transfer of the Water Permit is to another site upon which is not owned by the Transferee, the Transferee acknowledges and agrees that an application under section 136(2)(b)(ii) of the Resource Management Act 1991 will be required.

2.4. The parties agree that:

2.4.1. The Council shall be responsible for the cost of the initial applications only under clause 2.1 and/or 2.3;
2.4.2. That the Transferee shall be responsible for any and all costs and expenses which the Council may incur if the Council elects in its sole and absolute discretion to lodge an appeal to the Environment Court in regard of the decisions following the applications under clause 2.1 and/or 2.3; and

2.4.3. The Transferee shall be responsible for the costs incurred by the transfer (including, without limitation, any cost and expenses incurred by the Council) in connection with procuring easements (or other rights) or doing any other act, matter of thing necessary or desirable to enable it to access the water races.

2.5. The parties agree that as a condition of any transfer under clause 2.1 and/or 2.3 the Transferee shall continue to provide and maintain access to stock water at the volumes that are current at the date of this agreement, which are [insert number] litres per second.

3. Conditions

3.1. This Deed is subject to the following conditions:

3.1.1. Council being satisfied in its sole discretion with the following matters within 6 months after the date of this Deed:

3.1.1.1. A consultation process being completed between Council and all Irrigation Scheme Providers in relation to the Council’s proposal to dismantle part of the existing stock water network and transfer the provision of stock water to the Irrigation Scheme Providers;

3.1.1.2. The transferability of the Water Permits in accordance with the Resource Management Act 1991 and any constraints that may arise, including the Rangitata and Rakaia water conservation orders; and any Local Government Act implications, including but not limited to, any special consultative process requirements, any easements, closure processes, any powers to restrict supply, and any other considerations that the Council determines as relevant;

3.1.1.3. If required, an application by Council to Environment Canterbury for change in use for the existing Water Permits, and/or an application for any new water permit(s), for the purpose of using some of the water for irrigation purposes;

3.1.1.4. Council Board approval of the conditions of this Deed;

3.1.1.5. There being no other matters, commercial or otherwise, which prevent the Council from achieving the objectives of this Deed.

3.2. Clause 3.1.1 is for the sole benefit of Council and may be waived by it.

3.3. Settlement of this Deed shall only proceed on the basis that all conditions are confirmed as satisfied by the Council. For the avoidance of doubt, should the Council not be successful in any application for change in use, and/or any application for a new water permit, then the transfer of the Water Permit shall not proceed. However,
notwithstanding this, should any application for change in use, and/or any application by Council for a new water permit not be granted by Environment Canterbury, the Council may elect, in its sole and absolute discretion, to lodge an appeal against any decision by Environment Canterbury provided that the Transferee shall agree to meet all costs associated with any such appeal.

3.4. The Transferee agrees to grant reasonable requests for extensions of time to the Council to satisfy all conditions provided that applications have been lodged. In particular but without limitation, if such consents are obtained by an agreed date but any attaching appeal period has not expired then the date for confirmation of that condition shall be extended to the second working day after the expiry date of the latest appeal period applying to those consents.

4. **Obligations of Transferee**

4.1. Upon this Deed being executed and taking effect the Transferee shall provide to Council all relevant information reasonably requested by Council relating to the transferability of the Water Permits and/or the details of the Transferee’s irrigation scheme.

4.2. The Transferee shall be responsible for procuring easements (or other rights) or any other act, matter or thing necessary or desirable to enable it to access the water races.

4.3. Following transfer, the Transferee will comply with any and all terms and conditions of permit.

5. **Obligations of Council**

5.1. Upon the confirmation of this Deed becoming unconditional, and effective from the Settlement Date, Council shall, subject to the terms of this agreement, transfer the Water Permit to the Transferee.

5.2. For the avoidance of doubt the Council will not be responsible for meeting any costs which the Transferee may incur in connection with procuring easements (or other rights) or any other act, matter or thing necessary or desirable to enable it to access the water races.

6. **Joint Obligations**

6.1. Both parties agree to:

6.1.1. Sign all other necessary documents and to carry out any other acts necessary to put into effect the intention of this Deed by the Settlement Date.

6.1.2. Work together in good faith to resolve and provide solutions for unforeseen matters that arise between the parties in relation to this Deed with the intention of completing performance of an unconditional Deed rather than cancelling or frustrating this Deed.

6.1.3. Settle all obligations under this Deed on the Settlement Date.

7. **No warranties**
7.1. The Transferee enters into this Deed in reliance solely on the Transferee’s own judgement.

7.2. The Council or its advisors do not warrant the accuracy of any matter or fact in the conditions of transfer of Water Permit under this Deed, or in any discussions with the Transferee.

7.3. The Council does not warrant that a transfer of the Water Permit to the Transferee will be successful, or that any applications by the Council in the change in use or new water permit for the use of water for irrigation purposes will be granted, nor as to the terms or conditions that will attach to any such consent, if issued.

7.4. The Transferee is and will be deemed to have made all enquiries relating to any requirements imposed by any territorial or government authority in respect of the transfer of the Water Permit, and any applications granted to the Council in the change in use and/or new water permit and does not rely on any statements, advice or information provided by the Council or its advisors to the Transferee.

8. Indemnity

8.1. The Transferee hereby indemnifies the Council against all claims or demands, actions or proceedings made against the Council and all other claims, actions, proceedings, demands, damages expenses or liabilities suffered or incurred by the Council as a direct or indirect consequence of the Transferee breaching any terms of this Deed.

9. Sunset Date

9.1. If all the conditions of this Deed have not been satisfied to the extent that settlement under this Deed has not occurred by 31 January 2016 or some other date as mutually agreed to in writing (“Sunset Date”), either party may (at that party’s sole option and its discretion) at any time after the Sunset Date may, (but shall not be obliged to) elect to cancel this Deed by notice in writing to the other party and the neither party will have a right or claim against the other party.

10. Confidentiality

10.1. The Council and the Transferee shall not disclose or permit to be disclosed the existence of or the contents of this Deed to any other party other than their officeholders, professional advisors (and then only on a strictly confidential basis) until the Settlement Date except where such disclosure is required by law, including but not limited to, any special consultative processes.

11. No assignment

11.1. The Transferee may not assign its rights under this Deed to any other person without the written consent of the Council.

12. Invalidity, Illegality, Unlawfulness or Unenforceability
12.1. If any of the provisions in this Deed (or any part of those provisions) are held to be invalid, illegal, unlawful or unenforceable, this shall not affect any other provisions of this Deed.

13. **Non-Merger**

13.1. The obligations, warranties, undertakings and indemnities undertaken or given under or pursuant to this Deed, to the extent not already performed at settlement, shall not merge on settlement, or on the execution and delivery of any document pursuant to this Deed, but shall remain enforceable to the fullest extent and notwithstanding any rule of law to the contrary.

14. **No waiver**

14.1. No waiver of any breach or failure to enforce any provision, of this Deed at any time by any party shall in any way affect, limit or waive the right of such party thereafter to enforce and compel strict compliance with the provisions of this Deed.

15. **Entire Deed**

15.1. This Deed contains the entire Deed between the parties with respect to the matters contemplated by this Deed and supersedes any and all prior arrangements and undertakings between the parties with respect to such matters, whether written or oral.

16. **Costs**

16.1. The parties shall each pay their own costs in relation to the preparation and execution of this Deed.

17. **Further Assurance**

17.1. Each party shall do all such things and execute all such documents as may be necessary in order to give full effect to the provisions of this Deed.

18. **Governing Law**

18.1. This Deed shall be governed by, and construed in accordance with the laws of New Zealand.

18.2. The parties agreed to submit to the exclusive jurisdiction of the courts of New Zealand in respect of all matters arising out of this Deed.

19. **Signing by Facsimile and/or email**

19.1. The parties consent to the use of electronic technology for signing this Deed, pursuant to section 16 of the Electronic Transactions Act 2002.

19.2. The parties agree that accordingly:

19.2.1. A party may sign a facsimile copy or a scanned copy of the Deed.
19.2.2. A signed copy of the Deed may be sent by either facsimile or email to a party or their agent or solicitor.

19.3. Each signed facsimile or scanned copy of the Deed will be treated as an original and together with any signed original part, they all will form one Deed.

20. **Mediation**

20.1. Any dispute between the parties, will be referred to informal mediation by a person with experience in the mediation of land disputes. The mediator will be agreed upon by the parties, or failing Deed will be nominated on the application of either party by the President for the time being of the Canterbury Westland Branch of the New Zealand Law Society or his or her nominee. Such mediation will be a condition precedent to the commencement of any other legal action.

**SIGNED AS AN DEED**

SIGNED for and on behalf of  
ASHBURTON DISTRICT COUNCIL  
by its authorised signatory  
in the presence of:-

SIGNED for and on behalf of  
by  
in the presence of:-

Witness Signature: __________________________
Witness Name: __________________________
Witness Occupation: _______________________
Witness Address: _________________________
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