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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>1.30pm</td>
<td>Meeting commences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ORDER OF BUSINESS**

1. Apologies
2. Extraordinary Business
3. Conflict of Interest Declarations
4. Confirmation of Minutes – 20/04/17
5. Forward Programme

6. **Matters for Committee Decision**
   6.1 Ashburton Resource Recovery Park Opening Hours
   6.2 Future Options for Resource Consents CRC111706 & CRC111707 [Ashburton Business Estate Lot 9]
   6.3 Intersection Control Review
   6.4 Speed Limit Review
   6.5 Ocean Farm Grazing vs Cut and Carry
   6.6 Closure of Stockwater race – McLennans Bush Road
   6.7 Closure of Stockwater race – Hardys Road

7. **Activity Reports**
   7.1 Library
   7.2 Ashburton Museum
   7.3 EA Networks Centre
   7.4 Parks and Open Spaces
   7.5 Stockwater
   7.6 Solid Waste
   7.7 3 Waters Capital Projects
   7.8 Drinking Water
   7.9 Wastewater
   7.10 Stormwater
   7.11 Roading (subsidised)
   7.12 Roading (unsubsidised)
   7.13 Footpaths
   7.14 Contracts Awarded
   7.15 Upcoming Tenders
   7.16 Vandalism
   7.17 Methven Community Board

*Cont’d*
8 Business Transacted with the Public Excluded

8.1 Confirmation of minutes 20/04/17
   - Ocean Farm grass contract

Section 7(2)(h) Commercial activities

8.2 Ashburton Business Estate Stage 2

Section 7(2)(h) Commercial activities

26 May 2017
Committee Minutes

4.1 Service Delivery Committee

Minutes of the Service Delivery Committee meeting held on Thursday 20 April 2017, commencing at 9.39am in the Council Chamber, 2 Baring Square East, Ashburton.

Present
Mayor Donna Favel; Councillors Stuart Wilson (Chair), Thelma Bell, Leen Braam, Neil Brown, Lynette Lovett, Mark Malcolm, Liz McMillan, Diane Rawlinson, Selwyn Price, Peter Reveley and Alasdair Urquhart.

In attendance
Group Manager Service Delivery, Assets Manager, Operations & Projects Manager, Roading Manager and Committee Secretary.

Staff present for the duration of their reports: Open Spaces Manager, 3 Waters Engineer, Sports Facilities Manager, Museum Director, District Librarian.

1 Apologies
Cr Ellis Sustained

2 Extraordinary Business
Nil.

3 Declarations of Interest
Nil.

4 Confirmation of Minutes
That the minutes of the Service Delivery Committee meeting held on 9 March 2017, be taken as read and confirmed.

Braam/McMillan Carried

5 Forward Programme
1 June 2017 – Council workshop (Solid Waste and NZTA)

6.1 Closure of Stockwater Race – Maronan Road
It was noted that the Stockwater Working Group met to consider the draft reports for each of the proposed race closures presented to the Committee today. The Working Group supported the Officers’ recommendations.

1 That the Committee approves the closure of the stockwater race starting at PN: 3199 along Kennels Road, through four properties and joining at a junction at PN: 20088, a total distance of 1,370 metres; and

2 That the closure be effective immediately.

Malcolm/Urquhart Carried

6.2 Closure of Stockwater Race – Waimarama Road

1 That the Committee approves closure of the stockwater race starting at PN: 23203 on Waimarama Road through one property to PN: 16064 on Waimarama Road, at total distance 3,151 metres; and

2 That the closure be effective immediately.

McMillan/Rawlinson Carried
6.3 **Closure of Stockwater Race – Adam Jackson Road to Storriers Road**

1. **That** the Committee approves closure of the stockwater race starting at PN: 4711 from Adam Jackson Road, through two properties, crossing Boundary Road through another property, crossing Junction Road and running through three properties to at Storriers Road, PN 4680, a total distance of 7,738 metres; and

2. **That** the closure be effective immediately.

   Malcolm/Lovett Carried

6.4 **Closure of Stockwater Race – Rokeby School Road**

1. **That** the Committee approves closure of the stockwater race starting at PN 1612 from Rokeby School Road through ten properties to Mainwarings Road, PN 2270, a total distance of 10,919 metres; and

2. **That** the closure be effective immediately.

   Braam/Price Carried

6.5 **Rakaia Barrhill Race Closure**

The recommendation not to progress closure of the remainder of the race was not fully supported. Councillors opposing this action asked that the Working Group be reconvened to further consider the implications of closing the race. There was also concern that the alternative (BCI) supply to properties in the Rakaia Settlement has been unsuccessful and property owners are paying for a service that’s not being delivered.

The Assets Manager reminded Councillors of the discussion at a recent stockwater workshop where information provided by Officers highlighted the extensive work that has been carried out on the proposed closure. He explained that some properties have been unable to find a cost effective alternative water supply and on that basis, Officers could not recommend closure. Notwithstanding this, Officers will continue to look at selective areas and try to expedite closure where there is support.

**That** the matter under discussion be referred to the Stockwater working group and reported back to the Committee on 1 June 2017.

   Brown/Reveley Carried

*Post meeting note: The full Stockwater working group met to discuss this matter on 4 May 2017. It was agreed at that meeting that the original recommendation to not progress the closure of the remainder of the race be put back before the 1 June Service Delivery Committee for reconsideration, however the working group understands that there will be future requests for partial closures on this race. Refer to Section 7.5 of the 1 June Service Delivery Committee agenda for a meeting report.*

6.6 **Cass Street Loading Zone – Briscoes Group**

**That** the Committee approves the Briscoes Group request to use a loading zone on Cass Street between hours of 6:00 am to 9:00 am daily; subject to

1) the Briscoes Group paying for the reconstruction of the footpath to the necessary industrial specifications; and

2) the reconstruction plans for final dimension and design of the loading bay are subject to approval by Council officers.

   Brown/Braam Carried

7 **Activity Reports**

**That** the reports be received.

   McMillan/Mayor Carried
7.2 Triannual Report
The Triannual Performance Report for the November 2016 – February 2017 period was received.

Public conveniences – during discussion the Roading Manager was asked whether a bus park could be established opposite the Domain toilets and paddling pool area on Walnut Ave. Mr Fauth explained that the need for designated bus parking is not apparent and there is sufficient space on a first come basis. Council would have to establish demand before any change was made and there has been no request to do this.

EA Networks Centre – a breakdown of costs between the stadium, gym and pool was requested for future reports. Officers explained that the available technology doesn’t provide that level of detail and information would be an estimate only.

The Committee adjourned for morning tea from 10.34am to 10.48am.

Solid waste – Officers confirmed that more detail can be provided on recycling and refuse tonnages. The Committee is also to be updated on the locations for new recycling depots.

Transportation – the Committee asked for more detail on grading work. It was noted that the information would not form part of the performance reporting but can be included in the Committee’s activity reports. Councillors are interested to see whether the contracting company is meeting targets.

7.4 EA Networks Centre
Information was sought on the costs to operate and resource the Tinwald pool. Officers were asked to present this for consideration during the LTP review.

The Group Manager Service Delivery noted that a security light has been requested to improve safety in the shingle car parking area. He acknowledged that the initial solution proposed would be costly and agreed to investigate whether there is a more cost effective option.

7.7.2 Solid Waste Education Contract
That Crs Ellis and Price be appointed as the elected representatives on the Education contract evaluation panel.

Reveley/Mayor Carried

7.7.3 Ashburton RRP Opening Hours
The proposed change to the resource recovery park opening hours will be the subject of a report to the Committee on 1 June. The possibility of a reduction in the contract price, to correspond with the change in hours, will be discussed with the contractor when the contract is in place.

7.8 Sewer Pipeline Renewal – Walnut Ave
The Operations & Projects Manager reported that contractor’s attempt to put the pipe under the railway line was unsuccessful due to unforeseen problems with the material it was required to go through. The work has not completely failed and alternative means of putting a larger (1200mm) pipe through are being looked at, subject to KiwiRail’s approval. The contract budget has a contingency to meet the additional cost.

7.12.2 Rural Road Reference Groups Terms of Reference
The Roading Manager confirmed that community groups and organisations with an interest in road safety are able to make representations. Similarly, Councillors may also make the reference groups aware of road safety issues requiring discussion.

That the Committee approves the amended Terms of Reference for the Rural and Urban Road Reference Groups.

Mayor/Urquhart Carried
7.13 Footpaths and Parking
A report being provided to the Committee in June will address a request for additional bus stop parking on East Street, adjacent to the Ashburton i-Site.

7.17 Methven Community Board
• Cleaning street tiles
The Methven Community Board has highlighted concerns with the township’s tiled footpaths and has asked that they be cleaned before winter.
The Roading Manager agreed to seek advice on the most appropriate treatment for the tiles before any work is undertaken.

That Council’s Roading Department investigate the feasibility of cleaning / treating the tiled footpaths in Methven and proceed with the work if it’s possible.

Wilson/McMillan Carried

• NZ Community Boards Conference 2017
The Committee was reminded that the biennial conference will be held in Methven on 12-13 May. Cr McMillan will be attending, along with Methven Community Board representatives.

8 Business transacted with the public excluded (11.46am)
That the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting, namely – the general subject of each matter to be considered while the public is excluded, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter, and the specific grounds under Section 48 (1) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item no</th>
<th>General subject of each matter to be considered:</th>
<th>In accordance with Section 48(1) of the Act, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>Ocean Farm Grass Contract</td>
<td>Section 7(2)(h) Commercial activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Brown/Urquhart Carried

The meeting concluded at 11.57am.
## 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>July 27</td>
<td>Lake Camp &amp; Clearwater Management Plan</td>
<td>Open Spaces Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Additional Bus Stops in Ashburton</td>
<td>Roading Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Installation of cattle stops</td>
<td>Roading Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 5</td>
<td>Ocean Farm Grass Contract</td>
<td>Projects &amp; Operations Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.1 Ashburton Resource Recovery Park Opening Hours

6.1.1 Summary
The purpose of this report is to seek the committee’s approval to extend the opening hours of the Ashburton resource recovery park.

6.1.2 Recommendation
That the Committee approves:
1) the proposed extended opening hours at the Ashburton resource recovery park to:
   - 9am to 5pm on Sundays year round; and
   - 8am to 6pm Monday to Saturday during daylight saving time
2) the new hours to commence 1 July 2017; and
3) an increase in the proposed Ashburton Resource Recovery Park annual plan budget for 2017-2018 of $33,079.72 (1.1% of total).

6.1.3 Background
The current opening hours at the Ashburton resource recovery park cause frustration for some users of the park. This frustration stems from late opening times on Sunday when users have to wait/queue until 1pm to get into the park and at the end of the business day when some users are intending to get into the park at 5pm.

This proposal is presented as an increase in the opening hours without increasing gate fees at the park, and would be implemented from 1 July 2017.

The preferred alternative opening hours is based on a winter and daylight saving season system. This is in part due to available daylight hours in winter and health and safety management on site.

Winter:
- Opening earlier on a Sunday at 9am will even out the flow of traffic coming into the park when it first opens.

Daylight saving hours:
- Includes the above Sunday hours plus remaining open an hour longer Monday to Saturday until 6pm. This will allow businesses to close up their own operations and then get to park before it closes.

Two other alternatives and more detail on their implications are discussed below.

It is unlikely that any of these alternative proposals will increase revenue. Each will incur additional operational cost ranging from 0.4% to 1.1% of the total operational cost for Ashburton Resource Recovery Park.
The Ashburton resource recovery park is currently open to receive rubbish and recycling on weekdays from:

- 8am to 5pm weekdays; and
- 9am to 5pm on Saturday; and
- 1pm to 5pm on Sunday throughout the year

Council Officers have been receiving complaints about issues of queuing to get into the park on Sundays and the park closing too early on weekdays and Saturdays. The contractor operating the park also reports the same complaints are being made directly to them.

The graphs below illustrate the patterns where on a Saturday the frequency of visits is fairly consistent right through to the last quarter hour of the day.

*Number of visits by time of day across 12 months. Mid-February 2018 to Mid-February 2017*

![Saturday graph](image1)

The graph for Sunday illustrates how the heaviest frequency of visits is when the park first opens at 1:00pm. The frequency of visits is more than twice that of Saturday's average from 1pm and then trails off over the following two and half hours to match Saturday's average.

*Number of visits by time of day across 12 months. Mid-February 2018 to Mid-February 2017*

![Sunday graph](image2)
In response to this feedback and in consultation with the contractor, Council Officers have prepared a range of three alternative opening time options for Council to consider.

None of the alternatives below extend the closing time during winter hours. This is because the days are too short in the depths of winter and it gets dark too quickly to allow the park to operate safely.

Three alternative options have been considered

**Alternative 1: Discussion**

This is the preferred option. This would best address the complaints received about opening and closing hours at the Ashburton resource recovery park. This option addresses the weekend queuing year round and the closing times during the daylight saving period.

**Winter:**
- Opening earlier at 9am on a Sunday will even out the flow of traffic coming into the park when it first opens.

**Daylight saving hours:**
- Includes the above Sunday hours plus remaining open an hour longer Monday to Saturday until 6pm. This will allow businesses to close up their own operations and then get to park before it closes.

**Alternative 2: Discussion**

This is the next preferred option. This would address the weekend queuing year round at the weekends and the closing times on Saturdays only during the daylight saving period.

**Winter:**
- Opening earlier at 9am on a Sunday will even out the flow of traffic coming into the park when it first opens.

**Daylight saving hours:**
- Includes the above Sunday hours plus remaining open an hour longer on Saturday until 6pm during the daylight saving season.

**Alternative 3: Discussion**

This is the least preferred option. This option goes some way to addressing the weekend queuing year round. This option trades an hour of opening time on Saturday to reduce the impact of opening earlier on Sundays year round. This option will still see some queuing at opening times on both weekend days.

**Year round:**
- Opening earlier at 10am on a Sunday will help even out the flow of traffic coming into the park when it first opens on a Sunday but will trade off the earlier opening time on Saturday.
- There is no change to closing times

*The three options are summarised in the table below:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status Quo</th>
<th>Monday to Friday</th>
<th>Saturday</th>
<th>Sunday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Year round</td>
<td>8am to 5pm</td>
<td>9am to 5pm</td>
<td>1pm to 5pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 6.1.4 Options and Risks Considered

Council has the following options available:

**Option 1:** Approves the proposal to extend the opening hours of the Ashburton Resource Recovery Park from 1 July 2017, and increases the proposed 2017-2018 Annual Plan Budget by $33,079.72

Council approves the extended hours and the additional budget.

**Risks:**

There are no significant risks associated with approving Option 1.

**Option 2:** Does not approve Alternative 1 to extend the opening hours of the Ashburton Resource Recovery Park from 1 July 2017 and to increase the proposed 2017-2018 Annual Plan Budget by $33,079.72

Council does not approve the extended hours and the additional budget.

**Risks:**

Some ratepayers will continue to be dissatisfied with level of service relating to opening times of the Ashburton resource recovery park.

### 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 (WMMP). Council has such a plan, the most recent version adopted in 2016.

6.1.6 Significance and Engagement

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.

6.1.8 Financial Implications

The recommendation will require an additional $33,079.72 in funding however this work will have little overall impact (0.6%) on the proposed 2017-2018 annual plan budget for the Solid Waste Activity.

The draft 2017/18 budget will need to be amended and the 2017/18 Annual Plan updated before being adopted in June 2017. This change to the 2017/18 Annual Plan and Budget is not considered significant.
6.2 Future Options for Resource Consents CRC111706 & CRC111707 [Ashburton Business Estate Lot 9]

6.2.1 Summary
Council holds resource consents authorising the abstraction of up to 45 litres / second from a site located within the Ashburton Business Estate. This abstraction is subject to a companion consent that authorises the discharge to ground of up to 60 litres / second of stockwater at a site on Mitcham Rd. In simple terms, the ability to take water at one location is subject to a discharge of water at another location.

These consents became the subject of extensive media attention when Council was in negotiations with a business development for the sale of Lot 9 in April 2016. That sale process fell through due to the purchaser failing to meet some key conditions of the sale and purchase agreement.

There was and continues to be significant public interest in water consents, particularly those potentially, or even remotely, associated with water bottling developments.

The purpose of this report is to formally consider options for the future of these resource consents.

6.2.2 Recommendation

That the Committee approves in accordance with Option One of this report, taking no action with Resource Consents CRC111706 & CRC111707, at this time.

6.2.3 Background

Resource consents CRC111706 & CRC111707 became the subject of extensive media attention when Council was in negotiations with a business development for the sale of Lot 9 in month 2016. That potential sale fell through due to the purchaser failing to meet some key conditions of the sale and purchase agreement. That sale process to a developer proposing the establishment of a water bottling factory lead the formation of Bung the Bore, a group vehemently opposed to what they see as a sale of water to largely foreign interests.

There was and continues to be significant public interest in water consents, particularly ones potentially, or even remotely, associated with water bottling developments. In February, Jen Branje, a spokesperson for Bung the Bore, approached Council seeking Council surrender the consents.

In light of these events, Council requested a report that considered future options for these consents.

Note: This report only evaluates the merits and usability of the consents as they currently stand and does not consider use of the water by parties other than Council.
In May 2011, Council applied to Environment Canterbury for a Groundwater Recharge System and Water Take. The specific activities for which consent was sought were:

- To take and use water for commercial purposes
- To discharge water to groundwater

As stated in the application, the source of the water for the discharge component was intended to be stockwater. The consents were granted by Environment Canterbury in September 2011. The expiry date is 26 August 2046.

Resource consent CRC111706 authorises the abstraction of water up to 45 litres / second from a site located within the Ashburton Business Park (ABE) specifically Lot 9 DP 427668. A companion consent CRC111707 authorises the discharge of water to ground of up to 60 litres / second at a site at the corner of Mitcham Rd and Winchmore Dromore Rd (Lot 2 DP33596 & Res 1399). The ability to take water from a bore on Lot 9 is subject to a discharge of water to ground of 60 L/s.

The original rationale was that the water take consent (or supply of water) would be offered as part of a sale of land at the ABE. This was intended to overcome consenting uncertainties for potential purchasers / developers requiring a water abstraction in what is identified as a Red (over-allocated groundwater) Zone under the then Natural Resources Regional Plan. The effects on the environment from the water abstraction were to be mitigated by the groundwater recharge system proposed within the consent application.

As part of the application processing Environment Canterbury had to consider the impact of the Lot 9 abstraction on other neighbouring bores. Obviously, these effects cannot be fully assessed until a bore is actually drilled. The application presented preliminary effects analysis carried out using information from other bores in the area. This preliminary analysis identified four bores, (two separate owners) that were likely to be impacted, so mitigation arrangements and affected party sign-offs were provided as part of the application. Furthermore, when the consents were granted in 2011, and in order to protect the interests of other neighbouring bore owners, ADC proposed conditions on the abstraction consent requiring comprehensive aquifer testing to be completed on the new bore prior to the first exercise of the consent. This would determine the magnitude of well interference effects for all bores within a 2 km radius of a Lot 9 bore. If any bores were identified as “affected” as specified in the Land & Water Regional Plan (LWRP), written agreements would need to be sought from those potentially affected bore owners. A final mitigation to ensure impacts on neighbouring bores was less likely, the bore depth was specified as “not less than 95 metres deep”.

As noted, it was envisaged that the abstraction consent would transfer with the sale of land. In practice, the fact that the consents are intrinsically linked may be problematic if the abstraction consent is passed to another entity. That entity’s rights under the abstraction consent are solely reliant on Council meeting its obligations under the discharge to ground consent e.g. the take cannot happen without the discharge. It is assumed possible to provide a contractual mechanism to address this but it does appear to carry a level of compliance risk to both parties. It is also worth noting, that sale and purchase agreements at that time placed the drilling risk (of not finding water) with the land purchaser. If suitable water is not found at the site the abstraction consent may be unusable.

There was some speculation in the community and by interested stakeholders regarding the legality of the consents and it is understood those parties explored this avenue with ECan. It is understood that ECan are satisfied that the issuing of the consents was legal. However, in light of potential legal challenges to the validity of the resource consents, officers have sought legal advice. The advice indicates some uncertainty as to whether Council can utilise water from its stockwater network for the purposes of the groundwater recharge. This issue relates less to the two resource consents discussed but instead to resource consent relating to the stockwater network.
Specifically, the applicable water abstraction consent for the stockwater network (CRC169504) does not note groundwater recharge as a specified “use”. The legal opinion indicates that as an area of potential risk for Council.

In considering options for Council use of the consents, the merits of whether a future bore could be drilled under this consent and the water used to augment the Ashburton water supply was examined. This is impractical as it would require the establishment of another treatment facility. This is considered a significant and unnecessary expense. The Ashburton Business Estate (ABE) has been developed on the premise of supply from Ashburton and in particular the Bridge Street treatment plant & bore-field. As town demand grows or if a wet-industry is established in the ABE, the Bridge Street site is designed to accommodate another (third) bore in future. Note:- The Argyle Park site on Middle Road also has capacity for a third bore. The current LTP has programmed one of these bores for development in Year 9 (2023/24).

6.2.4 Options and Risks Considered

The following options have been identified:

**Option One** – Take no action at this time

Under this option Council simply resolves to do nothing with the consents at this time and in the absence of giving effect to them they will formally lapse on 30 September 2019. This option gives Council the flexibility should in the interim an opportunity presents itself to utilise these consents, this could be brought back to the committee for consideration.

Note:- Council could also at any stage before the lapsing date seek an extension to the lapsing date.

*Risks*

- *Council may be criticised by lobby groups for not surrendering consents.*

**Option Two** – Surrender resource consents

Under this option Council officers would formally advise Environment Canterbury its intention to surrender the consents. The consents would effectively be surrendered from the date of such advice.

Formally surrendering the consents has no financial implications other than confirming there will be no return on the investment of $47,500 in obtaining the consents.

*Risks*

- *Council may be criticised for not realising a return from the investment made in obtaining the consents.*
- *Decision could be seen as a “back down” and may embolden lobby groups to pressure this and other Councils on other matters.*

**Option Three** – Seek a variation, and proceed to give effect to the resource consents

Under this option, Council would prepare and lodge an application to vary the resource consents as necessary in order to address the area of potential risk with the consents. This may be variations to the Lot 9 consents and/or the stockwater consent. If this option is chosen, Council would also seek an extension the 30 September 2019 lapsing date.

Council is currently in the process of developing a working relationship with Te Runanga o Arowhenua. It would be necessary and appropriate to engage with Arowhenua before lodging an application for variation.
The matter of notification of the application is ultimately for ECAn as the consenting authority to determine, however given the recent public interest in this matter, Council would have to consider the merits of directing ECAn toward public notification regardless.

Subject to the variation process being successful, Council would proceed to give effect to the revised consents. This would need a commitment from Council to drill a bore on Lot 9 (or utility lot created for the purpose) and if the bore was successful, the subsequent development of the groundwater recharge system on Mitcham Road. This would confirm availability of groundwater, allow for the aquifer testing to be completed, and completion of any mitigation required for affected bore owners if identified. Assuming these matters are satisfactorily addressed, the development of the recharge system could follow shortly after.

This option requires further financial investment in the consents to cover the cost of seeking the variation, drilling the bore and constructing the groundwater recharge system. However, if successful, the water abstraction resource consent (for full consumptive use) would become very valuable. Council would look to recover the cost of this option from a purchaser requiring the water.

**Risks**

- Public notification will allow submissions from any party from the community and may result in protracted and expensive hearing process.
- Application for variation may ultimately be declined.
- Engagement with Arowhenua may not necessarily translate into support for application, and proceeding with intentions under those terms could jeopardise the developing relationship.
- Bore drilling carries the risk of not finding water at the required quantity, quality or depth.
- Future compliance risk operating the groundwater recharge system.
- Redirecting of resources to this matter may impact on delivery of other Council projects.

The recommended option is Option One. This is the option with least risk and provides Council with a degree of flexibility.

### 6.2.5 Statutory Implications

The following statutory implications have been identified.

**Resource Management Act 1991**

The resource consents have been issued under the RMA. The consenting authority in this case is Environment Canterbury. The most relevant clauses within the resource consents is provided below:

**Resource Consent CRC111706**

2. Water may be taken only from bore L37/1766, 200-300 millimetres diameter and not less than 95 metres deep, at map reference NZMS 260 L37: 1353-0268.
3. Water may be taken at a rate not exceeding 45 litres per second, with a volume not exceeding 3888 cubic metres per day and 1,419,120 cubic metres between 1 July and the following 30th June.
4. Water shall only be used for commercial purposes associated with a ‘wet industry’ located on Lot 9 of the Ashburton Business Estate as illustrated on the attached plan CRC111706, which forms part of this consent or for community purposes.
5. Water may only be taken in accordance with this consent when water is being discharged at a continuous rate of at least 60 litres per second to ground in accordance with resource consent CRC111707 (recharge consent).

... 

**Resource Consent CRC111707**

1. The discharge site (groundwater recharge system) shall be located on Lot 2 DP 33596 and Res 1399, at the corner of Mitcham and Winchmore-Dromore Road, referred to as Gravel Pits 239/240, as marked on attached plan CRC111707, which forms part of this consent.

2. At least 30 days prior to the construction of the groundwater recharge system, a detailed plan and appropriate explanation, shall be provided to the Canterbury Regional Council, Attn: RMA Compliance and Enforcement Manager, signed by a suitably qualified professional certifying, and demonstrating by means of clear information, that:
   a. The discharge (groundwater recharge system) shall deliver water to ground at a continuous rate of not less than 60 litres per second for the duration of this consent;
   b. The inlet(s) to the groundwater recharge system shall be designed and constructed with appropriate protection to prevent erosion and scour;
   c. Adequate area is available to ensure the appropriate operation of the groundwater recharge system, without compromising any other activity on and around the site;
   d. A weir, or similar structure, will be installed in order to be able to facilitate accurately measuring and recording the volume of water being discharged at all times;
   e. That the groundwater recharge system is capable of operating in accordance with all other conditions of this consent.

... 

4. The consent holder shall, within 30 days of the first exercise of this consent, provide certification that the rate of discharge to ground is occurring at an average of 60 litres per second over a continuous 24 hour period, and that there is no foreseeable reason why this rate of discharge cannot be sustained for the period of this consent.

... 

**Resource Consent CRC169504**

1. The damming, diversion, and abstraction of water from the following surface water bodies shall take place at the following map references, and shall not exceed the specified maximum abstraction rates:

... 

d. To dam and take water from an unnamed tributary of the North Ashburton River, via an existing structure at the Winchmore Intake, adjacent to Ashburton - Rakaia Gorge (Methven Highway) and Shearers Roads, via SWAP BY20/0089 at or about map reference NZTopo50 BY20:90419-52379, at a maximum rate of 790 litres per second

... 

9. The use of water shall be only for stock drinking water, treated domestic and community drinking water, and essential domestic and community use.

... 

**6.2.6 Significance and Engagement**

This matter in itself is not considered significant as this decision relates to legally established resource consents already held by Council and the recommendation proposes not to change anything at this point (status quo).

However, the degree of public interest in matters relating to water consents has risen markedly in recent times, and if the Committee were to favour other options, the Committee must satisfy itself whether this warrants engagement with the community before proceeding with those options.

This matter does not appear to be influenced by any other policies of Council.
6.2.7 **Financial Implications**

There are no financial implications relating to the recommendation contained in this report.

The total cost expended by Council on CRC111706 & CRC111707 is $47,500. This comprises investigations, consultation and negotiations with affected bore owners, lodgement fees, processing costs and consent mgmt.

The financial implications relating to the recommended and other options are set out in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost (ROC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Take no action [Recommended Option]</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Formally surrender the consents - confirms loss of investment.</td>
<td>$ 47,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Prepare application &amp; lodgement</td>
<td>$ 5,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Processing costs, hearing support, etc</td>
<td>$ 30,000+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drilling new bore</td>
<td>$ 100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development of groundwater recharge system</td>
<td>$ 220,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PREPARED BY**  
ANDREW GUTHRIE  
Assets Manager

**APPROVED BY**  
NEIL McCANN  
Group Manager Service Delivery
6.3 Intersection Control Review

6.3.1 Summary

There are three intersections in the Ashburton district which require their current controls to be reviewed. The three intersections are Oak Grove/Elizabeth Street, Seafield Road/Company Road and Winchmore Dromore Road/Mitcham Road which all have inadequate sight lines. The poor visibility is a safety issue and is potentially the reason for a number of crashes which have occurred at these intersections. These three intersections are all currently Give Way controlled.

6.3.2 Recommendation

That the following district intersections controls be changed from Give Way control to STOP control:

1. Oak Grove and Elizabeth Street;
2. Seafield Road and Company Road; and
3. Winchmore Dromore Road and Mitcham Road

6.3.3 Background

Three intersections in the Ashburton district require their current controls to be reviewed. The three intersections are Oak Grove/Elizabeth Street, Seafield Road/Company Road and Winchmore Dromore Road/Mitcham Road which all have inadequate sight lines.

1. Oak Grove – Elizabeth Street

Figure 1. Oak Grove intersection with Elizabeth Avenue.
The intersection of Oak Grove and Elizabeth Street has had 19 recorded crashes since 2007. This is the highest number of recorded crashes at an intersection in the Ashburton district. Of the 19 crashes, failure to give way was the main cause for every crash. Two of these crashes resulted in serious injury and every crash involved two or more parties. Twelve of the 19 crashes occurred at the northern side of the intersection when a vehicle was passing through the intersection from the central island. Looking southwest from the central island the vision is very poor as shown in figure 2. The oak trees which are planted in the central island can block vision of oncoming vehicles.

![Figure 2. Visibility northeast.](image1.jpg)

![Figure 3. Visibility southwest.](image2.jpg)

The vision looking northeast is also poor but not as bad as the vision southwest as shown in figure 3. Both the oak trees and parked cars can block the vision in this direction but the trees here are set back a further from the intersection than the trees on the southwest. Changing the control at the intersection to a stop sign would mean drivers would stop at the appropriate location so they can clearly see any oncoming vehicles before proceeding through the intersection.

2. Seafield Road – Company Road

![Figure 4. Company Road intersection with Seafield Road.](image3.jpg)
The intersection of Seafield Road and Company Road has had seven reported crashes since 2007. Four of the crashes involved multiple parties with all four of them being a result of failing to give way. One crash resulted in serious injury.

Due to the acute angle of the intersection, the hedge and power pole block a significant amount of vision when looking east as shown in figure 5. The visibility looking west is adequate as the hedge is set back enough from the intersection, shown in figure 6. Changing the control at the intersection to a STOP sign would mean drivers would stop at the appropriate location so they can clearly see any vehicles which are coming from the east.

3. Winchmore Dromore Road – Mitcham Road

While this intersection has had zero crashes as a result of drivers failing to give way, the sight looking both north and south is restricted due to trees and vegetation growing on the adjacent properties. The acute angle of the intersection decreases sight distance even further. Figures 8 and 9 show the visibility at the intersection. The number of crashes at this intersection is expected to be low due to the low traffic volume. However Mitcham Road is a 100 km/h road and the severity of an accident if it were to happen would be high. There are numerous roadside hazards (power poles, ditches and an irrigation race) at this intersection which could result in serious injury if hit.
Both the Seafield Road/Company Road and Winchmore Dromore Road/Mitcham Road intersections have visibility constraints which would warrant a STOP sign to be erected. The intersection of Elizabeth Street/Oak Grove has both sufficient visibility and very poor visibility dependent on the point at which the driver checks for other vehicles. Because of the difference in visibility at different points it is recommended that a STOP sign be installed to ensure the driver stops where there is adequate visibility.

6.3.4 Options and Risks Considered

There are three options for the committee to consider.

**Option One**: Leave the intersections as they currently are
This option will see the three intersections retaining their current give way controls.
**Risks**
- Site distances at intersections will remain low.
- Potential risk of crashes and injury remains high especially at the Oak Grove/Elizabeth Street and Company Road/Seafield Road intersections.

**Option Two**: Replace Give way signs with STOP signs
This option will change the current give way control to a STOP control. Drivers will legally have to stop at these intersections giving them more time to correctly check for oncoming vehicles and potentially reduce the crash rates.
**Risks**
- Drivers may still ‘roll’ through the stop sign potentially resulting in a crash.

**Option Three**: Cut down trees/hedges which block visibility
This option would improve the visibility and potentially reduce the risk of crashes at these intersections.
**Risks**
- Drivers may travel through intersection at higher speed due to increased visibility.
- Property owners may not wish to cut down their trees/hedges.

The recommended option is **Option Two**. By replacing the Give way signs with STOP signs at the Grove/Elizabeth Street, Company Road/Seafield Road and Mitcham Road/Winchmore Dromore Road intersections driver safety issues will potentially be improved.
6.3.5 Statutory Implications
The following statutory implications have been identified.

Local Government Act
Under section 355 of the local government act 1974 council has the ability to order a property owner to remove/trim vegetation if it is considered to be a hazard or create a safety risk.

“The council may, by notice in writing under the hand of the chairman or the principal administrative officer, require the owner of any land abutting upon any road within the district to do any of the following acts:

(C) to remove, lower, or trim to the satisfaction of the council any tree or hedge, or to lower any fence or wall, if in the opinion of the council the tree, hedge, fence, or wall is likely, by reason of its obstructing the view, to cause danger to the traffic on that or any other road.”

As stated in the district plan 10.9.12
No tree shall be planted within 30m of a road intersection, measures to the point at which the legal boundary lines of the two road frontages intersect.

This gives council power to get adjacent property owners to remove trees which are within 30m from an intersection.

MOTSAM - Stop Sign Policy
Manual of traffic signs and markings (MOTSAM) – Part 1 states:

“Subject to formal authorization by the road controlling authority, RG-5 STOP signs should be erected:

a) at blind intersections where lack of visibility makes it unsafe to approach the intersection at a speed greater than 10 km/h.

Note: it is unsafe to approach an intersection at more than 10 km/h if, from a point 9 metres from the intersection limit line on a controlled approach, a driver cannot see a vehicle on an uncontrolled approach at a distance of 1.2 times the speed (km/h) exceeded by 15% of vehicles on the priority route.”

MOTSAM - Give way Sign Policy
Manual of traffic signs and markings (MOTSAM) – Part 1 states:

“Subject to formal authorization by the road controlling authority, RG-6 Give Way signs should be erected:

a) at all crossroads that do not have visibility constraints requiring RG-5 STOP signs,”

6.3.6 Significance and Engagement
Given that the visibility issues at these intersections have been raised and that these intersections do not meet the requirements for Give Way control, these intersections should either have their control changed to STOP or have the trees blocking the visibility removed. As a road controlling authority it is our obligation to adhere to the current national standards. If we fail to do so we may be held liable for any accident that occurs.
If Council were to implement the recommended option, it will not have an impact on rates or levels of service, therefore the recommended option is assessed as having a minimal level of significance and requires no consultation.

6.3.7 Financial Implications

The costs associated with installing STOP controls is low. The associated costs with each site is as below:

- Elizabeth Street/Oak Grove approximately $1000
- Seafield Road/Company Road approximately $350
- Winchmore Dromore Road/Mitcham Road approximately $300

This will be funded from the roading minor maintenance budget.
6.4 Speed Limit Review

6.4.1 Summary
NZTA has released the Draft Land Transport Rule: Setting of Speed Limits [2017] which will be the new rule governing how speed limits are set in New Zealand. This proposed rule will replace the current out of date procedures for determining speed limits set in Land Transport Rule: Setting of Speed Limits 2003. The aim of this new rule is to bring a more consistent and appropriate approach to speed management across New Zealand and that the speed limit reflects the associated risks to road users.

6.4.2 Recommendation
That the information in this report be received.

6.4.3 Background
The Draft Land Transport Rule: Setting of Speed Limits [2017] has been released which will be the new rule governing how speed limits are set in New Zealand and will replace the current procedure for determining speed limits.

An example of the proposed changes include allowing for a maximum speed of 110 km/h on the very best roads in New Zealand. A road with at least two lanes in each direction separated by a median barrier could get a speed limit of 110 km/h.

There will also be provisions made for setting emergency speed limits. Following a crisis, such as an earthquake, storm or other natural event there is allowance for an immediate speed limit change to reduce the risk to the public.

If this rule is put in place the new methodology will be used for all speed limit evaluations going forward and will allow for current roads which have inappropriate speed limits to be changed to a speed limit which is fit for the hazards which exist on the road and roadside.

In 2010 the world health organisation launched a road safety initiative which is known as the “Decade of Action for Road Safety”. The goal of this initiative is to halve the number of international road deaths by 2020. From this initiative the safe system approach has been developed. The safe system is a fundamental change to the way road safety is viewed and managed.

The safe system philosophy is as follows:
- Humans will continue to make mistakes and crashes will continue to occur
- The human body can only withstand a certain level of crash force
- The system designers need to share the responsibility with the users to ensure that no individual is exposed to crash forces likely to lead to fatal and serious injuries
- We need to work together on all parts of the safe system to achieve this
The safe system has four key cornerstones:
- Safer Roads and Roadsides
- Safe Speeds
- Safe Vehicles
- Safe Road Use

Putting responsibility on each of the four cornerstones of the safe system ensures that if one part of the system fails the other three will ensure there is no death from a road crash.

The 2013 – 2015 safer journeys action plan has a focus on speed management. As a result a new way to set speed limits has been developed. The new national guidelines ensure that the speed limit of a road is appropriate to the role of the road and considers the associated risks of the road and roadside.

The current rules allow for the speed limits, 50 km/h for urban, 70 km/h for semi-urban and 100 km/h for rural roads. Using this method there could be two roads with completely different attributes but have the same speed limit. The new rules use the speed limits 40 km/h, 50 km/h, 60 km/h, 80 km/h, 100 km/h and 110 km/h. The choice of which speed limit to use is based off a number on different aspects.

These include:
- The safe speed to crash into the hazards on the road or roadside
- The infrastructure risk rating of the roadside
- The classification of the road
- The historical crash data of the road

The safe speed for a crash with a pedestrian would be 30 km/h. The safe speed for a side on collision is 50 km/h. The safe speed for a head on collision is 70 km/h. the safe speed for a road without the chance of side on or head on collision is 100 km/h or greater. Below is a graph showing the risk of fatality against the impact speed of a crash.

Figure 10. Four cornerstones of the safe system.
The infrastructure risk rating of a road is a score which is developed from eight different attributes of the road and roadside. These are the road stereotype, the alignment, carriageway size, roadside hazards, adjacent land use, intersection density, access density and traffic volume. The higher the associated risk rating of the road the greater the chance of death or serious injury if there is a crash.

The classification of the road can influence the choice of speed limit. There are four classifications of road; Class 1 - High volume national strategic; Class 2 – National, Regional and Arterial; Class 3 – Primary and Secondary Collector; Class 4 – Access and low-volume access. The higher the classification of the road the greater the allowed speed limit.

The personal and collective crash risk of a road is determined using historical crash data. The personal risk is the chance that you personally will be involved in a crash if there was a crash on the road. The collective risk is the probability that a crash will occur on a section of road. The higher the collective and personal risk of a road the lower the suggested speed limit will be.

This new methodology encompasses the idea that not all roads are equal. Roads that look similar and have similar safety features will have the same speed limit. Roads which look different and have different safety features will have different speed limits.

6.4.4 Options and Risks Considered

There are no options and/or risks to be considered at this time.

6.4.5 Statutory Implications

The proposed document will replace “Land Transport Rule: Setting of Speed Limits 2003”. All future speed limits will be set according to this new rule.

All current bylaws that state Land Transport Rule: Setting of Speed Limits 2003 as the rule to set speed limits will have to be changed to state the 2017 rule. Eventually all existing road speed limits listed in the transportation bylaw will require review/public consultation to determine the appropriate speed to be applied using this new Rule.

Figure 11. Chance of fatality for certain impact speeds.
6.4.6 Significance and Engagement
The implementation of this proposed rule is considered significant if the result is a district wide change in speed limits. There would have to be significant advertisement and consultation if the speed limits were to legally change as it would affect every driver who uses Ashburton district roads. There is also potential that the public may not agree with many of the safe and appropriate speeds suggested as the appropriate speed limits.

6.4.7 Financial Implications
Currently there are no financial implications of this proposed new rule. If the proposed new rule is to be implemented the cost will be dependent on the extent of roads that we decide should meet the requirements of the guide. The costs will come from speed limit signage and/or engineering improvements to the road and roadside so the road meets the requirements to be at a desired speed limit.

PREPARED BY
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6.5 Ocean Farm Grazing vs Cut and Carry Operations

6.5.1 Summary
At a recent meeting Councillors sought information on options to maximise revenue from Ocean Farm. A desk top review has confirmed that the consent conditions for Ocean Farm are quite prescriptive and leave little flexibility to alter current practices at the site. The work has also confirmed that the most efficient proportion between grazing and cut-and-carry is currently taking place.

The purpose of this report is to seek approval of the current practices in terms of grazing and cut-and-carry. This will allow officers to proceed with the development of the next standing grass contract.

6.5.2 Recommendation
65.3 Background

Ocean Farm is the final stage of the wastewater treatment system for Ashburton and Tinwald. The wastewater is treated in a pond-based system at Wilkins Road, passing through a screen, an aeration pond, then two maturation ponds before conveyance via pipe to the wetlands on Ocean Farm. Here the treated effluent passes through the wetlands to a storage pond before being pumped to irrigation network for land disposal. This land disposal is the primary function of Ocean Farm.

This operation is carried out under Resource Consent CRC30999.1. The Resource Consent was granted on 5 September 2012 and expires on 13 June 2039. Condition 5 of this Resource Consent requires us to operate as a cut and carry operation. This condition also specifies that we cannot graze cattle.

The farm is operated as a cut and carry from spring through to autumn and then grazing from autumn through to spring. The grazing often takes place on the same land after it has been cut to allow the lambs on the new grass. This makes the allocation of grazing areas versus cut and carry difficult to ascertain as they are not really separated. As many areas are shared for a few weeks at a time it is difficult to compare grazing versus cut and carry to ascertain which is more profitable at this time.

The main reason the cut and carry operation is required is to reduce the nitrogen loading on the soil. Our consent dictates that the nitrogen loading rates from the treated effluent shall not exceed 305 kilograms N/ha/year.

Having the grass removed removes close to 70% of the nitrogen that was put on by irrigating the effluent. Grazing does not achieve the same removal rates. Cut and carry is the only sustainable solution to counter the nitrogen input from the treated effluent.

6.5.4 Options and Risks Considered

The following options have been identified.

Option One – Continue with the current grazing/cut and carry operation.

No major changes shall be made to the ratio of grazing / cut and carry operations. The variations in the demand for the grass and the ability to sell the product means that the tender price will be low. If the current market continues Council will have to tolerate the low income for the first year. At that stage a decision can be brought to Council to decide whether we renew a negotiated contract or go back out to the market. The grazing contract will be treated in the same manner.

Risks

- Current market conditions may result in a low tender price for standing grass. Note: This risk can be partially mitigated by having an annual review and renewal clause in the standing grass contract.

Option Two – Reduce cut and carry operation in favour of larger area for grazing.

Under this option, a larger area shall be grazed and a smaller area is operated as cut and carry. The primary difficulty with this option is that the nitrogen loading rates on the soil may not exceed 305kg N/ha/year. The farm management plan indicated that this can be met with cut and carry
because the grass takes up most of the nitrogen which is removed from site. Grazing on the other hand does not remove as much nitrogen because it is reintroduced through animal urine. This could result with not meeting the resource consent conditions.

**Risks**
- May breach resource consent requirements, due to less nitrogen being removed and more added through stock loading.
- May not find sufficient grazing stock i.e. the same market conditions that reduce demand for standing grass also reduce the demand for grazing land.
- Reduced area of cut and carry may make the operation less economically viable and less attractive to some contractors. Lower interest in contract may translate into low tender prices.

**Option Three** – Cease cut and carry operations and only graze the available land

Under this option, the site will only be grazed. This will require a variation to our resource consent to make such an operational change. Proceeding otherwise would place us in breach of the resource consent.

**Risks**
- Without changes to the resource consent this option would breach resource consent requirements, due to less nitrogen being removed and significantly more added through stock loading.
- An application to vary the resource consent is in this case significant and has no guarantee of success. In making a case for the variation, Council would have to present how it was going to address nitrogen loading.
- Given the proximity of the site to the Hakatere River, any significant variation to the existing consents at the site would require engagement with Ngai Tahu and / or Arowhenua.
- May not find sufficient grazing stock i.e. the same market conditions that reduce demand for standing grass also reduce the demand for grazing land.

The recommended option is Option 1. This will ensure consent compliance can be maintained.

### 6.5.5 Statutory Implications

The following statutory implications have been identified.

**Resource Management Act 1991**

The resource consents have been issued under the RMA. The consenting authority in this case is Environment Canterbury. The most relevant clauses within the resource consents is provided below:

```
Resource Consent CRC030999.1
...
5. The parts of the farm receiving wastewater shall be operated as a cut and carry operation and no cattle shall be grazed.
...
20. The nitrogen loading rates of the wastewater shall not exceed 305 kilograms N/ha/year.
...
```
6.5.6 Significance and Engagement

This matter is operational in nature and not considered significant in terms of Council’s significance and engagement policy. Engagement with the wider community is considered unnecessary.

The subject matter does not appear to intersect any other Council policies.

6.5.7 Financial Implications

There are no financial implications arising from the recommendations contained in this report. The recommendation is based on maintaining the status quo, with the impact of the reduced income levels already provided for in future budgets.
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6.6 Closure of Stockwater Race – McLennans Bush Road to Waimarama Road

6.6.1 Summary

The purpose of this report is for the Committee to consider and approve the recommendation to close a section of stockwater race from a property on McLennans Bush Road to a property on Waimarama Road.

Full support for this closure has not been obtained by all affected parties, however there is a cost effective alternative water supply available to the property owner objecting to the closure.

6.6.2 Recommendation

1. That the Committee approves the closure of the stock water race starting at PN 603 on McLennans Bush Road through one property crossing Arundel Rakaia Gorge Road, through a second property where it crosses at Waimarama Road, then through a third property before crossing back over Waimarama Road and coming to an end at a junction on PN 6466 on Waimarama Road, a total distance of 4,628.6 metres; and

2. That the closure to be effective immediately.

6.6.3 Background

In April 2017 a stockwater ranger identified a section of stockwater race from McLennans Bush Road to Waimarama Road for closure.

This is now largely a dairy farming area and the races are no longer required for stock use. Although this race generally has a reliable flow, it has been known to dry up due to poor race maintenance. In the past property owners would alter the gates when the race was blocked further upstream and this would result in flooding along Waimarama Road.

The water ranger has confirmed the exact location of the race, and identified the affected parties. Of the five affected parties, only one objected to the closure. This property owner has completed a Water Race Closure Survey Form.

Council’s Stockwater Ranger advises that the property owner who has not signed the affected parties form is a paying contributor to the Spaxton Scheme and has been allocated 10,000 litres per day which is considered sufficient to supply the 40.6 ha block. The valve for the Spaxton Scheme is located at the top of the property and is under pressure. This should, when connected to a reticulated trough system, be able to reach all areas on the property. However if a storage tank was required, the neighbouring property owner has offered free use of a power supply which is located only 15 metres away from the valve.
The property owner had previously advised the Water Rangers that he would be troughed out by mid-February at the latest, however this has not occurred.

A CRM check shows one blocked race complaint, three flooding complaints and one low water complaint. The most recent registered complaint having been recorded in 2014.

6.6.4 Options and Risks Considered
The following options are available:

Option One – Retain stockwater race
The race will remain open.

Risks

- Council will be obligated to maintain a service for these races and property owners will be required to continue ongoing maintenance when four of the property owners wish to close the race.

Option Two – Close the stockwater race
The race will be closed. As the use of the race is clearly quite limited and only minor capital works are required to give effect the closure, it is proposed that closure be made effective immediately.

Risks

- The property owner may deem his alternative supply is not sufficient and request Council provide access to an alternative supply.

The recommended option is Option Two. This option is consistent with Council closure policy and desire to rationalise the stockwater network.

6.6.5 Statutory Implications
The recommendation in this report is consistent with LGA requirements and the Stockwater Race Closures Guidelines & Policy Documents.

6.6.6 Significance and Engagement
All five property owners in the proposed closure area have been consulted with by the water ranger.

Four property owners have signed an Affected Parties Consent Form for the closure to proceed. The remaining owner has been consulted with by two Stockwater Rangers. He has access to the Spaxton scheme, and would be able to install a reticulated trough system for less than $15,000. The owner of the neighbouring property has offered to provide power free of charge for filling a storage tank.

6.6.7 Financial Implications
Minor capital works is required with the culverts to remain for drainage and some berm shaping to be carried out. This will be managed from existing financial budgets. The water ranger can give effect to the race closure by no longer directing water down this particular race system.

PREPARED BY
DAVID ASKIN
Open Spaces Manager

APPROVED BY
NEIL McCANN
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Stockwater Application 170401 – McLennans Bush Road to Waimarama Road
PN: 603, PN: 16065, PN: 21748, PN: 23428, PN: 6466

X3 Road Crossings are affected by this closure

DISCLAIMER:
Digital map data supplied/derived from Land Information New Zealand. CROWN COPYRIGHT RESERVED.
This information displayed in the GIS has been taken from Ashburton District Council’s database and maps.
It is made available in good faith but its accuracy or completeness is not guaranteed. If the information is relied on in support of a resource consent it should be verified independently.
6.7 Closure of Stockwater Race – Hardys Road

6.7.1 Summary

The purpose of this report is for the Committee to consider and approve the recommendation to close a section of stockwater race from Wolseley Road, along Hardys Road to Bakers Road.

Full support for this closure has been obtained, however there are more than ten affected parties the closure is rated moderately significant, which requires Council approval to proceed with closure.

6.7.2 Recommendation

1. That the Committee approves closure of the stockwater race starting at PN 1801 on Wolseley Road, through 18 properties before ending at a junction at PN 16734 on Bakers Road, a total distance of 1,660.11 metres; and
2. That the closure to be effective immediately.

6.7.3 Background

In June 2015 a stockwater ranger identified a section of stockwater race for closure on Hardys Road.

Although the proposed section of water race to be closed is 1,660.11 metres, the race passes through a total of 18 properties and is therefore classified as ‘moderately significant’ in the Stock water guidelines.

In 2016 a survey was undertaken to determine from the affected property owners how often the race is used and the survey indicated that the majority of the property owners wanted the race closed. 15 of the property owners at that time completed and signed Affected Parties Written Consent forms.

Since the survey was undertaken, Council’s Three Waters Engineer, Matthew Glennon has undertaken individual site visits with all the affected property owners on Hardys Road as part of the more significant Rakaia Barrhill race closure consultation. The site visits included discussions on the use and requirement of the race along with ascertaining and confirming what alternative supplies, if any were available for the individual properties.

In early 2017 Council Stockwater Ranger Dean McDougall went back the three property owners who previously had not signed the Affected Party Written Consent forms. These three property owners have since provided signed forms agreeing to the race closure.

The water ranger has confirmed the exact location of the race and identified all the affected parties. All eighteen property owners have now signed affected parties forms.
6.7.4 Options and Risks Considered
The following options are available:

**Option One** – Retain stockwater race
The race will remain open.

*Risks*
- Council will be obligated to maintain a service for these races and property owners will be required to continue ongoing maintenance when all of the property owners wish to close the race.

**Option Two** – Close the stockwater race
The race will be closed. As the use of the race is clearly quite limited and only minor capital works are required to give effect the closure, it is proposed that closure be made effective immediately.

*Risks*
- There are no risks associated with the closure of this section of race.

The recommended option is **Option Two**. This option is consistent with Council closure policy and desire to rationalise the stockwater network.

6.7.5 Statutory Implications
The recommendation in this report is consistent with LGA requirements and the Stockwater Race Closures Guidelines & Policy Documents.

6.7.6 Significance and Engagement
All 18 property owners in the proposed closure area have been consulted with by both the Three Waters Engineer and the Water Ranger.
All 18 property owners have signed an Affected Party Consent Form for the closure to proceed.

6.7.7 Financial Implications
There are no financial implications to this closure. The water ranger can give effect to the race closure by no longer directing water down this particular section of the race system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PREPARED BY</th>
<th>APPROVED BY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAVID ASKIN</td>
<td>NEIL McCANN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Spaces Manager</td>
<td>Service Delivery Group Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7 Activity Reports

7.1 Library

7.1.1 Community Events in Library
The Ashburton Embroiderer’s Guild held a live display during the first week of May, with members bringing their embroidery work into the library and spending several hours a day working on their creations, and chatting to members of the public. This was very successful, with many people stopping to admire the variety of beautiful projects.

On the evening of Wednesday 10 May a “Free Taster” class on learning sign language was held in the library by local tutor Carol Smith. This event was to mark Deaf Aotearoa’s New Zealand Sign Language Week, 8 to 14 May. Sign Language is one of New Zealand’s official languages, and this event was one of many around the country to raise awareness of deafness, its language and culture.

Ten people attended the session, who had varying levels of sign language proficiency. Those who already had some knowledge helped the beginners to learn the sign alphabet and to carry out a simple conversation.

Displays by local organisations were also held in the library during May to celebrate Hospice NZ, World Smokefree Day, and NZ Music Month.

7.1.2 Children’s Library
The Brick Building event held during the school holidays was well attended, with 100 children coming along during the morning. They moved between the different sorts of bricks, and produced some original ideas and designs. Sometimes the simplest activities are the best, and this one is certainly worth repeating.

7.2 Ashburton Museum
The exhibition curated by staff, Far From You: Wartime Thoughts of Home, has been very popular. There are now several hundred poppies made by visitors and placed beneath and alongside photographs of local soldiers. The exhibition generated several positive news stories around ANZAC month, and was front page news for both the Ashburton Courier and Ashburton Guardian newspapers. Organised visits by Park Street Day Care, German exchange students, school groups and family members of soldiers added to the success. Over 100 service men and women from Ashburton are featured.

The formal education programme has been busy, with classes visiting for curriculum linked learning. We are still awaiting the outcome of an application for external funding in the hope of continuing Heritage Education Service provision, which remains under threat due to Ministry of Education funding reducing from $80,000pa to $50,000pa for the next three years. To continue providing this service, additional funding will be required.

The museum is hosting a Cross Cultural Workshop on 30 May from 10am to 12:30pm, in conjunction with Volunteering Mid & South Canterbury, and the Mid Canterbury Newcomers Network. This is specifically designed for volunteers and volunteer managers to encourage peer-to-peer learning and support. Because the purpose is for volunteers only we have had to turn away several organisations who asked to have their salaried staff/members attend. Their requests identified a local service gap which the Newcomers Network will be filling by working with non-voluntary organisations.
Congratulations goes to the Ashburton Museum Volunteer Team who won the 2017 Trustpower Community Award, Heritage and Environment category. Volunteers have been very proud of their success, and the framed certificate is now displayed at the museum front desk.

### 7.3 EA Networks Centre

Replacement lifeguards have been employed, trained and are now on deck.

Mid Canterbury Netball held a national Beko Netball League match in the stadium on Sunday 14 May with over 200 people attending.

The Ashburton swim team held a swim meet on 20 and 21 May with swimmers attending from all over Canterbury. Learn to Swim enrolments are continuing to track high, with enquiries still coming in on a daily basis.

The aquatic centre has been busy with a number of schools holding their swimming lessons. General membership numbers across the board remain strong and steady with consistent enquiries each day. Overall the facility is going very well and with the netball season in full swing the stadium is very busy. A Filipino group is holding a games weekend over the Queen’s Birthday weekend, and they are expecting approximately 700 people to attend.

The women’s only nights have not taken off as well as had been hoped so for now no further sessions have been planned. This however will be reviewed at a later date should interest rise again.

### 7.4 Open Spaces

#### 7.4.1 Landscaping and Beautification

Staff were kept busy preparing for ANZAC Day and the Biennial New Zealand Community Boards Conference in Methven.

Fifteen thousand daffodil bulbs have been planted in Smallbone Drive Reserve.

The autumn planting for the spring bedding displays is just about completed.

A number of trees have been planted at Argyle Park and street trees were planted in the grass berm on Middle Road between Allen’s Road and the entrance into Argyle Park.

#### 7.4.2 Public Conveniences

Work has begun on the upgrade of the Alford Forest toilets.

### 7.5 Stockwater

#### 7.5.1 Stockwater Working Group

A meeting of the Working Group was held on 4 May. Councillors Wilson (Chair), Brown, Ellis, Malcolm, Price, Rawlinson, Reveley and Bell attended.

Officers provided additional information on the Rakaia Barrhill stockwater race closure following the 20 April Service Delivery Committee meeting where a recommendation to not progress the closure was considered.

The Committee resolved:

“*That the matter under discussion be referred to the Stockwater working group and reported back to the Committee on 1 June 2017.*“
Following discussion on the additional information received, the group members agreed that the recommendation to not progress the Rakaia Barrhill stockwater race closure would return to the Service Delivery Committee on 1 June for re-consideration. The group members acknowledged that there may be future requests received for partial closures on this race.

Recommendation to Service Delivery Committee to resolve not to progress the remainder of the Rakaia Barrhill race closure, but to consider any potential future closures of parts of the Rakaia Barrhill stockwater race on a case-by-case basis.

7.6 Solid Waste

7.6.1 Ashburton Resource Recovery Park

All road work in the park has now been completed, including the road marking which sees a slightly different layout. It now has two entranceways - Gate 1 for access to the re-use shop and Gate 2 allowing direct access to the weighbridge and the recycle area. This has been implemented to help reduce traffic flow past the front of the re-use shop.

The new security fencing around the site has been completed and along with this, the new dog exercise area is now open to the public.

Stabilisation planting has begun along the riverside slope of the old landfill.

7.6.2 Rakaia Weighbridge

This contract was awarded to Higgins Contractors Limited on 18 May. Work commenced on 25 May and is expected to be completed in the current financial year.

7.6.3 Waste Levy

Transwaste Canterbury have increased the 2017-2018 waste levy by $1.01 per tonne, however they have reduced the transport charge from $961.52 to $947.10, resulting in a net reduction of 0.18% against the proposed budget of 2017-2018. Where future tonnage cannot be guaranteed the change is considered insignificant and there would be no benefit in proposing an alteration to the 2017-2018 budget.

7.7 3 Waters Capital Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contract SW AM – 10 Mill Creek Bank Stabilisation 14/15</td>
<td>This project is to improve the flow and the stability of the banks of Mill Creek.</td>
<td>This Contract has now been completed. Parks and Reserves will be undertaking the planting of the banks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashburton Relief Sewer / Ashburton River Crossing</td>
<td>This project is to construct a new trunk sewer main to address capacity issues in a key trunk sewer main known as the Ashburton Relief Sewer. Due to the dependency between the two pipelines, the scope of the original project has been widened to include the pipeline under the Ashburton River. This is the primary focus.</td>
<td>Opus have completed the preliminary design report for the Ashburton River crossing. This will be peer reviewed before proceeding.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This project is for the construction of the Wilkins Road sewer bypass and sewer renewals in Walnut Ave and Harrison Street.

The original sewer contract has been completed. Work is now progressing with the extended sewer up to Alison Street. The kerb and channel for the first block is being prepared for pouring. Unfortunately Chorus have not fulfilled their promise to have the poles removed. EA Networks have completed their undergrounding. We hope to have the road fully reinstated for the first block which will ease the congestion by the end of May. This contract is expected to be completed by the end of June.

This contract is substantially complete. There a few minor snags that will be completed by the end of May.

Work has recommenced after the setback with the pipe under the railway line. KiwiRail allowed us to excavate under the auxiliary rail lines and straighten the sleeve that had been forced off line by some large chunks of concrete. The pipe has now progressed through the roundabout and under the State Highway. The contract is expected to be completed by the middle of June.

This project involves the construction of new service mains in Northpark Rd (Bremners Rd to Taits Rd), Taits Rd (full length), and Glassworks Rd (Taits Rd to Company Rd).

The contractor (ACL) is completing preparations and is expected to start work shortly.

This project involved the extension of the Lake Hood wastewater rising main up to the screening facility at Wilkins Rd WWTP. The rising main previously discharged into the maturation pond at the site (bypassing key treatment steps).

This work is expected to commence soon and take around 10 days to complete.

## 7.8 Drinking Water

### 7.8.1 Water Safety Plans

Work is underway to improve our water safety plan (WSP) compliance. WSPs are being updated for the Hinds and Chertsey water supplies. A new WSP is being developed for the Dromore water supply. Officers are aiming to submit these three plans to Community & Public Health (CPH) by the end of May with a view to CPH approval by 30 June 2017.

Two other WSPs (Methven Springfield and Montalto water supplies) have been submitted to CPH previously but not yet approved. Officers are working through the issues raised by CPH to get those WSPs approved.
7.9 Wastewater

7.9.1 Ashburton Relief Sewer (ARS) / Ashburton River Crossing

The preliminary design report has been received. This has been reviewed by officers and the maintenance contractor (ACL) with comments provided back to the engineering service provider (Opus). Opus have now been instructed to proceed with detailed design. Preparations are underway for consultation with affected parties.

7.10 Stormwater

7.10.1 Ashburton – Carters Creek Stormwater Improvements

Some minor stormwater improvements are to be made to the stormwater sump structures discharging to Carters Creek in Tinwald. The existing structures do not operate as sumps and instead allow all stormwater sediments and trash to enter the waterway. As part of ongoing stormwater improvements, these have been identified for upgrading. The improvement work will include the construction of new sumps, complete with reusable trash bags within the sump, and new piping to the road culvert. At this point the work is limited to sumps in Grove St, Thomson Street, and McMurdo Street. Additional sites on Archibald Street and Melcombe Street may be added later.

The maintenance of the new sumps will be carried out by the maintenance contractor. For an initial period, at the time of cleaning, the contractor will be required to record details of the amount of material collected. This will enable maintenance requirements / frequencies to be confirmed. The information will also allow for a cost / benefit analysis to be carried out to support rollout to other sites.

7.11 Roading (Subsidised)

7.11.1 Maintenance and Renewal Contracts

All contract MSQA (Management, Supervision and Quality Assurance) is to be undertaken in-house.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C648 Foamed Bitumen Stabilisation – South Street</td>
<td>Pavement stabilisation of South Street.</td>
<td>ACL have completed the kerb and channel between SH1 and Chalmers Avenue. Fulton Hogan have completed the foam bitumen stabilisation of South Street between Chalmers Avenue and SH1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C636 Reseal and Pre-seal Repairs, Ashburton District 2015 - 16</td>
<td>Resurfacing of sealed network and sealing of vehicle access.</td>
<td>Contract let to Higgins Nelson. Contract has been substantially completed. Awaiting report from Opus on current position regarding remedial works to be completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C644 Resurfacing 2016/17</td>
<td>Resurfacing of selected sites on the sealed road network</td>
<td>Contract has been tendered and awarded to Fulton Hogan Timaru. Resurfacing is substantially complete. Fulton Hogan have small areas to complete where cars originally parked on street, road marking to be...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C645 Sealed Road Rehabilitation Rural West</td>
<td>Rehabilitation of sites on Thompsons Track and Pudding Hill Road. Contract extended to include Grahams Road Tinwald</td>
<td>Contract was tendered in October, and awarded early November to ACL. Thompsons Track site and Pudding Hill Road sites have been completed. Grahams Road rehabilitation is complete with shoulders to be levelled, topsoiled and grassed. Footpath construction to follow shoulder completion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C647 Sealed Road Rehabilitation Rural East</td>
<td>Rehabilitation of remaining sites for 2016/17. Sites are on: Beach Road East; Fairfield Road; Seafield Road.</td>
<td>Grant Hood Contracting has completed Fairfield Road and Seafield Road sites. Currently working on Beach Road East to complete contract works.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C651 South Street – AC Resurfacing</td>
<td>Resurfacing South Street from SH1 to Chalmers Avenue with intersection tie-ins.</td>
<td>Contract let to Fulton Hogan on 7 April. Resurfacing has been completed. Service covers to be lifted and levelled and road marking to be completed at the Chalmers Avenue end.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.11.2 EV Charging Stations

EA Networks are progressing the installation of three EV (electric vehicle) charging stations. One has been installed in the parking area on Rolleston Street at Rakaia, opposite Salmon Tales. One will be installed in the Methven Medical Centre parking area. The third one in the West Street carpark opposite the Z Service Station. Electric cable installation is currently underway. All areas will have surveillance cameras and will require minor adjustments to existing infrastructure as part of the installations.

7.11.3 One Network Road Classification (ONRC) Standard Reporting

Local authority road network managers received their first ONRC standard reports from NZTA and the Roading Efficiency Group (REG) on 5 May. These reports provide a snapshot of a network’s performance against a peer group for ten key ONRC performance measures. [Pages 42-53]

REG has produced these reports for several reasons:
- To give road managers a communication tool to engage their councils and CEOs
- To provide a standardised representation of the evidence base for Activity Management Plans and business cases
- To help local authority’s identify and illustrate their investment stories, which should be indicated in these standard reports

The reports are based on the ONRC Performance Measures Reporting Tool Information obtained from RAMM records and NZTA’s Transport Investment Online information that local authorities have provided.
Ashburton District Council ONRC Summary Report

The One Network Road Classification (ONRC) is a new system for measuring and classifying the condition on New Zealand’s roads.

The ONRC has been jointly developed by the New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA) and Local Government New Zealand (LGNZ) as a tool for moving to a consistent Level of Service experience by customers as they travel throughout the country.

The One Network Road classification (ONRC) divides New Zealand’s roads into categories:
- National – link major population centres and transport hubs
- Regional – major connectors between and within regions, often public transport routes
- Arterial – link regionally significant places and industries
- Primary Collector - link significant local populations and industries
- Secondary Collector – provide secondary routes, can be the only route to some places
- Access – small roads facilitating daily activities
- Access (Low Volume)
- Please note: categories are not shown if there are no road sections in that category on the network.

For the following measures, comparisons have been made within peer groups. Ashburton District Council is compared with councils from the Rural Districts peer group. This peer group contained Carterton District Council, Central Hawke’s Bay District Council, Central Otago District Council, Clutha District Council, Far North District Council, Gore District Council, Hurunui District Council, Kaipara, Mackenzie District Council, Manawatu District Council, Otorohanga District Council, Rangitikei District Council, Ruapehu District Council, Selwyn DC, South Taranaki District Council, South Wairarapa District Council, Southland District Council, Stratford District Council, Tararua District Council, Waikato District Council, Waikato District Council, Wairarapa District Council.
Network Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ONRC Category</th>
<th>Urban (Km)</th>
<th>Rural (Km)</th>
<th>TOTAL LENGTH (Km)</th>
<th>Urban Journeys</th>
<th>Rural Journeys</th>
<th>ANNUAL TOTAL JOURNEYS TRAVELLED (M Veh Km)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arterial</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Collector</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Collector</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>873</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Volume</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>957</td>
<td>1,011</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL NETWORK</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>2,423</td>
<td>2,624</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Network Statistics for network length (km) and journeys travelled (Million vehicle km) by ONRC Class - Sourced from ONRC performance measures reporting tool

Figure 1: Network Percentage Length and Journeys Travelled - Sourced from ONRC performance measures reporting tool

What am I looking for? The data details the road network length and number of journeys by ONRC category. Journeys travelled are measured by multiplying the volume of traffic on a road by its length. This shows where most customer journeys are made. Primary collector routes make up only 6% of the network by length but carry 30% of the amount of travel undertaken in the district due to the higher traffic volumes.
Safety

Customer Outcome 1: number of serious injuries and fatalities (DSI)

Key Questions: Are my injury numbers trending up or down or trending differently within any classification?

![Graph showing Customer Outcome 1: number of serious injuries and fatalities (DSI)]

Figure 3: Serious injuries and fatalities (DSI) by ONRC category - Sourced from ONRC performance measures reporting tool
Customer Outcome 2: collective risk (serious injuries and fatalities (DSI) per km of road)

Collective Risk is a measure of the total number of Serious injuries and fatalities (DSI) per km over a section of road. Personal Risk is a measure of the danger to each individual using the road being assessed. These risk ratings were devised by the New Zealand Road Assessment Programme (KiwiRAP – a partnership between the Automobile Association, NZ Transport Agency, Ministry of Transport, ACC and NZ Police.)

Key Question: Are my collective risk ratings at the low end or high end? How does my network compare with my peers, my region and nationally?

Figure 4: Serious injuries and fatalities (DSI) per km of road by ONRC category (low/medium ratings per KiwiRAP) - Sourced from ONRC performance measures reporting tool.
Key Question: Are my personal risk ratings at the low end or high end? How does my network compare with my peers, my region and nationally?

Figure 5: Serious injuries and fatalities (DSI) per 100 Million vehicle km by ONRC category (Low/medium/high ratings per KiwiRAP) - Sourced from ONRC performance measures reporting tool.
Amenity

Amenity Customer Outcome 1 - Smooth Travel Exposure (STE)

Key Question: How does my network compare nationally and against my peer group?

Figure 6: Smooth Travel Exposure by ONRC category (Higher percentage indicates smoother roads) - Sourced from ONRC performance measures reporting tool
**Amenity Customer Outcome 2 - Peak Roughness**

**Key Question:** How does my network compare nationally and against my peer group?

**Figure 7:** Peak Roughness - Urban - Sourced from ONRC performance measures reporting tool
Cost Efficiency

Percentage of network surfacing renewed annually

Key Question: How much of my sealed network am I renewing each year in comparison with others?

Figure 9: Annual surfacing renewal & pavement renewal percentage - Sourced from NZ Transport Agency TIO annual achievement figures
Cost Efficiency 2 & 3 - Sealed road maintenance

Key Question: How does the cost of maintaining my sealed road network compare to others?

5 year average annual work category costs per sealed network kilometre

Figure 10: Sealed road maintenance costs per kilometre - Sourced from NZ Transport Agency TIO Work Category funding reports
Cost Efficiency 4 - Unsealed road maintenance

Key Question: How does the cost of maintaining my unsealed road network compare to others?

5 year average annual costs per unsealed network kilometre

Figure 11: Unsealed road maintenance costs per kilometre - Sourced from NZ Transport Agency T1O Work Category funding reports
Cost Efficiency EEM5 - Overall Network Cost (Excluding Emergency Works)

Key Question: How does the Overall network cost compare to others?

Figure 12: Overall network cost (excluding emergency works) per kilometre - Sourced from NZ Transport Agency T&O Work Category funding reports
7.12 Roading (Unsubsidised)

7.12.1 Unsubsidised Roading Projects

The following projects are being undertaken using the LTP’s $650,000 unsubsidised annual road budget plus carry forward monies unspent during 2015/16:

- Forming of a section of Hendersons Road as an unsealed road between Winslow and Tinwald. This work has been completed.

- C650 Ealing Montalto Road – Sealed Road Rehabilitation. 8.2km to be widened from a 4.5m to a 6.6m carriageway with full pavement strengthening. Expected cost around $1.2m. Contract awarded to Fulton Hogan and they have commenced work. To date 2.5km have been reconstructed and sealed. Two Fulton Hogan gangs are now on site with a Timaru crew starting from the far end. A further 1.2km should be ready to seal by 23 May. Expected completion is in June but final sealing will depend on weather.

7.12.2 Grading

Fulton Hogan’s progress for year two of Contract C640 with grading of unsealed roads.

Up to 15 May 45% of the total years grading has been completed. The year in question is from December 2017 until November 2018. This equates to 45% completed in 45.8% of the available year.

7.13 Footpaths

7.13.1 Ashburton Township

Briscoes is presently seeking quotations for the reconstruction of the footpath for the loading zone on Cass Street, which was approved at the April Service Delivery Committee meeting.

A request for additional bus stop parking has been received from the I-Site manager. Officers are assessing this request and will report on this at the July Committee meeting.

7.13.2 Renewal Contracts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C649 Footpath and kerb &amp; channel renewals, 2016-17</td>
<td>Resurfacing of footpaths and replacing k&amp;c at various sites.</td>
<td>The sealing of footpaths under C642 was completed in the 2015/16 year with the grassing of berms held over and completed September/October 2016. The 2016/17 programme of work has been finalised. Contract tendered and awarded to ACL on March 17. Works to be completed by 30 June.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.14 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>C651</td>
<td>South Street – AC Resurfacing</td>
<td>Fulton Hogan</td>
<td>7/4/17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$467,245.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$262,894.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR-AU 17/11</td>
<td>Rakaia Resource Recovery Park weighbridge</td>
<td>Higgins Contractors Ltd</td>
<td>18/5/2017</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$125,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$145,083.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.15 Upcoming Tenders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tender/contract</th>
<th>Tenders called for in:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RR-BA 17/18 - Ashburton District Waste &amp; Water Sustainability Education Services</td>
<td>May 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.16 Vandalism

Vandalism reported for the month of April:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Total cost April</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Road signs</td>
<td>$783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous public toilet repairs, litter bin fires etc</td>
<td>$850</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.17 Methven Community Board

The Methven Community Board met on 22 May 2017. Minutes of the meeting will be circulated with the Committee agenda.

NEIL McCANN  
Group Manager Service Delivery
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>Biodiversity, Community Road Reference (Rural and Urban Areas), Stockwater and Wastewater.</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>Twelve Councillors and Mayor (ex officio)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quorum</td>
<td>Seven</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Delegations             | Council delegates to the Service Delivery Committee all of the duties and decision-making powers within the following areas of responsibility:  
  - Amenity provision including:  
    - Cemeteries  
    - Conservation works  
    - Public conveniences  
    - Public swimming pools  
    - Walkways  
    - Cycleways  
    - 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  
    - EA Networks Centre |
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 2.3 and 2.4 of this Delegations Manual.

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