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**Strategic Framework**

The Council’s Vision – Christchurch is a city of opportunity for all.
Open to new ideas, new people and new ways of doing things – a city where anything is possible.

**Whiria ngā whenu o ngā papa**
**Honoa ki te mauau tāukiuki**

Bind together the strands of each mat
And join together with the seams of respect and reciprocity.

The partnership with Papatipu Rūnanga reflects mutual understanding and respect, and a goal of improving the economic, cultural, environmental and social wellbeing for all.

**Overarching Principle**
Partnership – Our people are our taonga – to be treasured and encouraged. By working together we can create a city that uses their skill and talent, where we can all participate, and be valued.

**Supporting Principles**
- Accountability
- Agility
- Equity
- Innovation
- Prudent Financial Management
- Stewardship
- Trust
- Wellbeing and resilience

**Community Outcomes**
What we want to achieve together as our city evolves

**Strong communities**
- Strong sense of community
- Active participation in civic life
- Safe and healthy communities
- Celebration of our identity through arts, culture, heritage and sport
- Valuing the voices of children and young people

**Liveable city**
- Vibrant and thriving central city, suburban and rural centres
- A well connected and accessible city
- Sufficient supply of, and access to, a range of housing
- 21st century garden city we are proud to live in

**Healthy environment**
- Healthy waterways
- High quality drinking water
- Unique landscapes and indigenous biodiversity are valued
- Sustainable use of resources

**Prosperous economy**
- Great place for people, business and investment
- An inclusive, equitable economy with broad-based prosperity for all
- A productive, adaptive and resilient economic base
- Modern and robust city infrastructure and community facilities

**Strategic Priorities**
Our focus for improvement over the next three years and beyond

- Enabling active citizenship and connected communities
- Maximising opportunities to develop a vibrant, prosperous and sustainable 21st century city
- Informed and proactive approaches to natural hazard risks
- Increasing active, public and shared transport opportunities and use
- Safe and sustainable water supply and improved waterways
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1. Apologies
   At the close of the agenda no apologies had been received.

2. Declarations of Interest
   Members are reminded of the need to be vigilant and to stand aside from decision making when a conflict arises between their role as an elected representative and any private or other external interest they might have.

3. Confirmation of Previous Minutes
   That the minutes of the Waitai/Coastal-Burwood Community Board meeting held on Monday, 4 February 2019 be confirmed (refer page 5).

4. Public Forum
   There will be no public forum at this meeting

5. Deputations by Appointment
   Deputations may be heard on a matter or matters covered by a report on this agenda and approved by the Chairperson.

   5.1 Aileen Trist, resident of Parklands will speak to her correspondence at item 7 regarding Taiora QEII

   5.2 Evan Smith, Spokesperson for the Avon-Ōtākaro Network, will speak to the Travis Road & Bower Avenue 40km/hr Variable Speed Limit (School Speed Zone) and Frosts Road Permanent Speed Limit Change report at item 7

   5.3 Monica Davis will speak on behalf of Avonside Girls High School regarding the Travis Road and Bower Avenue School Speed Zone and Frost Road speed limit change report 7 on the agenda.

6. Presentation of Petitions
   There were no petitions received at the time the agenda was prepared.
Waitai
Coastal-Burwood Community Board
OPEN MINUTES

Date: Monday 4 February 2019
Time: 4.30pm
Venue: Boardroom, Corner Beresford and Union Streets, New Brighton

Present
Chairperson: Kim Money
Deputy Chairperson: Tim Sintes
Members: Tim Baker, David East, Glenn Livingstone, Linda Stewart

Jo Wells
Manager Community Governance, Coastal-Burwood
941 6451
jo.wells@ccc.govt.nz
www.ccc.govt.nz

To view copies of Agendas and Minutes, visit:
www.ccc.govt.nz/the-council/meetings-agendas-and-minutes/
The agenda was dealt with in the following order.

1. **Apologies**
   
   Part C
   
   Community Board Resolved CBCB/2019/00001
   
   **Community Board Decision**
   
   That the apology for lateness from David East, be accepted.
   
   Glenn Livingstone/Tim Sintes
   
   Carried

2. **Declarations of Interest**
   
   Part B
   
   There were no declarations of interest recorded.

3. **Confirmation of Previous Minutes**
   
   Part C
   
   Community Board Resolved CBCB/2019/00002
   
   **Community Board Decision**
   
   That the minutes of the Waitai/Coastal-Burwood Community Board meeting held on Monday, 3 December 2018, along with the Public Excluded minutes from the 3 December 2018 be confirmed.
   
   Tim Baker/Linda Stewart
   
   Carried

4. **Public Forum**
   
   Part B
   
   4.1 **Spencerville Residents Association**
   
   Denis Gilmore and Rene Howison, representing Spencerville Residents Association spoke to their concerns about a proposed subdivision on Spencerville Road, including water quality and flooding.

   4.2 **Christchurch Beautifying Association**
   
   Ron Andrew from the Christchurch Beautifying Association spoke to the Board on the projects and work that the Christchurch Beautifying Association do such as the Street/Garden and Community Pride awards.

   4.3 **South Brighton Residents Association**
   
   Hugo Kristinsson from the South Brighton Residents Association, spoke to the board about Coastal Futures.
5. Deputations by Appointment

Part B

5.1 Christchurch Beautifying Association

Ron Andrew on behalf of Christchurch Beautifying Association spoke to his correspondence (item 7 refers) on the Street/Garden and Community Pride Awards.

The Association expressed their commitment to working with the Board in a positive partnership relationship, and their hopes of holding an awards ceremony within the Coastal-Burwood ward in 2019.

The Chairperson thanked Ron Andrew for his deputation.

5.2 Spencerville Residents Association

Denis Gilmore and Rene Howison of the Spencerville Residents Association, spoke regarding their Association’s correspondence (item 7 refers). They expressed concerns around the private gate entrances within the community centre carpark and the timeframe in which the sealing of the carpark has been allocated. The association also displayed photographs showing the condition of the playground on Seabrooke Drive, Spencerville.

The Chairperson thanked Denis Gilmore and Rene Howison for their deputation.

5.3 East Christchurch Shirley Cricket Club

Angus McLeod and Nicola Smith spoke on behalf of East Christchurch Shirley Cricket Club in support of the Burwood Park Junior Cricket Wicket report (item 8 refers). They advised of the fundraising the club had undertaken to ensure the future of cricket in the area.

In response to a question from the Board, they advised the preferred site, while being adjacent to the senior cricket wickets, provides a necessary separation for the juniors and allows for a concrete wicket to be installed. They have no other preferred site.

The Chairperson thanked Angus McLeod and Nicola Smith for their deputation.

6. Presentation of Petitions

Part B

There was no presentation of petitions.

7. Correspondence

Staff Recommendations

That the Coastal-Burwood Community Board:

1. Receive the information in the correspondence report dated 04 February 2019

Community Board Resolved CBCB/2019/00003
Part B

That the Coastal-Burwood Community Board:

1. Receive the information in the correspondence report dated 04 February 2019
2. In relation to Mr Smith’s correspondence, requests staff consider undertaking any necessary maintenance works including filling and seeding any areas in Ironwood Reserve to make it safe for play
3. Request that staff provide advice regarding the request from the Christchurch Beautifying Association to hold Garden Pride Awards in the ward in 2019
4. Request that staff follow up on the issues raised by the Spencerville Residents’ Association in their correspondence
5. Request staff to thank Isobelle Doig for her feedback and advise that the issue of the Shaw Avenue public toilets will be considered by staff and we will inform her as soon as possible
6. Notes that the request from Sam Hawkins of the South Brighton Holiday Park has been actioned with the removal of the identified unsafe trees in South Brighton Domain

Linda Stewart left the meeting at 5:42 p.m.

Kim Money/Tim Sintes  Carried

8. Burwood Park Junior Cricket Wicket

Community Board Resolved CBCB/2019/00004 (Original staff recommendation accepted without change)

Part C

That the Waitai/Coastal-Burwood Community Board:

1. Approve East Shirley Cricket Club’s development of a junior cricket pitch on the site of the former bowls club in Burwood Park

Tim Baker/Tim Sintes  Carried

9. Queenspark Reserve - Lighting application from Parklands Rugby Football Club Incorporated

Community Board Resolved CBCB/2019/00005 (Original staff recommendation accepted without change)

Part C

3.1 That the Waitai/Coastal-Burwood Community Board recommend that the Head of Parks approve:

3.1.1 The installation of two new sportsfield lighting poles on Queenspark Reserve, as shown in Attachment A, by Parklands Rugby Football Club Inc. subject to the conditions in clause 3.1.3.

3.1.2 The upgrading of two existing sportsfield lighting poles on the section of Queenspark Reserve that is managed by Christchurch City Council, but owned by the Ministry of Education, as shown in Attachment A, by Parklands Rugby Football Club Incorporated,
subject to the conditions in clause 3.1.3, and final approval from the Ministry of Education.

3.1.3 Approval of the lighting is subject to the following conditions:

- The applicant obtaining any necessary resource consents and building consent at their cost before commencing installation of the lighting system on the park.

- The applicant being responsible for ensuring that they or the contractors they engage are responsible for obtaining plans of all services presently laid underground in the park (including electricity, telecommunications, sewerage, stormwater, high water, water supply and irrigation).

- The applicant being required to deposit scaled plans showing the lighting poles and cable layout in the park, as built, within two months of the work being completed.

- The applicant being responsible for all costs associated with the installation, maintenance, and insurance, of the lighting system.

- The applicant being responsible for ensuring that the lighting system is maintained in a safe and tidy condition at all times.

- That the lights are operated on a maximum of four nights per week (Monday to Thursday) from April to September.

- That the lights are not operated after 8.30pm and an automatic cut-off switch is installed to this effect.

- The applicant is to pay a bond of $2000 to the council via the Parks Advisor, Parks Sector North, before any construction work commences on the site. The bond, less any expenses incurred by the Council, will be refunded to the payee on completion of the development to a standard acceptable to the Head of Parks or their designate.

- This approval will lapse if the development is not completed within two years of the date of the letter of approval from the Head of Parks.

Tim Baker/Kim Money

Linda Stewart returned to the meeting at 6:01 p.m..

10. Waitai/Coastal-Burwood Community Board Area Report - February 2019

Staff Recommendations

That the Waitai/Coastal-Burwood Community Board:


2. Note for information purposes the Board’s feedback to the Council on the Ōtākaro - Avon River Corridor Draft Regeneration Plan.

3. Consider member attendance to the Community Boards Conference 2019 being held in New Plymouth, including an entry for the Best Practice Excellence Awards being held as part of the conference.

4. Amend the 2019 Board meeting schedule to replace the approved 15 July 2019 Board meeting with 22 July 2019 in order to avoid meeting during the Council’s recess week.

5. Provide a letter of support to Environment Canterbury for the Riverside Festival event being held between 1pm – 4pm on either 24 or 31 March 2019.
Community Board Resolved CBCB/2019/00006

Part B

That the Waitai/Coastal-Burwood Community Board:

2. Note for information purposes the Board’s feedback to the Council on the Ōtākaro -Avon River Corridor Draft Regeneration Plan.
3. Consider and advise staff of interest in attending the Community Boards Conference 2019 being held in New Plymouth, including an entry for the Best Practice Excellence Awards being held as part of the conference.
4. Amend the 2019 Board meeting schedule to replace the approved 15 July 2019 Board meeting with 22 July 2019 in order to avoid meeting during the Council’s recess week.
5. Provide a letter of support to Environment Canterbury for the Riverside Festival event being held between 1pm – 4pm on either 24 or 31 March 2019.
6. Request staff to review the Dog signage at Waimairi, North Beach and Brighton to assess if the size and placement is appropriate.
7. Request staff to provide a briefing to the Board on dog control matters in the Board’s area.
8. Provide a letter of thanks to Grace Vineyard Church for their contribution towards the cost and hanging of festive decorations on the New Brighton Clock tower.

Kim Money/Tim Sintes

Glenn Livingstone left the meeting at 06:30 p.m.

11. Elected Members’ Information Exchange

Part B

11.1 The Board requested staff to follow up on Hawke Street public carpark condition concerns.
11.2 Staff undertook to seek advice on the process for proposed art work on the new Thomson Park toilets.

Meeting concluded at 6.53pm

CONFIRMED THIS 18th DAY OF February 2019
7. Correspondence

Reference: 19/127985
Presenter(s): Peter Croucher, Board Advisor

1. Purpose of Report
Correspondence has been received from:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aileen Trist, Parklands Resident</td>
<td>Taiora QEIId</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen Rhodes</td>
<td>Parking Wattle Drive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Staff Recommendations
That the Coastal-Burwood Community Board:

1. Receive the information in the correspondence report dated 18 February 2019

Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Coastal-Burwood Community Board - 18 Feb 2019 - Inwards Correspondence – Aileen Trist, resident of Parklands - Taiora QEIId</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Coastal-Burwood Community Board 18- Inwards Correspondence – Helen Rhodes Parking Wattle Drive</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From Aileen Trist Parklands

Earlier this week, I was at the QE2 pool attending a hydrotherapy pool exercise class for people with health issues and disabilities with movement etc. This pool is positioned next to the spa pool down the far end of the pool complex. Attendees to this class who have had strokes or problems with mobility along with those who have weak bladder/bowels have a long way to walk to use the existing toilets in the complex. I suggest the Council do away with the inside planting area down that end and put in a couple of toilets for easy access for these people to use. Having read that QE2 pool has had the highest numbers of ‘code browns’, I could see why.
From Helen Rhodes

I am a home owner in New Brighton. Recently there has been a huge increase in the trade workers parking outside and along the street. This has got to the point that we have nowhere to park outside our house ourselves. My issue with this is that I drive special need children to school and back and require a park outside my house for my work van. It is also very difficult to manoeuvre down the road due to vans being parked either side. This has turned the Travis Road end of Wattle Drive into a one way street.

I have contacted the Christchurch City Council and had a talk with one of the senior traffic control officers. He very nicely said there is nothing he will do. I have also contacted Southbase Construction. To date they have not returned my inquiry.

The real problem here is that there has been no provision made for in increase in vehicles requiring parking in the area due to construction of the new school on Travis Road.

A little forethought and consideration for the local community would have been appreciated. The impact is causing stress and ill will.

There are a number of areas they could have been used for bulk parking, even the trades people I have talked to agree. To minimise the impact on the local community Southbase could perhaps have had the forethought to arrange for parking for the many vehicles now invading our street daily.

I realise there is most likely nothing you can do either, however I would like you to be aware of the situation for future construction sites.

It just seems to be no though put into the impact on us locals.

Thank you
Kind regards

Helen Rhodes
8. Travis Road & Bower Avenue 40km/hr Variable Speed Limit (School Speed Zone) and Frosts Road Permanent Speed Limit Change

Reference: 19/88882
Presenter(s): Wayne Gallot (Traffic Engineer) & Tessa Zant (Senior Engagement Advisor)

1. Purpose and Origin of Report

Purpose of Report

1.1 The purpose of this report is for the Coastal-Burwood Community Board to endorse the installation of two new 40 km/h variable speed limit (school speed zone) on Travis Road and Bower Avenue, and the setting of a permanent 50 km/h speed limit on Frosts Road.

Origin of Report

1.2 This report is staff generated in response to formal requests received from Avonside Girls High School (AGHS) and Shirley Boys High School (SBHS) to have the school speed zones installed on Travis Road and Bower Avenue. The proposed 50 km/h permanent speed limit on Frosts Road is also in response to requests from AGHS, SBHS and community Police.

2. Significance

2.1 The decisions in this report are of low significance in relation to the Christchurch City Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.

2.1.1 The community engagement and consultation outlined in this report reflect the assessment.

3. Staff Recommendations

That the Waitai/Coastal-Burwood Community Board recommends that the Council:

1. Approve, pursuant to Part 4 Section 27 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017, and Land Transport Rule: Setting of Speed Limits 2017, that speed limits on Travis Road, Bower Avenue and Frosts Road be revoked and set as identified in Attachment A (HPRM 19/95764) and listed below in Clauses 1a – 1d including resultant changes made to the Christchurch City Council Register of Speed Limits and associated Speed Limit Maps;

a. Revoke the existing permanent speed limit of 70 kilometres per hour on Frosts Road, commencing at its intersection with Travis Road and extending in a northerly direction to a point 100 metres south of Beach Road.

b. Approve that the permanent speed limit on Frosts Road, commencing at its intersection with Travis Road and extending in a northerly direction to a point 100 metres south of Beach Road, be set at 50 kilometres per hour.

c. Approve that a 40 kilometres per hour variable speed limit (school speed zone) be set on Travis Road, commencing at a point 110 metres east of Frosts Road and extending in an easterly direction for a distance of 600 metres, as it meets the requirements of the New Zealand Gazette Notice (21/04/2011, Number 55, page 1284) including the times of operation.

d. Approve that a 40 kilometres per hour variable speed limit (school speed zone) be set on Bower Avenue, commencing at a point 100 metres north of Travis Road and extending in a northerly direction for a distance of 385 metres, as it meets the requirements of the
New Zealand Gazette Notice (21/04/2011, Number 55, page 1284) including the times of operation.

2. Approve the speed limit changes listed in Clauses 1a – 1d above come into force following the date of Council approval, installation of all required infrastructure (signage and/or markings) and removal of obsolete infrastructure (as indicated in Attachment A), and the required notice being provided to NZTA and NZ Police in accordance with Section 2.7(6) of Land Transport Rule: Setting of Speed Limits 2017.

4. Key Points

4.1 This report does not support any specific levels of service identified in the Council’s Long Term Plan (2018 – 2028).

4.2 The following feasible options have been considered:

- Option 1 – Establish 40 km/h variable speed limits (school speed zones) on Travis Road and Bower Avenue, and reduce the permanent speed limit to 50 km/h on Frosts Road in accordance with Attachment A (preferred option)
- Option 2 – Do nothing

4.3 Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages (Preferred Option)

4.3.1 The advantages of this option include:

- The proposed 50 km/h permanent speed limit on Frosts Road will help to reduce operational speeds, and therefore improve safety.
- The proposed 50 km/h permanent speed limit on Frosts Road will support the safe operation of a new signalised pedestrian crossing proposed by NZTA.
- The proposed 50 km/h permanent speed limit on Frosts Road provides increased consistency with existing speed limits on Travis Road, Beach Road and Mairehau Road, and therefore helps to improve credibility of speed limits locally and nationally.
- The proposed 40 km/h variable speed limit (school speed zones) on Travis Road and Bower Avenue will reduce operational speeds on these roads, and therefore improve safety, during peak school travel times.
- The electronic speed zone signs enhance driver awareness of the likely presence of children.

4.3.2 The disadvantages of this option include:

- Increased amount of signage on Travis Road and Bower Avenue, as well as side roads, within the proposed school speed zones.

5. Context/Background

Context

5.1 New school facilities are currently being built for Avonside Girls High School (AGHS) and Shirley Boys High School (SBHS) on land that was formally part of QE II Park. The new schools will become operational at the beginning of the second term of this year (29 April 2019).

5.2 The new schools have direct frontage to both Travis Road and Bower Avenue. Increased numbers of all road users (including vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians) associated with the new schools are anticipated on Travis Road, Bower Avenue and Frosts Road.
Background

5.3 During the consenting processes to establish the new schools on the QE II Park site, Council staff worked closely with external agencies including the Ministry of Education (MoE) and the New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA) to identify and consider transport infrastructure changes that would be necessary to support development of the schools whilst minimising impacts on transport level of service. Part of that process, and Council staff participation, included an NZTA-led “Safer Journeys to School” working group.

5.4 In addition to a number of road layout improvements for Travis Road and Bower Avenue that were identified through that process (and have now largely been completed), Council committed to consider the installation of a school speed zone on Travis Road that was to be fully funded by MoE. To that end, MoE has provided Council a financial contribution of $55,000 to cover the costs of a school speed zone on Travis Road.

5.5 In response to concerns raised about pedestrian safety crossing Frosts Road, Council staff have been working with NZTA to develop an NZTA proposal for a signalised pedestrian crossing north of the Anzac-Frosts-Travis roundabout. That project is being funded and progressed by NZTA, separate to this Council proposal for the school speed zones and the Frosts Road speed limit change.

5.6 Council also has an ongoing commitment to improve road safety. Reducing excessive vehicle speeds, where appropriate, outside schools during peak arrival and departure periods improves safety for children. Council has a programme of installing 40 km/h variable speed limits (school speed zones) outside schools according to a prioritisation process. This process, including the methodology behind it, was endorsed on 25 August 2011 by the Council as the most appropriate method of improving road safety outside certain schools, where no other traffic control devices are practical or feasible.

5.7 Council staff have continued a close working relationship with AGHS and SBHS following the consenting process, to identify and consider various transport safety and travel planning matters. Local community Police have also been involved in that process, which led to formal requests being received by Council for the installation of school speed zones on Travis Road and Bower Avenue as well as a request to consider a reduced speed limit on Frosts Road.

5.8 Prior to finalising the current proposal, technical advice and preliminary feedback was obtained from NZTA (in their regulatory capacity). The current proposal, including the school speed zone sign locations and also the reduced speed limit on Frosts Road, is supported by NZTA.
6. **Option 1 - Establish 40 km/h variable speed limits (school speed zones) on Travis Road and Bower Avenue, and reduce the permanent speed limit to 50 km/h on Frosts Road (preferred)**

**Option Description**

6.1 Install the 40 km/h variable speed limits (school speed zones) on Travis Road and Bower Avenue, and reduce the permanent speed limit on Frosts Road to 50 km/h, as shown in Attachment A.

6.2 Electronic signs are proposed to be installed at the start of each zone on the north side of Travis Road to the east of Frosts Road, on the south side of Travis Road to the west of Bower Avenue, on the west side of Bower Avenue to the north of Travis Road and on the east side of Bower Avenue to the north of Marriotts Road. Signs installed on the opposite side of the road, will advise road users that they are exiting the school speed zone. Signs identifying the start and end of the school speed zones will be installed on all side roads (Atlantis Street, Blue Gum Place, Wattle Drive, Saltaire Street, Marriotts Road and Ascot Avenue). Appropriate warning ‘children’ and ‘school’ signs will also be installed as required in accordance with legislative requirements and national guidelines. Localised footpath widening is proposed outside No.219/221 Bower Avenue to ensure that an adequate footpath width is maintained past the proposed electronic school speed zone sign in this location.

6.3 As required by the conditions listed in the New Zealand Gazette (see the Legal Implications Section below), the school speed zones will operate on school days for no more than 35 minutes in the morning, and 20 minutes in the afternoon. The proposed operating times will be aligned to the schools’ start and end times, once these are confirmed.

6.4 Existing signage on Frosts Road associated with the current 70 km/h speed limit will be removed, or possibly relabelled and repositioned to act as repeater (reminder) 50 km/h speed limit signage. Additional infrastructure (eg signage and markings) to support the reduced speed limit may be considered in future once the schools become operational.

**Significance**

6.5 The level of significance of this option is low consistent with Section 2 of this report.

**Impact on Mana Whenua**

6.6 This option does not involve a significant decision in relation to ancestral land or a body of water or other elements of intrinsic value, therefore this decision does not specifically impact Ngāi Tahu, their culture and traditions.

**Community Views and Preferences**

6.7 AGHS and SBHS communities and local residents are specifically affected by this option due to the improved safety provide by changes to the speed limits on neighbouring roads.

6.8 Consultation on the proposal ran from 20 December 2018 to 28 January 2019.

6.9 An email notification was sent to key and local stakeholders, residents of the affected roads were door knocked, and absentee owners were sent a letter. A message also went out in the QEII newsletter which has a reach of approx. 700.

**Consultation Feedback**

6.10 In total 47 submissions were received and most were in support. See Attachment B (19/101657) for a list of all submissions.

6.11 Of the 38 comments about the school speed zone, 35 were in support, one wanted a smaller zone, one was not in support and one was about an out of scope matter.

6.11.1 Of those in support of the School Speed Zone 15 wanted additional restrictions, such as a lower speed, permanent speed change, and extension of the School Speed Zone.
6.12 Of the 42 comments about the speed reduction on Frosts Road, 27 were in support, 13 were not in support and two commented about an out of scope matter.

6.12.1 Those opposed to the proposal mentioned the lack of driveways, wide cycleway / footpath, existing crossing points and pupils using other routes, as reasons to maintain the current 70kmph speed limit.

6.13 Feedback was received on a range of out of scope issues, including the intersection of Frosts and Travis Road and parking generated by the schools. A new crossing on Frosts road should address some of these concerns and parking around the schools will be monitored once they are operational.

Alignment with Council Plans and Policies
6.14 This option is consistent with Council’s Plans and Policies

Financial Implications
6.15 Cost of Implementation – approximately $80,000.
6.16 Maintenance / Ongoing Costs – covered under the area maintenance contract and effects will be minimal to the overall asset.
6.17 Funding source – allocated funding in the 2018/2019 Traffic Operations capital expenditure budget (including the $55,000 financial contribution received from MoE).

Legal Implications
6.18 Implementation of variable speed limit school speed zones, including installation of any associated signs and/or markings, must comply with Land Transport Rule: Setting of Speed Limits 2017, the New Zealand Gazette notice (21/04/2011, Number 55, page 1284) and NZTA Traffic Note 37 revision 2 (May 2011).
6.19 The interpretation Act 1999 provides for the New Gazette notice (21/04/2011, Number 55, page 128) and NZTA Traffic Note 37 to have continued effect, despite those documents being established under (and referring to) the now repealed Land Transport Rule: Setting of Speed Limits 2003.
6.21 In accordance with the Christchurch City Council Delegations Register, Council has not delegated its powers under the above legislative framework.
6.22 The installation of any signs and/or markings must also comply with Land Transport Rule: Traffic Control Devices 2004.

Risks and Mitigations
6.23 None identified.

Implementation
6.24 Implementation dependencies - dependant on Community Board endorsement and Council approval for eth proposed speed limit changes.
6.25 Implementation timeframe – Installed by 30 April 2019 (start of second school term)

Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages
6.26 The advantages of this option include:

- The proposed 50 km/h permanent speed limit on Frosts Road will help to reduce operational speeds, and therefore improve safety.
- The proposed 50 km/h permanent speed limit on Frosts Road will support the safe operation of a new signalised pedestrian crossing proposed by NZTA.
- The proposed 50 km/h permanent speed limit on Frosts Road provides increased consistency with existing speed limits on Travis Road, Beach Road and Mairehau Road, and therefore helps to improve credibility of speed limits locally and nationally.
- The proposed 40 km/h variable speed limit (school speed zones) on Travis Road and Bower Avenue will reduce operational speeds on these roads, and therefore improve safety, during peak school travel times.
- The electronic speed zone signs enhance driver awareness of the likely presence of children.

6.27 The disadvantages of this option include:
- Increased amount of signage on Travis Road and Bower Avenue, as well as side roads, within the proposed school speed zones.

7. **Option 2 – Do nothing**

**Option Description**
7.1 Retain existing 70 km/h speed limit on Frosts Road and do not install the proposed 40 km/h variable speed limit school speed zones on Travis Road or Bower Avenue.

**Significance**
7.2 The level of significance of this option is low consistent with Section 2 of this report.

**Impact on Mana Whenua**
7.3 This option does not involve a significant decision in relation to ancestral land or a body of water or other elements of intrinsic value, therefore this decision does not specifically impact Ngāi Tahu, their culture and traditions.

**Community Views and Preferences**
7.4 As a road safety project, this option was not consulted on. Refer to Section 6.7 for community views and preferences relating to the preferred option, which includes feedback that does not support the preferred option.

**Alignment with Council Plans and Policies**
7.5 This option is consistent with Council’s Plans and Policies.

**Financial Implications**
7.6 Cost of Implementation – cost of staff time investigating the proposal and preparing report.
7.7 Maintenance / Ongoing Costs – not applicable
7.8 Funding source – not applicable

**Legal Implications**
7.9 Not applicable.

**Risks and Mitigations**
7.10 None identified.

**Implementation**
7.11 Implementation dependencies - not applicable
7.12 Implementation timeframe – not applicable
Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages

7.13 The advantages of this option include:
- No additional cost to Council.

7.14 The disadvantages of this option include:
- It does not address the safety concerns and preferences of the schools, community and other stakeholders.

Attachments
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Confirmation of Statutory Compliance

Compliance with Statutory Decision-making Requirements (ss 76 - 81 Local Government Act 2002).
(a) This report contains:
(i) sufficient information about all reasonably practicable options identified and assessed in terms of their advantages and disadvantages; and
(ii) adequate consideration of the views and preferences of affected and interested persons bearing in mind any proposed or previous community engagement.
(b) The information reflects the level of significance of the matters covered by the report, as determined in accordance with the Council’s significance and engagement policy.
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Travis Road & Bower Avenue School Speed Zones (40km/hr Variable Speed Limit) and Frost's Road Permanent Speed Limit Change For Approval
### Submissions received on the QEII School Speed Zone and speed reduction on Frost Road

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub ID</th>
<th>Any comments on the school speed zones</th>
<th>Any comments on Frost Road speed reduction</th>
<th>Name or organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20650</td>
<td>Fine</td>
<td>I don't believe this is necessary and given there is no residential homes on that section of road the 70km/hr limit should remain. Make it 50 just before getting to the roundabout if required for a</td>
<td>Ben Robinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pedestrian crossing but not the whole section as that is unnecessary.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20651</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Frost Road/Travis Road roundabout is extremely dangerous for pedestrians to cross, as the bushes in the middle of the roundabout block pedestrians view of approaching cars. Once school pupils are crossing this intersection daily, a pedestrian only phase such as lights will be necessary to</td>
<td>Rosalin Stewart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>prevent serious accidents. There is insufficient time for pedestrians to cross safely as cars approach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>at speed off Anzac Drive. With the bushes so high they are obscured until the last minute.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20652</td>
<td></td>
<td>Support the speed reduction on Frost Road. Concerned about the current cycle paths requiring the crossing of multiple lanes on Frost Road full of motorists focused on entering and leaving the roundabout. Those cycling from Anzac Drive or Travis Rd toward Mairehau Rd past the</td>
<td>Emma Jamieson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Queenspark/Beach intersection are being directed by the cycle paths into an area on Mairehau Rd toward Burwood Hospital where there are many busy intersections and very little protection for cyclists (it consists of a white line) and little cycling space.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20655</td>
<td>Definitely need to reduce the speed limits on Travis, Bower Ave &amp; frost road with flashing speed signs and speed cameras</td>
<td>Down to 50 km/hr</td>
<td>Judith Keen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20657</td>
<td>School speed zones at areas of direct entry and exits. Including school bus areas. These are not primary school children.</td>
<td>There is no need for speed reduction on this stretch of road.</td>
<td>Gill Hubert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20658</td>
<td>Support this proposal.</td>
<td>This is a totally rural road i.e. no residential properties fronting onto this part of Frost Road. I see no need to or any benefit from reducing the current speed limit.</td>
<td>Anthony Fletane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20661</td>
<td>It's a school area so it should the same as all other school areas 40km</td>
<td>Reduced speed limits or speed bumps</td>
<td>Nicholas Lond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20663</td>
<td>Please make the speed zones as low as possible. I believe the school zone should begin 200 metres BEFORE the Travis Road roundabout (at Frost Road, Travis Road and Anzac Drive) NOT after, as there will be a large number of students coming from those streets. Because this roundabout is part of a ring-route and consistently travelled by large trucks at high speeds, it poses a huge danger to those students crossing/walking/biking here. The amount of traffic will increase dramatically when the schools start and if the zones are not made safe and someone is killed, it will be a tragedy that could have been easily prevented.</td>
<td>Vicki Edwards-Brown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The first half of Frost Road (coming from Travis Road) should be 40kms not 50kms (as above the school zone should begin 200 metres before Frost Road meets the Travis Road roundabout) because there will be children exiting straight on to Frost Road, then it can become 50kms as it leads into Mairehau Road.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20664</td>
<td></td>
<td>I support the permanent 50km an hour speeds down frost road. A lot of children will be coming to school via this way.</td>
<td>Annabelle Denniset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I also would have bought that the frost road roundabout would be changed into traffic lights. This is not a safe place to cross as an adult, I don't think kids will be able to do so that safely either. Please look into this</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20666</td>
<td>I agree with the proposed zones. The safety of the approx. 2000 students and other during school starting and finishing periods is paramount.</td>
<td>I agree with the reduction to 50kph. This is a main approach to the school zone and will likely have students biking along it to and from school.</td>
<td>Robert Jugovic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20667</td>
<td>Agree with this as long as the 40km is only during certain hours of the day. Completely disagree to slow down traffic for the whole day.</td>
<td>Disagree 100%. Reducing the speed limit here will cause frustration for drivers who are used to that speed limit. Implementing a crossing there is also pointless as there is already the crossing at the roundabout which works perfectly well. Why would anyone need to cross mid-way down frost road when the only thing there is the golf course. Frost road should stay 70km, even with school kids around it is unlikely they are going to be needing to cross in this higher speed section and the footpath is wide enough that kids won't spill on to the street anyway</td>
<td>Michael Banks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20668</td>
<td>As long as we have those lit up signs indicating the 40k limit is in effect fine as long as they remember to turn it off after the allotted time has elapsed</td>
<td>No need to reduce speed limit on Frost Road so much! 60kph would be fine, it's not like the kids going to this school are little with no road sense they're teenagers</td>
<td>Marie Roberts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I like the idea of reducing the speed zones in line with keeping the students safe. My main concern would be the roundabout intersection at Frosts Rd & QE2 Drive. I have two teenagers attending the new school next year and would love to see lights or a roundabout for easier management for the kids to cross the road on bikes or walking.

I like the idea of reducing Frosts Rd from 70kmph to 50kmph during the school times. 

Hannah Nixon

Reduced speed in school times makes sense.

Disagree this is needed. There is a dedicated cycle lane/footpath so speed on Frosts should be kept at 70kmph

Chris Evans

1. Would like to offer to make 40km/h speed zone on Travis Road permanent as very often kids going to and leaving schools outside the proposed 20-35 minutes time frames.
2. Would like to offer to prohibit car parking on resident (south) side of Travis Road (between Anzac Ave and Bower Ave) from 6am till 8pm on working days. Large number of non-resident cars parked along the south side of the road completely block view for motorists trying to join the Travis Road traffic from local properties and creates dangerous situations.

Speed reduction is a great idea! However we as a family have a big problem with the overgrown bushes on the roundabout on Frosts Road / Travis road

My children like to visit their grandparents and need to walk their bikes across Frosts road onto Travis road bike way however it is very difficult to see the traffic going through the roundabout from Anzac drive onto Frosts road! We would love to see the bushes removed from the roundabout to allow safer viewing of vehicles from all directions.

Completely support.

Konstantin Kazantsev

Fiona McNicholl

The speed zones are great but someone will be killed if traffic lights aren’t installed. My family have tried crossing from Travis Road over Anzac Drive and it is very dangerous, both our children acknowledged how scary it was at the time and I don’t think the reduction of speed will stop a school child being killed.

The speed zones are a must to keep our children safe so I am all for this to happen and we get a 40 zone outside the school entrances.

I think Frosts Rd speed limit has to be lowered. People go way to fast down there as it is and when it has a load of kids trying to get to school it will be very dangerous.

Sharon Richards

Nadene Spriggs

Speed zones are a must to keep our children safe so I am all for this to happen and we get a 40 zone outside the school entrances.

Yes, please reduce speed to 50km on Frosts Rd. Permanently.

T. Scott

A very good idea, but would you consider the parking in nearby streets at the same time as with all the buildings that is going on at the moment we have had a insight what is going to be like with the Students that will be parking in the the cars, Saiitare St becomes a one way with parking on both sides of the road making it a hazard to everyone. I have seen some close calls .Please feel free to call me. All residents near me feel the same.

A very good idea, but would you consider the parking in nearby streets at the same time as with all the buildings that is going on at the moment we have had a insight what is going to be like with the Students that will be parking in the the cars, Saiitare St becomes a one way with parking on both sides of the road making it a hazard to everyone. I have seen some close calls .Please feel free to call me. All residents near me feel the same.

John Jackson

I think all the suggested changes should be implemented as suggested. However Travis Road, East of Frosts Rd should have an increased speed zone. Both sides of this road have wide pedestrian and bike zones and are clearly separated from the motorised traffic. The traffic always pushes the 60kmh limit of 50kmh anyway, and would make it clear that the divide to the school zone from the Frosts road round-about applies (and fits with the 70kmh zone to the South of the roundabout too)

I actually think that the road need to have separate, wide cycle and pedestrian lanes - as there is room on both sides for this to happen. This would also have the added benefit of increased cycle/pedestrian access to the yet-to-be developed GEB master plan area and East Travis Wetland.

Andrea Stanley

Michael Skinner

happy for the lower speed limits on travis and bower but don’t think it’s necessary for frosts rd.

There is no need to reduce the speed limit on frosts road. There is a perfectly wide sidewalk which is a good distance from the road, which means that there is no risk to pedestrians. If parents are concerned about their children getting to school, then they can instruct their children to walk/cycle via bower ave.

Dominique DuPrayez

Ursula Klein
20713 The 40 km speed limit is appropriate

The very short 70 km speed limit on Frost Rd is dangerous in that it encourages drivers to speed when re-entering the 50km limit at the Bower Ave Corner. It should be 50kms as it is on QE11 drive. This makes a consistent speed ratio. Pedestrians and cyclists have a nervous time crossing the road.

Parklands recovery group

20719 I totally agree with these being put in place. Also Breezes Road from Aranui High to Avondale Road should have these restrictions put in place also as it has been proven via an email from council to us that the traffic/trucks through this area exceed the 50km speed limit also. If you are going to do it for one area you need to consider all areas where schools and also playgrounds are situated.

Totally agree as there will be children cycling on this road

Jude Brown

20723 Support

Support

Cody Cooper

20725 I agree with the electronic school speed reductions

I agree with reducing Frost Road to 50km per hour

Scott Williams

20822 Stephen here to give my thoughts about the new speed restrictions pertaining to the new high schools in QE 2 Park. I live in a unit.

I have concerns about the increasing busyness & the safety of the teenagers at the new schools. The thoughts of possible injuries or deaths horrifies me & all safety measures are welcome. At present a number of drivers speed along Travis Road & around that sharp corner past the BP garage.

The proposed speed restrictions are very welcome. I have noted elsewhere how effective the 40 School Zone signs are.

It’s a bit hard to make out from the map dropped in my letter box but I think that electronic signs both sides of the school grounds in Travis Rd are very important & of course the static signs.

Can I also mention parking in Blue Gum Place. I think that yellow line no parking is necessary on one side of the street is necessary because of the narrowness of the street. At the moment the temporary parking on both sides of the street by construction workers is tolerable but on a longer term base the restricted movement on the street road would be a real problem.

Stephen Best

20832 You would also likely reduce a lot of drop off / pick up traffic if you put in place traffic light pedestrian crossings or underground tunnels at the roundabout for students to walk and cycle over/through - allowing students to walk from quite a distance away and not having to cross these roads that parents are definitely concerned about (& will likely remain concerned about even with speed limits reduced) will cut down the amount of drop offs to the school gates.

Totally agree on reduced speed limit, Plus Speed cameras

Tanya Drury

20833 Totally agree with the reduced speed limit, Plus Speed cameras.

Totally agree on reduced speed limit, plus cameras

Robert Hart

20835 Fully support school zone speed zones on Travis Rd and Bower Ave. Please ensure the signs are positioned in such a way as to not be missed amongst other signs. Perhaps a reminder sign part way down Travis Rd in each direction would help, as drivers often speed up too soon within the zone when they are long (witnessed daily outside Rangi Ruru on Rosshall).

I thought this road was already 50 km/h, or used to be before the EQs. I fully support the reduced speed, but this will need enforcement as, like Travis Rd to the west of the Anzac roundabout, most drivers will go 60+ regardless of posted speed limit. Perhaps bigger signs with a suburb name underneath would help make it more noticeable?

Fiona Bennett

20836 I would like to see Travis road between Atlantis and Bower Ave made 30 km during school hours or even better all the time. The CCC have made the CBD safer by doing this why not around school and our kids.

Good idea. Also need to put lights in on the corner of Frost rd, Travis and Anzac dr. It’s very hard and dangerous to cross at this roundabout. Please make this top priority before someone is hit. And it’s a NZTA road so make them pay.

James Halliday

20839 Spokes supports lower limits in school zones. A 30 km/h limit should be considered.

Spokes supports the 50 km/h limit on Frost Road as it will signal drivers that they are entering a more congested area and need to reduce speed and increase their awareness.

Spokes Canterbury

20840 Fine with this

Opposed. Keep at 70kph.

Scott Saunders

20841 Allowing 70kph as the limit to continue on Anzac Dr between the river and Travis Rd is appalling those intersections at the roundabouts need lights and slower limits. This is an extreme Safety issue - kids will die because of these stupid decisions. CCC needs to work with NZTA on these matters urgently!!!!!

Eastern Vision

20642 I have a problem with the driveway from the school that is directly opposite my driveway. That driveway is also side by side with the drive from QE2 doctors. The doctors driveway is supposed to

not at this time

Garry Robinson
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.: 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>not be used it is breaching the consent given to them at the beginning. Tell the doctors to stop using that driveway is impacts on mine and the schools new driveway.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20856</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Item No.: 8

**Waitai/Coastal-Burwood Community Board**

18 February 2019

#### Attachment B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2085</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>I support the need for school speed zones but I would like to see them include the Travis/Rookwood-Bower Ave roundabout as I believe there will be a huge amount of student movement there and that would also support the children traveling to Rawhiti School. For safety and ease of residential use these speeds could be all day for these suggested portions of the road which would be easier to install than the flashing 40km signs. This area has high use all day with the Gymnastics, Medical Centre, schools and retail stores and it is becoming harder to walk through the area at most times of the day. School half days, early Wednesday finishing and changes with senior time tables would make a permanent speed reduction sensible.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 2086 | 29 | “It is necessary to manage speeds appropriate to its primary use. I.e a high volume road needs to be able to move traffic efficiently and safely and therefore reducing the speed limit along this type of road is not appropriate. It is more appropriate to provide an environment (be it a higher speed one) that provides a safe system environment where there is a low probability of a fatal or serious crash occurring.” The council would have been more credible if they had proposed a limit of 60km/h. |

| 2088 | 29 | I support the reduction of speed on Frost Road to 50km. This is to ensure that cars coming off the roundabout are at a speed that allows better reactions to cyclists and pedestrians crossing the road. |

| 2089 | 29 | The Christchurch North East Secondary Education Committee (NESE) consults widely and advocates on behalf of our members on secondary education related issues in North East Christchurch. NESE was established in 2003. NESE’s Management Committee members are all volunteers from our local community. We currently represent 646 subscribing families and individuals. We support the proposal in general with two minor amendments for improved functionality. We consider that the school zone signs outside the BP Service Station will not be sufficiently visible. It is a busy roundabout. There is already a lot of distracting signage in that location. Drivers have their eyes on the road with the roundabout traffic, pedestrians crossing, as well as vehicles entering & exiting the service station. That is how the road functions now at busy times - before adding 2500 students and teachers to the congestion with the new schools. We feel the sign on Travis Road by the BP would be a better purpose on the other side of the roundabout. This would mean repositioning the sign to Rockwood Road, as well as moving the proposed sign near 219 Bower Ave, only 100m, to 185 Bower Ave. We are all locals who regularly drive through this intersection. We feel that this change would significantly improve the effectiveness of the school zone. Atlas Street is red zoned except for the church on one side and one residential driveway on the other side. The position of the Atlas Street school speed zone sign is not ideal. Nobody will see it where it is shown on the map, as all drivers are between the proposed sign position and the intersection. This sign needs to be much closer to the intersection than usual to be viewed by drivers from these addresses. Otherwise there is simply no point having a sign there. |

| 2090 | 29 | It has been the local community’s preference for Frost Road to return to 50Kmph for a long time. We strongly support this proposal. We recommend it would be timely for the roundabout shrubs at the intersection of Anzac Ave, Frost Road & Travis Road to be reduced in height to 1 meter, in conjunction with this work, and maintained at the lower height into the future. There have been an increasing number of near misses at this roundabout involving slower vehicles & cyclists since the shrubs became taller than 1.5m high. This is due to poor visibility at this intersection combined with the 70kmph speed. Anzac Avenue will continue to have a 70kmph speed limit. Travis Road west of the intersection is 50Kmph. However, traffic including large trucks regularly travel at 70kmph on this section of Travis road. Increasing visibility at this roundabout would actively prevent further serious injuries, especially to cyclists. Cyclists and pedestrians using this intersection need your action on this matter now to keep them safe at this intersection. We ask for your attention and consideration of this additional safety measure. |

| 2091 | 29 | Logical step, safety for pedestrians, cyclists and also drivers. However, believe there is a bigger issue in regards to health and safety than the speed limit, which is the quality of roads and cycle lanes. Take New Brighton Road and Bower Ave for instance, which are both main thoroughfares to the school and for a large amount of the North East community. Due to the condition of the roads vehicles have to drive all over their lane to avoid pot holes, uneven surfaces, bumps, extremely poor non/exist levelling of road and poor chip sealing. No cycle way and risk with the above on a health and safety incident, to cyclist, pedestrian and actually even a driver. The only way this can be rectified is with correct grading, releveloping, surfacing of road and then labelling of cycle ways on the road. Some work has recently been conducted on Bower Ave with chip sealing which is unfortunately worse than the prior state condition making more of a hazard and H&S issue. |

| 2092 | 29 | Logical step. However, believe there is a bigger issue in regards to health and safety than the speed limit, which is the quality of roads and cycle lanes. Take New Brighton Road and Bower Ave for instance, which are both main thoroughfares to the school and for a large amount of the North East community. Due to the condition of the roads vehicles have to drive all over their lane to avoid pot holes, uneven surfaces, bumps, extremely poor non/exist levelling of road and poor chip sealing. No cycle way and risk with the above on a health and safety incident, to cyclist, pedestrian and actually even a driver. The only way this can be rectified is with correct grading, releveloping, surfacing of road and then labelling of cycle ways on the road. Some work has recently been conducted on Bower Ave with chip sealing which is unfortunately worse than the prior state condition making more of a hazard and H&S issue. |

---

**Eliesa Smith**

**Christchurch North East Secondary Education Committee Inc. (NESE)**

**Amanda Greary**
9. Aranui A-Town Boxing Gym

Reference: 18/351086
Presenter(s): Kathy Jarden, Team Leader Leasing Consultancy

1. Purpose and Origin of Report

Purpose of Report
1.1 The purpose of this report is for the Coastal-Burwood Community Board to consider a number of matters:

(i) the future of the Wainoni Park Youth Activity Centre building including leasing or sale and transfer of ownership of the building to A-Town Boxing Gym Incorporated; and

(ii) if maintaining ownership of the building, the Community Board granting a lease of the building and land to A-Town Boxing Gym Incorporated; or

(iii) if transferring ownership of the building, the Community Board granting a ground lease to A-Town Boxing Gym Incorporated.

Origin of Report
1.2 This report is staff generated based on discussions between Council Community Governance officers and Trustees of A-Town Boxing Gym Incorporated and a proposal from them to repair and lease or purchase the building.

2. Significance

2.1 The decisions in this report are of low significance in relation to the Christchurch City Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.

2.1.1 The level of significance was determined by:

- Low number of people affected and/or with an interest being the Aranui/Wainoni community and participants in the A-Town Boxing Gym programmes.
- Low level of community interest already apparent for the proposal or decision.
- Low level of impact on Council carrying out its roles and functions.
- Medium level of possible benefits and opportunities to the wider community in taking ownership of the building.
- Medium level of significance in reversing a decision if the A-Town Boxing Gym is unable to raise funds to repair the building and abandons the project.
- There is a high level of significance if Council were to retain ownership of the building and complete the repairs as it is not an item in the Long Term Plan.

2.1.2 The community engagement and consultation outlined in this report reflect the assessment.

3. Staff Recommendations

That the Coastal-Burwood Community Board:

1. Approve the granting of a lease to A-Town Boxing Gym for the Wainoni Park Youth Activity Centre building and land.

2. Acknowledge that the A-Town Boxing Gym will carry out any repairs to the building.
3. Acknowledge that public advertising in accordance with the requirements of the Reserves Act 1977 has been completed and that no submissions or objections have been received.

4. Recommend that the Chief Executive, in her capacity of holding the Minister of Conservation’s Delegation, gives consent to the lease in accordance with S4(1)(b) of the Reserves Act 1977.

5. Authorise the Property Consultancy Manager to finalising lease documentation to A-Town Boxing Gym for a period of up to 33 years broken into three 11 year terms at an annual rental of $1.

4. Key Points

4.1 This report supports the:

4.1.1 Activity: Community Development and Facilities
- Level of Service: 2.0.1.2 Provide a range of well utilised community facilities, including voluntary libraries - Community Facility Plan adopted

4.1.2 Activity: Recreation, Sport, Community Arts & Events
- Level of Service: 7.0.3.1 Support citizen and partner organisations to develop, promote and deliver recreational sport in Christchurch.

4.2 The following feasible options have been considered:
- Option 1 – Council Maintains Ownership of the Building and Grants Lease with Club Completing Repairs (preferred option)
- Option 2 - Council Undertake Repairs and Maintains Ownership of the Building and Grants Lease for Occupation
- Option 3 - Transfer Ownership of Building and Grant Ground Lease

4.3 Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages (Preferred Option)

4.3.1 The advantages of this option include:
- The building is repaired at no cost to the Council.
- The Club has a permanent home at Wainoni Park to continue to promote their programmes.
- Helps to build and sustain a sense of local community
- Ensures that the community has access to facilities that meets their needs.
- Increases participation in community recreation and sport programmes and events
- Enhances the safety of communities and neighbourhoods.
- Improves basic life skills so that all residents can participate in society.

4.3.2 The disadvantages of this option include:
- Dealing unilaterally with the Trust may be seen as limiting the uses for the property and prevents any other interested parties from having an opportunity to enter into a lease with the Council or have the ability to purchase the building.
- The use of the land is limited to utilisation for recreational activities which reduces the types of groups that would meet the criteria for occupation.
4.4 The preferred option meets community outcomes and brings no additional costs to the Council as building owner in repairing and maintaining a building that has no identified operational use.

The request for formal occupation of The Bunker by A-Town Boxing Gym is well known to the local community and members of the Coastal-Burwood Community Board.

Representatives of A-Town have spoken to elected members and a seminar was held with the Board in December 2018. Initial discussions were based on ownership of the building being transferred to A-Town, however A-Town has made the decision that they would prefer to have a lease of the building and carry out the repairs through their funding efforts.

The granting of a lease to provide a permanent home to A-Town meets the Council’s community outcomes by helping to build a strong community.

Taking a holistic approach, this matter is not only about providing a permanent home for A-Town; but providing the participants with a safe place to hang out, learn discipline team work, and gain confidence and values that will assist them to become valued and contributing members of their community.

(Refer to Option 1 for an analysis of the advantages and disadvantages to this preferred option.)

5. Context/Background

The Land and Buildings

5.1 The Wainoni Park Youth Activity Centre (the “Bunker”) is located on Wainoni Park at 31 Hampshire Street, Aranui, as shown in Attachment A.

5.2 The legal description of the land is Part Reserve 5208, held as fee simple subject to the Reserves and Domains Act 1953 now repealed and replaced by the Reserves Act 1977. The land is held for recreation purposes.

5.3 The Bunker is a single storey structure consisting of a large octagonal central space with a small kitchen addition on the eastern side and a boxing ring on the western side. The building is approximately 22m x 9.8m wide.

5.4 The Bunker was built in the 1960s with the western addition added at a later date. The building is constructed of reinforced concrete masonry walls, concrete slab flooring with lightweight profiled metal sheet roofing.

5.5 Post-earthquakes the building was assessed as being 76% NBS. There was some hairline cracking but the building was in good condition and no potential critical structural weaknesses were identified. A geotechnical report concluded that the existing foundations to the building were adequate but there was a risk of settlement occurring in a future seismic event.

5.6 An arson attack on 15th June 2014 caused damage to part of the building. A Fire Damage Asset Assessment, prepared in 2016 by Evan Medland, Council’s Strategic Property Analyst, is attached for reference (Attachment B).

A-Town Boxing Gym

5.7 A-Town Boxing Gym Incorporated (the Club) is registered with New Zealand Companies Office.

5.8 The Club has been based at the Bunker since 2005.

5.9 The Club’s main purpose is to provide youth of Aranui and the wider community with the opportunity to participate and learn about the sport of boxing, ensuring that they are involved in the decisions that affect their future, offering guidance and support with discipline, proper
health, nutrition and prevention of injuries. The Club’s programmes are fully supported by the local community including the Police.

5.10 The Club is a member of Boxing New Zealand Association Incorporated.

5.11 Club members pay a low subscription fee for training sessions to assist with the running of the Club.

Current Hire Arrangements

5.12 The Club currently hires the Bunker through the Council’s Community Facilities booking system.

5.13 The Club hires out the building 3 hours per week and keeps their equipment in the building on a permanent basis. There are no other groups using the Bunker. Hire fees are currently $13.50 per hour. The Club has not been charged a hire fee due to the fire damage and continues to utilise the building for training. The Club has hired the building for more than 13 years with no other organisation hiring out the building. There is a community centre on the adjoining land that provides facilities to the general public.

Proposal

5.14 In April 2016 Council staff had discussions with the Club and advised that it was not economical for Council to repair the Bunker. Staff met with the Club to discuss future utilisation of the building and the Club proposed to officers that they undertake the repairs and secure a long term future at the Bunker either by way of a lease or purchase or gifting of the building.

5.15 The Club indicated that they wanted to raise funds required to repair the building through a fundraising campaign and grant funding. The Club has currently raised $5000 through a donation from Westpac Bank Corporation. Further fundraising is on hold awaiting a decision from the Council regarding their proposal to buy or be gifted the building or obtain a long-term lease. The Club’s intention will be to approach such organisations at the Rata Foundation and NZCT.

5.16 The Club has been offered pro-bono the services of a local professional fundraiser who has had success with other local projects.

5.17 The Club and Council obtained estimates for repairs to the Bunker as detailed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A-Town</th>
<th>Jul-17</th>
<th>Private Contractor</th>
<th>$ 188,034.00</th>
<th>Estimate (includes roof repair/replacement)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council</td>
<td>Jul-14</td>
<td>Council Contractor</td>
<td>$ 192,345.00</td>
<td>Estimate including roof replacement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All validity periods for all estimates have expired and estimates would need to be updated. The above data is provided to provide an indication of the cost involved.

5.18 Following a meeting with the Club in November, officers were advised that the Club would prefer a lease of the building and land and that they would undertake any repairs to make it fit for their purposes.

Building Valuation and Rental Assessment

5.19 The building’s book value is currently $151,021. This is an impaired value which takes into account the fire damage and reflects its current value.

5.20 A separate market valuation to determine the building value and a comparable market rental was undertaken in January 2018.

5.21 In summary, the valuer made the following assessments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value as repaired</th>
<th>$ 200,000.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value as is</td>
<td>$ 150,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental - comparative commercial basis</td>
<td>$ 9,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rental - depreciated cost basis as repaired</th>
<th>$16,000.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rental - depreciated cost basis as is</td>
<td>$12,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.22 The Council has adopted a policy in setting rents to sports groups that own their own buildings on parks or reserves. For comparison purposes, if the Bunker was owned by a sports club, the current annual ground rental would be approximately $187.00 per annum plus GST based on the building footprint size.

5.23 There is currently no rental policy set for determining rents to sports groups and organisations occupying Council-owned buildings. To set rentals for these types of occupations, a market valuation is undertaken and then discussed with the internal Council asset owner and based on the lessee’s ability to pay rent.

5.24 The Club has limited income earning capacity and relies on grants, fundraising, sponsorship and donations to meet their operational costs. For the financial year ending 2016 the Club had a net surplus of $1061 and for the year ending 2017 the net surplus was $5388. A copy of the financial statement is appended to this report in Attachment C.

5.25 These financial statements confirm that the Club is not in a position to pay a market rental for the building.

Building Maintenance, Renewals and Funding Source

5.26 The Community Facilities Specialist has provided the following information.

5.27 The building maintenance costs for the Bunker that have been attributed towards this facility for the last 3 financial years include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$2,253.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$2,123.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$1,891.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.28 There have been no renewal costs for this facility for the last 3 financial years.

5.29 Funding Sources include but are not limited to:
5.29.1 Council funding through an LTP or an annual plan process. This is likely to be contestable with numerous competing priorities.

5.29.2 Council funding through a funding scheme. This is likely to be contestable and the project may face difficulties meeting the requisite criteria.

5.29.3 Philanthropic funding. Philanthropic funding is increasingly difficult to attain, a community purpose helps, a robust business case and proven community need will also help.

5.29.4 Commercial funding. Possible if the funding entity has defined community outcomes that the Club has synergies with.

5.29.5 Sponsorship. Possible, if the potential sponsor considers the exposure to the Club has synergies that are complementary.

Community Board Delegations
5.30 The Council has granted Community Boards the delegated authority to grant leases on Recreation Reserves in accordance with section 54 of the Reserves Act 1977.

5.31 Section 54(1)(b) of the Reserves Act 1977 makes provision for the administering body to grant leases to any voluntary organisations for any stands, pavilions, gymnasiums, other buildings or structures already on the reserve subject to the provisions set out in Schedule 1 of that Act relating to leases of recreation reserves provided that a lease granted with the prior consent of the Minister of Conservation given on the grounds that it is considered to be in the public interest for sports, games or public recreation not directly associated with outdoor recreation.

The bunker is an existing building and the sport of boxing and training fits within the intention of this section of the Reserves Act.

5.32 As there is no approved reserve management plan for Wainoni Park, the administering body (the Council) must give notice in accordance with section 119 and 120 of the Reserves Act 1977 of the intention to grant a lease with any objections and submissions to be heard by a hearings panel. This delegation excludes the hearing and determining of submissions or objections; such panel would be convened by the Council.

5.33 Public advertising of the intention to grant a lease has been undertaken and there were no submissions in support nor objections to the lease proposal.

Minister of Conservation Delegation
5.34 On 12 June 2013, the Minister of Conservation delegated to all territorial authorities powers, functions and duties where the territorial authority is the administering body of the relevant reserve. The Council has sub-delegated that power to the Chief Executive.

5.35 In exercising the Minister’s delegation, the administering body (i.e. the Council) must give consideration to those matters previously applied by the Minister, for example ensuring that:

- The land has been correctly identified;
- The necessary statutory processes have been followed;
- The functions and purposes of the Reserves Act have been taken into account in respect to the classification and purpose of the reserve as required under section 40 of the Act;
- The administering body has considered submissions and objections from affected parties and that, on the basis of the evidence, the decision is a reasonable one;
- Pursuant to the requirements of section 4 of the Conservation Act 1987, the administering body has consulted with and considered the views of tangata whenua or has in some other way been able to make an informed decision.
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Council officers have publically notified the Council’s intentions to consider granting A-Town Boxing Gym Incorporated a lease for 33 years.

5.36 Council officers are satisfied that the proposed lease will comply with the Minister’s requirements.

Legal Considerations - Dealing Unilaterally

5.37 The Council must ensure that it complies with the relevant policies adopted. In this instance the policy for “Property – Leasing Council Property” is applicable:

5.37.1 “where the Council recognises there is only one logical lessee for a public property, the Council will unilaterally deal with that lessee.” This includes facilities linked to contracts including but not limited to buildings on parks and reserves and not for profit organisations. (Adopted December 2015)

5.38 On this occasion it is open for the Council to grant a lease in accordance with the above policy as it has received a proposal for the stewardship of the Bunker:

- Supports Council’s Strengthening Communities Strategy by:
  - Helping to build and sustain a sense of local community
  - Ensuring that the community has access to facilities that meets their needs.
  - Increasing participation in community recreation and sport programmes and events
  - Enhancing the safety of communities and neighbourhoods.
  - Improving basic life skills so that all residents can participate in society.

- Supports Council’s Physical Recreation and Sport Strategy 2002 by:
  - Increasing participation in physical recreation and sports which in turn promotes better health and reduces health care costs and contributes to people’s quality of life.

- Supports Council’s Safer Christchurch Strategy 2016 by:
  - Reducing and preventing the incidence and effects of crime through mentoring and training of the members of the boxing programme.
  - Providing a place where members are valued and respected.
  - Providing a place for members to feel safe and seek solace, giving them a sense of community.

5.39 Having given consideration to the above factors, staff are of the view that the proposal benefits the community and outweighs any benefits that may be realised from an open tender process.

6. Option 1 – Maintain Ownership of the Building and Grant Lease with the Club Completing Repairs

Option Description

6.1 A lease is granted to A-Town Boxing Gym on the basis that they undertake the repairs required for their utilisation of the building at a peppercorn rental ($1).

Significance

6.2 The level of significance of this option is low consistent with section 2 of this report.

6.3 Engagement requirements for this level of significance is to provide the public with balanced and objective information to assist in understanding the alternatives, opportunities and/or solutions.
6.4 A public notices outlining the intention to grant a lease has been published in The Press and no objections were received.

**Impact on Mana Whenua**
6.5 This option does not involve a significant decision in relation to ancestral land or a body of water or other elements of intrinsic value, therefore this decision does not specifically impact Ngāi Tahu, their culture and traditions.

**Community Views and Preferences**
6.6 Members of the A-Town Boxing Gym are specifically affected by this option due to their desire to have a permanent home in the Aranui community. Their preference is to obtain a long-term lease would guarantee tenure and provide a home for the Club.

6.7 The intention to grant a lease in accordance with the Reserves Act 1977.

**Alignment with Council Plans and Policies**
6.8 This option is consistent with Council’s Plans and Policies

**Financial Implications**
6.9 Cost of Implementation – less than $1000 which includes public advertising and legal document preparation.

6.10 Maintenance / Ongoing Costs – no cost to Council, to be set out in lease agreement

6.11 Funding source – Community Facilities – Community Support Governance & Partnership budget

6.12 Rental - $1 per annum

**Legal Implications**
6.13 There is a legal context, issue or implication relevant to this decision

6.14 This report has not been reviewed and approved by the Legal Services Unit

6.15 The legal consideration is the Reserves Act 1977 and the Council’s Leasing Council Property policy. The preparation of the Deed of Lease is a routine matter on which the legal situation is well known and settled.

**Risks and Mitigations**
6.16 There is a risk that the Club does not raise sufficient funds for the repairs. This may result in the building remaining on the park in an unrepaired state.

6.16.1 Residual risk rating: The residual rating of the risk after the below treatment(s) is implemented will be low.

6.16.2 Planned or current treatment(s) include providing staff resources to assist the Club in obtaining funding from private organisations, developing business plans and presentations to assist in secure funding.

6.16.3 A programme of repairs will be prepared by the Club once they obtain the remaining funding required.

**Implementation**
6.17 Implementation dependencies - funding availability and completion of repairs

6.18 Implementation timeframe – dependent on funding; lease implementation 4-8 weeks.

**Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages**
6.19 The advantages of this option include:

- The building is repaired at no cost to the Council.
There is currently no funding in the Council’s operating budget to carry out repairs or demolition of the building. Through the lease, A-town is undertaking to repair the building and make fit for their purposes.

- The Club has a permanent home at Wainoni Park to continue to promote their programmes.

Finding a permanent home elsewhere in the Aranui community at no cost would provide similar advantages; however there are no known suitable buildings in the area. They have been in Aranui on Hampshire Street for 14 years and they consider it their home. The building is on Wainoni (Hampshire) Park, close to where the youths live. Young people learn better in familiar surroundings. Moving it somewhere farther away would be of no benefit as these youths have very limited resources. It is somewhere they can walk/cycle to – it’s their neighbourhood. Temporary use elsewhere would only provide uncertainty to them and would isolate those who couldn’t find their way to a location that may be farther from home.

- Helps to build and sustain a sense of local community.

The community is behind them; the local school and especially the neighbourhood Police are fully supportive as activities provided by Jamie (the coach) and his assistants provides role models for these kids – this is a decile 1 area where many of the participants are not living a traditional privileged life with happy, healthy and encouraging home lives. Going to A-Town gives them a sense of belonging, a chance to become role models, a confidence boost and engagement with the community. Nurturing local talent in the local community.

- Ensures that the community has access to facilities that meets their needs.

The lease is the mechanism to get A-Town tenure so they can raise money to renovate the facilities. Westpac has provided some funds to assist the Club. Council could continue to let them “hire” it on a long term basis (making a hall booking each year) but that won’t achieve objectives of making the facility fit for purpose nor provide evidence to funders that the group can stay long-term.

- Increases participation in community recreation and sport programmes and events.

Improved facilities lead to increased participation and greater availability of resources and community connectedness.

- Enhances the safety of communities and neighbourhoods.

The community police participate in these programmes and provide guidance to the participants and leaders. They know who the vulnerable kids are and this programme provides an opportunity for the Police to channel the kids into an organised activity rather than potentially continuing on a destructive path.

- Improves basic life skills so that all residents can participate in society.

As outlined above – they are learning respect for their community and gaining confidence and respect in themselves as well as other important values. This enhances the low socio-economic area as previously mentioned.

6.20 The disadvantages of this option include:
• Dealing unilaterally with the Trust may be seen as limiting the uses for the property and prevents any other interested parties from having an opportunity to enter into a lease with the Council or have the ability to purchase the building.

There has been minimal to no interest in using the building and no objections to the published notification in The Press to grant a lease.

• The use of the land is limited to utilisation for recreational activities which reduces the types of groups that would meet the criteria for occupation.

This may be seen as a disadvantage because there is only one type of activity (recreation) that can be considered under the Reserves Act. The local football club are not interested in the use of this facility. If it was classified as a local purpose community building, the catchment of interested groups may be larger. There are no plans to change the classification of the reserve.

7. **Option 2 – Council Undertake Repairs and Maintains Ownership of the Building and Grants Lease for Occupation**

**Option Description**

7.1 The Council repairs the building and brings it up to an acceptable lettable standard and grants a lease of the building to A-Town Boxing Gym at a rental to be negotiated.

**Significance**

7.2 The level of significance of this option is low consistent with section 2 of this report.

7.3 Engagement requirements for this level of significance is to provide the public with balanced and objective information to assist in understanding the alternatives, opportunities and/or solutions.

7.4 A public notices outlining the intention to grant a lease has been published in The Press and no objections were received.

**Impact on Mana Whenua**

7.5 This option does not involve a significant decision in relation to ancestral land or a body of water or other elements of intrinsic value, therefore this decision does not specifically impact Ngāi Tahu, their culture and traditions.

**Community Views and Preferences**

7.6 Members of the A-Town Boxing Gym are specifically affected by this option due to their desire to have a permanent home in the Aranui community. The granting of a long-term lease would guarantee tenure and provide a home for the Club. If the Council undertook the repairs it would free the Club from fundraising to undertake this work.

**Alignment with Council Plans and Policies**

7.7 This option is consistent with Council’s Plans and Policies

**Financial Implications**

7.8 Cost of Implementation – costs associated in preparation of a lease document (approximately $250); costs to Council to carry out required upgrades and deferred maintenance on building – approximately $200,000

7.9 Maintenance / Ongoing Costs – annual maintenance costs, renewals and replacements – undetermined as there has been no budget set aside for this specific building and any costs
would come from the general fund held for community facility buildings and be prioritised on a needs basis. Refer to paragraph 5.26 for historical maintenance costs.

7.10 Funding source – Community Facilities – Community Support Governance & Partnership budget.

7.11 Rental – market rents are identified in paragraph 5.21; a rental would be negotiated with the tenant.

Legal Implications

7.12 There is a legal context, issue or implication relevant to this decision

7.13 This report has not been reviewed and approved by the Legal Services Unit

7.14 The legal consideration is the Reserves Act 1977 and the Council’s Leasing Council Property policy. The preparation of the Deed of Lease is a routine matter on which the legal situation is well known and settled.

Risks and Mitigations

7.15 There is a risk that repairs will not be carried out until budgets are made available.

7.15.1 Residual risk rating: The residual rating of the risk after the below treatment(s) is implemented will be low.

7.15.2 Planned treatment(s) include budget being reallocated to fund the repairs and ongoing maintenance.

Implementation

7.16 Implementation dependencies - funding availability and completion of repairs

7.17 Implementation timeframe – dependant on above; leave implementation 4-8 weeks

Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages

7.18 The advantages of this option include:

- Council maintains ownership of the asset and receives a nominal rental return through the lease.

7.19 The disadvantages of this option include:

- No allocated budget in the Long Term Plan for the repairs.
- No identified purpose for maintaining ownership of the building.
- Future ongoing expenditure in maintaining ownership of the building.

8. Option 3 – Transfer Ownership of Building and Grant Ground Lease

Option Description

8.1 Council transfers ownership of the building at a nominal sum ($1) on an “as is basis” and the Community Board approves a ground lease to A-Town Boxing Gym.

Significance

8.2 The level of significance of this option is low consistent with section 2 of this report.

8.3 Engagement requirements for this level of significance is to provide the public with balanced and objective information to assist in understanding the alternatives, opportunities and/or solutions.

8.4 Consultation – The public consultation process in accordance with Section 78 of the Local Government Act would be required. This process requires full consultation with the community
to seek their views and preferences on the disposal of the building asset. This has not been undertaken as the Club’s preference is to have the Council maintain ownership of the building.

Impact on Mana Whenua
8.5 This option does not involve a significant decision in relation to ancestral land or a body of water or other elements of intrinsic value, therefore this decision does not specifically impact Ngāi Tahu, their culture and traditions.

Community Views and Preferences
8.6 Members of the A-Town Boxing Gym are specifically affected by this option due to their desire to have a permanent home in the Aranui community. In follow-up discussions with the Trust outlining the processes for transferring ownership, the Club determined that their preference was for Council to remain the building owner and granting a lease.

Alignment with Council Plans and Policies
8.7 This option is consistent with Council’s Plans and Policies

Financial Implications
8.8 Cost of Implementation – less than $1000 which includes public advertising and legal document preparation.
8.9 Maintenance / Ongoing Costs – no cost to Council
8.10 Funding source – Community Facilities – Community Support Governance & Partnership budget
8.11 Rental – the annual rent would be based on the policy for setting rents to sport groups on parks and reserves; in this instance it would be approximately $215 per annum.

Legal Implications
8.12 There is a legal context, issue or implication relevant to this decision
8.13 This report has not been reviewed and approved by the Legal Services Unit
8.14 The legal consideration is the Reserves Act 1977 and the Council’s Leasing Council Property policy and Disposal of Property process. The preparation of the Sale and Purchase Agreement and Deed of Lease is a routine matter on which the legal situation is well known and settled.

Risks and Mitigations
8.15 There is a risk that the Club does not obtain the funding to repair the building. This may result in a building remaining on the park that is in poor condition and appearance.
8.15.1 Residual risk rating: The residual rating of the risk after the below treatment(s) is implemented will be low.
8.15.2 Planned or current treatment(s) includes provisions in the lease that the building must be repaired within a specific time frame.

Implementation
8.16 Implementation dependencies - public advertising and consultation, preparation of agreements
8.17 Implementation timeframe – lease implementation 3-6 months

Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages
8.18 The advantages of this option include:
- The building is repaired at no cost to the Council.
- The Club has a permanent home at Wainoni Park to continue to promote their programmes.
- Helps to build and sustain a sense of local community
• Ensures that the community has access to facilities that meets their needs.
• Increases participation in community recreation and sport programmes and events
• Enhances the safety of communities and neighbourhoods.
• Improves basic life skills so that all residents can participate in society.

8.19 The disadvantages of this option include:
• Dealing unilaterally with the Trust may be seen as limiting the uses for the property and prevents any other interested parties from having an opportunity to enter into a lease with the Council or have the ability to purchase the building.
• The use of the land is limited to utilisation for recreational activities which reduces the types of groups that would meet the criteria for occupation.
• Contravenes the Council’s policies on disposal of property and leasing of property.
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Wainoni Park Youth Activity Centre

“The Bunker”
31 Hampshire Street
Wainoni Park Youth Activity Centre

Fire Damage Asset Assessment

PRO_1264_002

Fire Damage

As a result of an arson attack this building was damaged by fire on the night of 15 June 2014. The fire caused damage to a portion of the building predominantly on the western elevation. The damaged area was cordoned off at the time of the fire damage and the undamaged portion of the building was able to remain open and operational.

To date, the fire damaged portion of the building has been made safe and internal access to that portion of the building secured off. No remedial or reinstatement works beyond making safe have been undertaken.

Location

Wainoni is a lower socio economic area with a higher percentage of Maori and Pacific peoples compared with Canterbury averages. More than a third of the population of the area are under 25 years of age. Over a third have no educational qualifications and incomes are generally low.

Insurance

At the time of damage the building was covered under Council’s Material Damage Policy. The excess on any claim under this policy is $100,000. As damage reinstatement cost estimates from Citycare have come in at circa $98,000 (excluding GST) a decision has been made that in this instance that there will be no insurance claim.

The premium cost for insurance cover on Council assets is approximately $3000 per annum per $1,000,000 of cover. As the recently assessed replacement value of this building is $680,000 the annual premium for this specific asset equates to approximately $2000.

Structure

The building is situated within a Reserve, behind Hampshire Street in the Eastern Suburbs of Christchurch. The site is relatively flat and open access is available around all four sides of the building.

The Wainoni Park Youth Activity Centre is a single storey structure consisting of a large octagonal central space (approximately 10m x 10m) with a small 2m x 3m kitchen addition to its eastern flank and a larger 10m x 6m addition housing a boxing ring to the West. The building is approximately 22m long in the East-West direction and 9.8m wide in the North-South direction.
The original building was constructed in the 1960's with the large addition to the west of the main octagonal space having been added at a later date. The building is constructed of reinforced concrete masonry walls, concrete slab flooring, with lightweight profiled metal sheet roofing.

Earthquake Damage Assessment

The building suffered only minor damage as a result of earthquake events and performed well under seismic conditions - there was some minor hairline cracking but the building appears to be in good general condition. No potential critical structural weaknesses have been identified in the building.

The building has a calculated capacity of 76% NBS.

A geotechnical report undertaken on the site concludes that the existing foundations to the building are adequate but that there is a potential risk of differential settlement occurring in a future seismic event.
Rates

The building is sited on Reserve which is classified as non-rateable land. As there is a separate charge or fee for water and sewerage these costs are however chargeable and are currently approximately $1800 per annum across the entire site which is shared with other building assets.

Buildings Appropriateness to Use

The boxing gym users would likely find the open ceiling, exposed rafters and wide-open floor spaces well suited to its use. Trussed roof structural members provide support for heavy punch bag equipment and the high ceiling space assists air flow and ventilation. There are minimalistic kitchenette and ablution facilities in an average to poor condition but nevertheless functional and fit for purpose.

Maintenance

There has been minimal maintenance monies spent on this building over the preceding 10 year period. The purpose for which the building is used has to a certain extent determined the level of interior finish deemed appropriate.

Basic cyclic maintenance is ongoing on the building and includes the likes of building wash downs, spouting and gutter cleans (allow $1000 pa).

There is an exterior repaint scheduled for 2015 on a 10 year cycle. The building in a lower socio economic area is easy to reach, in a highly visible location and subject to varying levels of surveillance day and night - thus making it a target for graffiti. CCC attempts to remove graffiti quickly which however makes for a number of partial, localised 'patch paints' occurring between major repaints. The exterior was inspected in Nov 2014 and it was suggested, given substrate condition the exterior paint job could be pushed out 3 years to 2018 (allow $12,000).

An Interior paint is due in 2016. The current condition of the interior is average but 'fit for purpose'. And the condition of interior redecoration is more about protecting the asset than providing for a higher level of finish that may be desirable for the likes of a library or other public space.

Vinyl and carpet floor coverings are currently in average condition, being 'fit for purpose' and functional for the buildings use as a gym. There is an allowance allocated in 2025 to have floor coverings replaced.

The roof appears sound and well-constructed. The lack of evident leaks and water ingress issues suggests it is providing good function. The roof although steeply pitched is subject to graffiti and the accompanying maintenance issues occurring when exposed to the pressures of human weight. There is a reroof scheduled in SAP for 2025 (allow $25,000).

A grouping of works have been programmed in 2027 being kitchen and toilet refit, renewing of services, window replacement, electrical upgrade etc. These works are designed to extend the buildings useful life through to a theoretical date of 2047 at which stage there is an allowance to rebuild.

Use

There is no lease on this facility. It is treated similarly to a community centre and subject to standard community rate usage charges on an hourly rate. The gym is predominantly used Tuesdays and Thursdays. The yearly income for the facility is just over $1,000.
A Town Boxing Gym Incorporated 1969504 (society number)

Financial Statement for 2017

Financial year – January 2017 – December 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>5200</td>
<td>10,032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundraising / Sponsorship / Donation</td>
<td>18086.56</td>
<td>12,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees</td>
<td>81.50</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Fundraising</td>
<td>956</td>
<td>16,171.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Income</strong></td>
<td>24,327.64</td>
<td>38,564.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenses</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>280.60</td>
<td>193.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Refunded</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle . Ring, Trailer expenses</td>
<td>3384</td>
<td>2895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitions and Travel expenses</td>
<td>8500</td>
<td>16,179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>1840</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gear</td>
<td>6453.60</td>
<td>3375.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koha / fight costs / school costs</td>
<td>2525</td>
<td>2803.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wages</td>
<td></td>
<td>5117.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax</td>
<td></td>
<td>691.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total expenses</strong></td>
<td>23,263.20</td>
<td>33175.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL INCOME</td>
<td>24,327.64</td>
<td>38564.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Expenses</td>
<td>23263.20</td>
<td>33175.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Net surplus / deficit          | 1061.44  | 5388.20  |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assets</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ring – new 2015</td>
<td>11,170</td>
<td>10,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Balance</td>
<td>3,314.73</td>
<td>8,702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gym Equipment</td>
<td>8,660</td>
<td>9,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trailer – new 2015</td>
<td>11.175.30</td>
<td>10,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing</td>
<td>1,033.75</td>
<td>516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Assets</strong></td>
<td>35,353.78</td>
<td>39,201</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liabilities</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(no liabilities)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ASSETS</strong></td>
<td>35,353.78</td>
<td>39,201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Liabilities</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Assets</strong></td>
<td>35,353.78</td>
<td>39,201</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. Aranui and Shirley Vacuum Sewer Systems

Reference: 18/1282144
Presenter(s): Michele McDonald, Senior Planning Engineer - Growth

1. Purpose and Origin of Report

Purpose of Report

1.1 The purpose of this report is for the Coastal-Burwood Community Board to be informed on progress achieved in dealing with the ongoing wastewater capacity constraints in the Aranui and Shirley vacuum sewer catchments.

Origin of Report

1.2 This report is being provided to fulfil Coastal-Burwood Community Board resolution (24525) / item 12.4: Staff undertook to obtain answers for the Board on a variety of questions around the Aranui sewer system capacity.

2. Significance

2.1 The decisions in this report are of medium significance in relation to the Christchurch City Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.

2.1.1 The level of significance was determined by following and assessment of the criteria in the Significance and Engagement Policy, particularly the level of impact of those affected, level of community interest and the impact on the capacity of Council to carry out its roles and functions.

2.1.2 The community engagement and consultation outlined in this report reflect the assessment.

3. Staff Recommendations

That the Waitai/Coastal-Burwood Community Board:

1. Take note of the responses to the specific questions raised and to be updated on the current status of the wastewater capacity constraints faced in the Aranui- and Shirley vacuum sewer catchments.

4. Key Points

4.1 The Coastal-Burwood Community Board was briefed on 7 May 2018 on capacity constraints experienced in the Aranui- and Shirley vacuum sewer catchments.

4.2 Staff undertook to obtain answers for the Board on a variety of questions around the Aranui vacuum sewer system capacity and confirms that additional wastewater connections within the Aranui- and Shirley vacuum sewer catchment areas cannot be accepted at present.

5. Context/Background

5.1 Staff briefed the Coastal-Burwood Community Board on 7 May 2018 regarding the capacity challenges faced in the Aranui- and Shirley Vacuum Sewer Catchments.
5.2 Additional questions were raised by the Community Board on 5 November 2018. Response to these questions are provided as follows:

- **How are people able to make a decision regarding having a different sewer if there is no timeframe provided as to when the vacuum system will be able to be connected to?**

  The installation of seven air admittance devices in the Aranui vacuum sewer system was completed at the end of 2018. The system will now be re-tuned by the vacuum sewer system supplier in order to optimise the air to liquid ratio. This will be finalized by March 2019. Council staff will then monitor the flow rate into the vacuum station during wet weather and when ground water level is high to assess the effectiveness of the upgrade and to confirm if there is sufficient capacity in the system. It is expected that this assessment will be complete by June 2019.

The tender review for the installation of air admittance devices in the Shirley vacuum sewer system has been completed and the tender will be awarded shortly.

In the meantime, property owners are being advised at the earliest opportunity that no new connections to the Aranui- and Shirley vacuum sewer systems are being accepted until adequate capacity is confirmed.

- **Is the impact on the system really bad enough to prevent new builds?**

  A vacuum sewer system requires a vacuum to be maintained in the pipes in order for the vacuum suction to work. If the vacuum sewer pipes become full of liquid, the vacuum station can no longer convey the sewage through the pipes. This is the case in the Aranui vacuum sewer system when it rains. Every 4 to 5 houses share one vacuum chamber that is equipped with a vacuum valve which opens when there is sufficient suction available in the vacuum pipes. The vacuum chambers have been designed for a limited storage capacity. If sewage is not sucked from the chamber because of insufficient vacuum in the pipes, the sewage will backup and overflow onto the street and private properties. To prevent this from happening, Council sends sucker trucks during rain events to empty chambers where overflows are imminent or have happened. Therefore ‘any’ additional discharge into a single vacuum chamber can have significant consequences when the vacuum cannot be maintained (i.e. during rain events) and will increase the risk of overflows onto the street and private properties as well as the frequency of emptying manually by sucker trucks.

  The rain event in July 2017 resulted in the system unable to function adequately for up to 10 days. During 2018 alone, Council has invested $15,000 on resolving individual vacuum chamber overflows resulting from relatively minor rain events.

- **Why have some new properties been able to connect to the system (e.g. 276 Breezes Road)?**

  It has been accepted that dwellings may be re-established on a single property and where previous dwellings are demolished under the strict condition that a) all private sewers to be replaced and b) the sewer lateral up to the vacuum chamber to be inspected and if found damaged to be replaced at the property owners cost.

  2/276 Breezes Road is a development where a previous residential house is demolished to be completely replaced by two minor dwelling units (2 bedrooms each) and therefore not considered to result in an increased wastewater discharge into the vacuum chamber servicing that property. Similarly, development has been approved in Basingstoke Street where agreement has been reached with Housing New Zealand that existing dwellings would be demolished.
• What are the plans, if there was to be an increase in demand to build in the area. Is the system able to be adapted to handle this?

The system was designed by Stronger Christchurch Infrastructure rebuild Team (SCIRT) based on the development allowed in the previous Christchurch City Plan, which had a minimum lot size of 450 m². The Land Use Recovery Plan and the subsequent Christchurch District Plan allows for more intensification than the Christchurch City Plan. At Council’s request, SCIRT increased the size of some vacuum sewer pipes to accommodate mostly Housing New Zealand developments in the Aranui vacuum sewer area that were underway at the time.

Design provision was made for 195 additional dwellings to be serviced in Aranui, distributed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vacuum Arm</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above capacity will however only be available once the existing wet weather flow is reduced to within the designed capacity.

The design flows used by SCIRT were in accordance with the Council’s Infrastructure Design Standard, which assumes that inflow and infiltration is 2.78 times the peak daily flow. The reason for the capacity issues during wet weather is because the inflow and infiltration exceeds the above allowance. This can be mitigated by allowing extra air into the system to improve the air to liquid ratio in wet weather and/or by reducing the amount of inflow and infiltration into the system to avoid waterlogging of the vacuum pipes.

244 Breezes Road is situated in Vacuum Arm 3.

• Where are you at with the work that is being done to address the broken laterals? I.e. what is the timeline?

This issue relates to private sewers within property boundaries. As part of the SCIRT project to implement the vacuum sewer system, the sewer laterals within legal road were replaced and new laterals were established to convey wastewater from each property boundary into a vacuum chamber. Additionally, CCTV inspections were undertaken to identify damage to private sewers i.e. the sewers within property boundaries. Where it was confirmed that there was damage to private sewers, property owners were advised to claim from Earthquake Commission (EQC) and to repair their sewer pipes. Council has also distributed pamphlets to remind and educate residents of the importance of fixing their broken sewer pipes. In addition, the following information was placed on the property Land Information Memorandum in order to ensure that property owners and future buyers are aware of the requirement to fix private sewers. This notice is only removed when confirmation is received that repairs were done.

The Council has received a third party report relating to an unverified sewer lateral inspection on this property. It has been placed on the property file. The Council does not accept any liability for the contents, or representations, made within the report. The report is not included in the Land Information Memorandum (LIM) because the Council cannot verify the information in the report. If a copy is required you can request a property file by contacting Council on (03) 941 8999 or visiting a Council Service Centre.

Council does not have a capital programme or project to repair broken private sewers. Property owners can still lodge a claim with EQC. Those that have received an EQC payout should be encouraged to repair their sewers. For all replacement dwellings, property owners are advised at building consent stage that they may not re-use any of the existing private sewer pipes. For changes to existing dwellings, property owners are requested to inspect and repair broken sewer pipes.

Where residents are unable or unwilling to repair damaged sewers, Council could enforce compliance with section 459 of the Local Government Act 1974 and its bylaws (see below), but in order to do that, adequate evidence of non-compliance would be required. However, the current operational budget for
wastewater is insufficient to provide the necessary resources to follow up with property owners with leaky laterals.

Data from the new monitoring system will be very useful to enable the identification of the problem areas. Council intends to use the monitoring data to target streets with the worst capacity problems first and to identify the vacuum chambers where increased flow rates are experienced during wet weather.

- **How wide across the city are the problems with the sewer capacity/broken laterals?**

An allowance is made for inflow and infiltration when designing a sewer system and problems are generally encountered when this allowance is exceeded. There are some catchments where inflow and infiltration exceeds the expected volume and where capacity constraints are experienced as a result. There are several programmes, either as capital projects or part of operational processes to identify areas with high inflow and infiltration and to find solutions to reduce the negative impact on the available capacity or to remove capacity constraints.

The Council has not undertaken a survey of all laterals in Christchurch, so do not know how many laterals are problematic.

A wastewater flow monitoring programme has recently been completed over a three month period, and the data will be used to identify the areas with the highest inflow and infiltration.

The Shirley vacuum sewer system suffers from capacity problems similar to those in the Aranui vacuum sewer system.

There are also areas of gravity sewer where we have capacity problems during wet weather. These are shown in the map below.
• What is the legality of having a broken lateral? Are you allowed to? Can the Council require people to fix them? Is Council able to loan people money to pay for the repair of their laterals?

Section 459 Local Government Act 1974 provides that the Council may, by notice in writing, require the owner of land or a building within the Council’s district to, among other things:

(1) In respect of any land or building within the district, the council may, subject to sections 283 and 294(9) of this Act [these sections are now repealed so are not relevant here] and to subsection (7) of this section, by notice in writing, require the owner thereof to do all or any of the following things:

(a) To provide, construct, and lay a private drain from any land or building which is not drained by some drain to the satisfaction of the council, and to connect that private drain with any public drain or watercourse or the sea, as the council thinks fit:

(b) To cleanse and repair or to relay or alter the course, direction, and outfall of any existing private drain of or belonging to the premises:

(c) To connect any such existing private drain with any public drain or watercourse other than the public drain or watercourse with which the private drain was previously connected:

(d) To provide and affix in and to any such existing private drain, and in and to any such new private drain, all such traps, methods of ventilation, and other fittings whatever as the council directs:

(e) To connect or disconnect any existing or new private drain with or from any water closet, urinal, bath, sink, grease trap, or other sanitary appliance:

(f) To execute, provide, and do generally any works, materials, and things which in the opinion of the council are necessary or expedient for the efficient drainage of the premises and every part thereof.

(4) Every notice under this section shall specify the works, materials, and things to be executed, provided, or done thereunder, and the public drain or watercourse with which any private drain is required to be connected, and shall limit a time within which the works, materials, and things shall be so executed, provided, and done.

(5) The foregoing powers shall, among other things, enable the council to require any owner of premises to cause any pollutant and any water that does not contain any pollutant to be drained respectively by sewerage drains and stormwater drains to separate outfalls/Provided that the council shall not in any such notice require any pollutant to be drained into any open drain.

(6) If the owner fails to do any work specified in the notice and as therein directed, the council may, if it thinks fit, cause the work to be done, and may recover from him the costs and expenses of the work together with 10 percent of those costs and expenses for supervision by the officers or agents of the council, and interest at a rate per annum, as fixed by the council ..., on the total sum until payment thereof. Where any work done by the council pursuant to this subsection is on account of several owners, the council may apportion the total amount as aforesaid between those owners, and the amount so apportioned to each such owner shall be the amount recoverable from him.

(7) No owner shall be required—

(a) To construct any private drain, other than a common drain, to connect with any public drain or the sea at a point more than 30 metres from his land; or

(b) To construct any private drain for the drainage of a building if the nearest part of the building is situated more than 60 metres from the public drain, or watercourse, or sea to which it is required to be connected.

Section 459 states “the Council” may by notice in writing require the owner to do the various things. In the Council’s delegations register various powers relating to s459 have been delegated:

• Council Hearings Panels: To hear and determine any objections concerning private drains notices or orders under ss.459 or 460 of the Local Government Act 1974.
Council also delegated “to the City Water and Waste Manager and to the Building Control Manager (severally) its powers under section 459 of the Local Government Act 1974.”

And to the Inspections and Enforcement Manager: “The powers of the Council contained in sections 459 and 460 of the Local Government Act 1974 including the power to sign section 459 notices on behalf of the Council (relating to private drains and drainage works).”

Approval to send a notice in writing under s459 in any instance needs to be done by one of these 3 people – or someone they have sub-delegated this power to.

In addition, where it is deemed that excessive inflow is due to illegal connections including rain water connections, the Water Supply, Wastewater and Stormwater Bylaw 2014, provides in Clause 27, that:

(1) Unless authorised by the Council no person may:
   (a) Cause or allow any water from a water pipe, artesian well, ram or other hydraulic appliance or any surface water, subsoil drainage, roof water or condensing water to enter a wastewater drain or a drain connected with a wastewater drain.

There are also powers in the Building Act 2004 (as modified by the Canterbury Earthquake (Building Act) Order 2010) and the Health Act 1956 that could provide authority for the Council to carry out the works on sewer laterals. However, under the Building Act it is necessary to decide that the work is required because the building is insanitary. Similarly, under the Health Act the broken lateral would need to be in such a state as to be offensive or likely to be injurious to health.

Council has several loan and grant schemes that could potentially be considered to support needy residents, where it is not possible to claim for repairs from EQC.

In the area, there are approximately 4,000 houses, 900 chambers, and 7 people that have asked to build – would those 7 people really have an impact?

Unfortunately this is the case as explained in question 2 above. The failure of one vacuum valve, servicing 4 to 5 houses, can impact the available vacuum in the main pipe and if left un-resolved can result in an entire vacuum arm to fail i.e. vacuum cannot be maintained in the main pipe. Also, if the system is unable to create sufficient vacuum, any additional discharge will reduce the storage time in the pipes and in the chamber and will increase the frequency by which the vacuum chamber must be emptied by sucker truck in order to avoid spillage onto streets and private properties.

The vacuum sewer system services 2,797 residential properties and 57 business properties. Some of these residential properties have not yet been built on. The Aranui vacuum sewer system comprises 6 vacuum arms (main pipelines), meaning that the catchment is divided into 6 catchments. The arms in each catchment have a certain flow capacity. In addition, each vacuum chamber can service a maximum of 6 residential dwellings.

There is currently a hold on building consents to establish an additional 11 residential dwellings in the Aranui sewer catchment. In addition to this, agreement has been reached with Housing New Zealand to delay the proposed development of 9 additional dwellings within the vacuum system, until wastewater capacity is available.

There are two cases where property owners have elected to follow the provisions of Clause G13-Foul Water of the Building Regulations 1992, which provides as follows:

G13.3.4 If no sewer is available, facilities for the storage, treatment and disposal of foul water must be constructed-

(a) with adequate capacity for the volume of foul water and the frequency of disposal; and

(b) with adequate vehicle access for collection if required; and
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(c) to avoid the likelihood of contamination of any potable water supplies in compliance with Clause G12 “Water supplies”; and

(d) to avoid the likelihood of contamination of soils, groundwater, and waterways except as permitted under the Resource Management Act 1991; and

(e) from materials that are impervious both to the foul water for which disposal is required, and to water; and

(f) to avoid the likelihood of blockage and leakage; and

(g) to avoid the likelihood of foul air and gases accumulating within or entering into buildings; and

(h) to avoid the likelihood of unauthorised access by people; and

(i) to permit easy cleaning and maintenance; and

(j) to avoid the likelihood of damage from superimposed loads or normal ground movement; and

(k) if those facilities are buried underground, to resist hydrostatic uplift pressures.

Due to several challenges related to the establishment of holding tanks that must be emptied by sucker trucks and the potential long-term negative impacts on the surrounding neighbourhood, Council does not wish to promote the above as a servicing option.

- Could you please provide an update of the progress of the projects that are being implemented to improve the situation?

  **Automatic Air Admittance Systems**: All automatic air admittance devices have been installed in the Aranui vacuum sewer system. The suppliers of the vacuum sewer system will retune the vacuum sewer system to optimise the air to liquid ratio. The ability to service new connections will be confirmed once the effectiveness of this upgrade has been assessed.

  The tender to install the automatic air admittance devices in Shirley will soon be awarded.

  **Vacuum System Monitoring Equipment**: Devices to monitor the valves in the collection chambers have been installed for 50 collection chambers, and a three month trial period started on 25 October 2018. The information from the trial will be used to improve the roll out of the remainder of the monitoring devices. These will be installed by the end of 2019. The data from the monitoring devices will be used to identify areas with highest inflow and infiltration.
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Annexure A - Previous Correspondence

Sent: Tuesday, October 28, 2018 5:55 PM
To: Tim Baker <tim@davidlawrence.kiw>; graham.wardham@ccc.govt.nz
Cc: O'Brien, Bridget <Bridget.O'Brien@ccc.govt.nz>; Mance, Chris <Chris.Mance@ccc.govt.nz>; Johnson, Mark <Mark.Johnson@ccc.govt.nz>; Moore, John <John.Moore@ccc.govt.nz>
Subject: RE: Tim baker re sewer capacity and issues with Aranui Vacuum Sewer System

Dear Mr. Baker

Thanks for your e-mail regarding your building consent application. You are correct in that we have a major problem with stormwater inflow and groundwater infiltration into the vacuum sewer system in Aranui. The vacuum pipes need a certain air to liquid ratio in order for the vacuum suction to work. If the vacuum sewer pipes become full of liquid, the vacuum station can no longer suck the sewage through the pipes. This is the case in the Aranui vacuum sewer system when it rains. To avoid overflows of raw sewage onto the street and from gully traps on private property, our maintenance contractor Citycare uses sucker trucks to suck out sewage during storms.

Each event costs the Council tens of thousands of dollars. We do not wish to exacerbate this situation, so have put a hold on all new connections to the Aranui vacuum sewer system until this has been resolved.

We have two projects underway to improve the situation. The first is installing automatic air admittance devices which will allow air into the pipes to maintain the air to liquid ratio, and so maintain the ability of the vacuum station to suck the sewage through the pipes. This is expected to be complete by the end of the year. The second project is installing a monitoring system on every collection chamber in the vacuum sewer system. This will allow us to identify which collection chambers suffer from stormwater inflow and groundwater infiltration. We will then conduct further investigations to determine whether this is a problem with the public and/or private part of the wastewater system and work to resolve this. However, we will not know how successful these projects will be until they have been implemented.

We agree that damaged wastewater laterals are a significant problem for the Aranui vacuum sewer system, and we already have a programme underway requiring property owners to fix their damaged wastewater laterals. We will continue with this, and the data from the new monitoring system will be very useful in identifying problem laterals. The first monitoring devices have been installed already and we are targeting the streets with the worst capacity problems first.

In many cases, the property owner has received, or is entitled to, a payout from EQC for earthquake damaged laterals. If they haven't done so already, we are encouraging property owners to use CCTV their laterals to see if there is earthquake damage, and if so, to lodge a claim for earthquake damage with EQC. Where an EQC payout has already been received, we are encouraging property owners to use this to repair the lateral. This is supported by the Water Supply, Wastewater and Stormwater Bylaw 2014 which prohibits stormwater and groundwater entering our wastewater network without our permission. Thank you for your suggestion about a loan scheme for property owners to repair their laterals. This could be useful for those who have laterals in poor condition but not suffering from earthquake damage. We will consider this.

Please be assured of our commitment to resolve this matter as soon as feasible.
Capacity considerations in the Aranui and Shirley Vacuum Sewer Catchments

Staff Briefing: Coastal-Burwood Community Board
7 May 2018
Questions

2nd – **what is the issue with the Aranui Sewer System**? Are there too many laterals broken or is it something else or a combination?

**What is being explored to fix this?**

If I am right and the laterals are a problem there is time to put a budget in the LTP to fix it. Perhaps the council could have a $10,000,000 loan scheme for people to borrow from to have laterals fixed so there are no excuses.

*Kia ora Jo, this is information I expected as I have heard bits from many people.*

Will you please **ask if minor dwellings and family units are permissible** in the Aranui catchment?

This reply/information is very bad news for the district.
Background

- Three vacuum sewer catchments in Christchurch
- Aranui and Shirley vacuum sewer systems were established post-earthquake by SCIRT as retrofit systems to replace badly damaged public gravity systems
- Prestons vacuum sewer system was established by the developer in terms of an Infrastructure Development Agreement with CCC as the preferred servicing option for the greenfield area
Background

How vacuum sewer works:

- A traditional gravity line carries wastewater from the customer to an AIRVAC valve pit package.
- When 10 gallons of wastewater collect in the sump, the AIRVAC valve opens and differential pressure propels the contents into the vacuum main.
- Wastewater travels at 15 to 18 fps in the vacuum main, which is laid in a sawtooth fashion to insure adequate vacuum levels at the end of each line.
- The vacuum pumps cycle on and off as needed to maintain a constant level of vacuum on the entire collection system.

Source: PDH Engineer (2007)

Capacity Considerations

- Each vacuum valve / chamber can service between 4-6 dwellings
- Each vacuum pipeline has a maximum flow capacity which is the peak wet weather flow
- The vacuum pumps have been designed for an air / liquid ratio of 7 at maximum wastewater flow (119 l/s for Aranui and 41 l/s for Shirley)
- The sewage pumps are designed at 1.2 of maximum flow (143 l/s for Aranui and 50 l/s for Shirley)
Vacuum sewer design standards for Aranui and Shirley

- Designed to CCC standard design flow rates and peaking factors i.e. Inflow and Infiltration peak factor of 2.78.
- The design was based on the former Christchurch City Council Land Zoning Requirements prior to the Land Use Recovery Plan (LURP)
- Evaluation post LURP and based on the new Christchurch District Plan determined that capacity for ‘some’ intensification could be available but the would depend on the actual wet weather flow into the system compared to design flows.
- Repairs to private drains were outside the scope of the project but CCTV was undertaken to identify damaged drains. Property owners were advised to claim from EQC and repair, however + 100 priority 1 repairs not yet done despite additional reminders and +1,000 priority 2 repairs (defects).
Status Quo: Hydraulic Performance Assessment by SCIRT (September 2017)

There is currently no spare capacity in Aranui and Shirley as a result of excessive infiltration and inflow during wet weather due to:

- Ground water infiltration due to damaged private property drains
- Rain water ingress at illegal stormwater connections
- Flood water entering the system through gully traps
- Surface water and groundwater enters the chambers at the top and through the connections (more prevalent at Shirley)

The above results in: waterlogging of vacuum mains + reduced storage leading to overflows

Approximately 6 applications for 14 additional dwellings currently ‘on hold’ due to wet weather capacity challenges
Actions to address the issue

RECOMMENDATIONS BY SCIRT

1. Install an automated air admittance system (AAAS), then retune the system to reduce the air-to-liquid ratio
2. Identify areas with high inflow and infiltration
3. Private property owners to:
   • Repair damaged drains
   • Seal or raise gully traps
   • Remove illegal stormwater connections

CCC

1. Sucker trucks alleviates waterlogging
2. AirVac is tuning Aranui system (current)
3. CPMS #45156: WW Automatic Air Admittance Systems
   ▪ Estimated cost = $752k (vs initial budget of $405k)
   ▪ Tender being prepared for market release
4. Re-tune systems and assess performance improvement to determine spare capacity now
5. CPMS #42603: WW Vacuum System Monitoring Equipment
   ▪ Total Cost = $1,225k
   ▪ Contract awarded Apr‘18 – completion Dec‘19
6. Continue to engage with property owners for repair of private drains / enforce bylaws

New technology deployed in CCC aligned with Smart Cities concept, using LoRaWAN
Engagement process

- Information included in the Land Information Memorandum
  The Council has received a third party report relating to an unverified sewer lateral inspection on this property. It has been placed on the property file. The Council does not accept any liability for the contents or representations, made within the report. The report is not included in the Land Information Memorandum (LIM) because the Council cannot verify the information in the report.

- Information included in PIM / Development Report
  **Intensification Within Vacuum Sewer Catchment:** This property is located within a vacuum sewer catchment which currently has limited capacity for development and where specific design requirements need to be met. To establish whether the Council sewer serving this site has the capacity to accommodate development please contact wastewatercapacity@ccc.govt.nz. An “Engineering Acceptance” will also be required from the Planning Engineer, Asset Planning – Water & Wastewater Team. **No sewer works must proceed until this acceptance is in place.**

- Housing New Zealand was advised of capacity intensification restrictions in Aranui and Shirley during their master planning process

- Each application is assessed on an individual basis. Go ahead is given for replacement dwellings only (i.e. no additional demand) and further development asked to be placed ‘on hold’ until conclusion of CPMS #45156: WW Automatic Air Admittance Systems.

- The following requirement for building of replacement dwellings: “**New sanitary drainage to be established for servicing the dwelling (no re-use of sanitary drainage within the property).**”
Questions?

Reference: 19/46091
Presenter(s): Katie MacDonald – Community Support Officer

1. Purpose and Origin of Report

   Purpose of Report
   1.1 The purpose of this report is for the Waitai/Coastal-Burwood Community Board to consider an application received for funding from its 2018/19 Youth Development Fund.
   1.2 There is currently a balance of $950.00 remaining in this fund.

   Origin of Report
   1.3 This report is to assist the Board to consider an application of funding from Logan Roberts.

2. Significance

   2.1 The decision in this report is of low significance in relation to the Christchurch City Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.
   2.1.1 The level of significance was determined by the number of people affected and/or with an interest.
   2.1.2 Due to the assessment of low significance, no further community engagement and consultation is required.

3. Staff Recommendations

   That the Waitai/Coastal-Burwood Community Board resolve to:
   1. Approve a grant of $250 from its 2018/19 Youth Development Fund to Logan Roberts towards the costs of his flights for representing Canterbury in the Under 18 Mixed Touch Team at the 2019 New Zealand Touch National Tournament in Rotorua, 8 to 10 February 2019. The granted funds are not to be used for any supervisory staff, coaching, tuition or management costs.

4. Applicant 1 – Logan Roberts

   4.1 Logan is a 17 year old student currently in year 13.
   4.2 Logan has been selected in the Touch Canterbury Under 18 Mixed team to compete at the 2019 Touch Junior National Tournament in Rotorua from 8 to 10 February 2019.
   4.3 There are a total of 16 players that have been selected for the Touch Canterbury Under 18 Mixed Team for the 2018 season. Selection occurred through an invitation trial process.
   4.4 Logan is also a Canterbury Rugby representative and competed as part of the Under 16 Metro team which won the South Island tournament in October 2018.
   4.5 Logan has represented Canterbury touch teams for a total of eight years and gives back to the sport of Touch by volunteering as a referee when he is not playing.
   4.6 The application was received from Logan within the six week timeframe as set out in the criteria for the Coastal-Burwood Youth Development Fund. Due to the recess of the Community Board over the holiday period and delay in information coming from Touch Canterbury the application was not able to be assessed and presented to a Board meeting prior to the event.
4.7 Logan received sponsorship from a residential building company that was paid directly to Touch Canterbury towards the overall costs of representing in the 2018/19 season.

4.8 The following table provides a breakdown of the costs for Logan to represent the Under 18 Mixed Canterbury Touch Team for the 2018/19 season. Touch Canterbury were not able to provide a breakdown of the specific costs relating to the Touch Junior National Tournament in Rotorua as they combine costs for the entire season.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENSES</th>
<th>Cost ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation/ Food/ Snacks</td>
<td>$285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flights</td>
<td>$430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vans and Petrol</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physio/ Tent Hire</td>
<td>$75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Entry Fee</td>
<td>$105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing Uniform/ T-Shirt/ TC Socks</td>
<td>$135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin Fee/ Advertising</td>
<td>$80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prizegiving/ Photograph</td>
<td>$35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1245</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fundraising</th>
<th>Cost ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Company Sponsorship</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time work and savings (amount unknown)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$250</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REMAINING</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$995</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.9 This is the first time the applicant has applied for funding.

Attachments
There are no attachments to this report.

Confirmation of Statutory Compliance
Compliance with Statutory Decision-making Requirements (ss 76 - 81 Local Government Act 2002).
(a) This report contains:
   (i) sufficient information about all reasonably practicable options identified and assessed in terms of their advantages and disadvantages; and
   (ii) adequate consideration of the views and preferences of affected and interested persons bearing in mind any proposed or previous community engagement.
(b) The information reflects the level of significance of the matters covered by the report, as determined in accordance with the Council’s significance and engagement policy.
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12. Elected Members’ Information Exchange

This item provides an opportunity for Board Members to update each other on recent events and/or issues of relevance and interest to the Board.