

**MINUTES OF THE SELWYN DISTRICT COUNCIL
DRAFT LONG TERM PLAN 2021– 2031 SUBMISSION DELIBERATIONS
HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS, ROLLESTON
THURSDAY 20 MAY 2021, COMMENCING AT 9.00AM**

PRESENT

Mayor (S T Broughton), Councillors, M A Alexander, J B Bland, S Epiha, J A Gallagher, D Hasson, M P Lemon, M B Lyall, S G McInnes, G S F Miller, R H Mugford & N C Reid

STAFF

Messrs D Ward (Chief Executive), G Bell (LTP Project Manager), S Hill (Group Manager Communication and Customers), K Mason (Group Manager Organisational Performance), D Marshall (Group Manager Property), M England (Asset Manager – Water Services), M Rykers (Manager Open Space and Property), M Washington (Group Manager Infrastructure), A Mazey (Asset Manager, Transportation), C Colenutt (Management Accountant), A Chauhan (Water and Wastewater Engineer), S Tully (Advisor to Mayor), Mesdames D Kidd (Group Manager Facilities and Community Services), T Davel (Council Governance Co-ordinator), K Johnston (Senior Communications Advisor), A Ross (Water Services Asset Planner) and N Smith (Executive Assistant).

APOLOGIES

No apologies were received for this meeting.

OPENING COMMENTS

1. Introduction and Welcome from the Mayor

Mayor Broughton thanked to staff for their work leading into this process and for ensuring that requested information was pulled together ahead of the proceedings. He also spoke about the process for the deliberations and referenced the earlier document circulated with staff comments. Mayor Broughton suggested that Council spend some time reflecting on the process post-deliberations.

2. Overview from the Chief Executive

The Chief Executive acknowledged the considerable effort of staff to get the information compiled in the manner it has been. He also acknowledged the amount of reading that had been involved by Councillors in order to prepare for today's deliberations.

DELIBERATION MATTERS

DECISION 1 - What is your view on how we should keep our drinking water supply safe?

Staff comments

Staff acknowledge that ratepayers' preference is to avoid chlorination. Staff will, over the next 12 months, engage with Taumata Arowai in respect to requirements for mandatory disinfection. Depending on the outcome to those discussions, we will review cost and rating options prior to the development of our Draft 22/23 Annual Plan.

Councillor comments

All Councillors agreed with the staff recommendation with the following comments:

Councillor Miller stated there is a clear desire to have unchlorinated water. The issue will be driven by legislation but currently Council should continue to utilise the risk matrix.

Agreed Council position

Agree with staff direction.

DECISION 2 - what is your view on how we pay for drinking water supply?

Staff comments

Staff acknowledge the support for increasing the volumetric charge and recommend that we proceed to put this option in place.

Councillor comments

Councilor Hasson raised the issue of people in the District who had water readily available compared to those who do not.

Councillor Alexander noted rating was not about more money but rating the volume of water delivered to people. He said Selwyn used more water per household and mostly this was simply wasteful. He added an education campaign would need to be rolled out.

Councillor Miller said water should be a basic commodity that council provides. People valued water and Council need to look at optimising water delivery and maintain the lowest possible cost. He asked whether Development Contributions were charged appropriately and said developers must pay for pipelines so in theory the cost of delivery shouldn't have to increase. He said Council was the biggest waster of water through its own Infrastructure inefficiency.

Councillor McInnes said an educational approach was a good idea.

Councillor Reid said there was a negative effect on those with fixed incomes, in particular elderly residents whose enjoyment is their garden and tending to it. She supports education and working with particularly the bigger users.

Agreed Council position

Implement higher lift in volumetric charging.

DECISION 3 – what is your view on developing a new wastewater system in Darfield and Kirwee?

Staff comments

It is the view of staff that priority be given to installing trunk infrastructure and connecting new development areas. Staff are also of the view that Council should commit to this as a priority project, but in doing so, review the timetable for connection of existing properties.

Councillor comments

Councillors agreed with some amendments to the way forward. The following comments were made around the table:

Councillor Bland referred to the need for Council to market this a lot better going forward.

Councillor Hasson said Raeburn farm should be considered surplus and be sold. The funds should go back into the Darfield wastewater system.

Staff noted that the purchase of Raeburn Farm came from general funds.

Councillor Alexander noted that connection should not be for all new properties as some new properties would not be able to connect to the new system. He also said in terms of the options below that in effect Kirwee and Darfield would be subsidized which was a change to Council policy. He also thought two Councillors could be direct beneficiaries and thought they should declare an interest. Councillor Alexander said Raeburn was bought with general rates and as such any proceeds from a sale of the land should go back to general rate.

Councillor Gallagher noted her support for the Council decision and spoke briefly to the connection timeframe. She also noted that there was a lot of misunderstanding in the community about new builds.

Councillor Miller referred to the number of submitters stated they had just put in a septic tank, noting they were rightly concerned. He said Council had a moral obligation and needed to make this system affordable. Councillor Miller referred to the costs potentially destroying people's livelihoods and he thought there needed to be more work on the funding model for the system. He saw the value in it but thought it was an ad hoc decision and as such, unfair on ratepayers. He added the community did not ask for this, rather, this Council decided to do it, and because Council thinks it is in the community's best interest Council should make it achievable.

Councillor Miller then spoke to the ESSS Development Contributions with the cost to join the system being very low. He said that Malvern has a good argument that growth had yet to yield any benefits for them and this was an opportunity to look outside of Rolleston and help these communities. He said he wasn't averse to voting for a district-wide Rate on this issues.

Councillor Miller agreed that there was a need for new subdivisions to connect, but that it becomes problematic around the commercial street, saying he was of the view that Council should stop there decision wise, and then have a good discussion about the rest. He said he

sees the value of putting this in the main street. Councillor Miller noted that if Council gets the funding package right, then people can live with this.

Councillor McInnes spoke to the costing model, saying there are a lot of unknowns about the payment part.

Mayor Broughton said pausing would provide an opportunity consult further and work with the communities to be affected. Other Councillors agreed there was plenty of time to get the funding model sorted out.

Councillor Lyall also agreed noting the need to balance the funding model with being strategic. Raeburn farm was kept separate as an investment and he thought it was essential.

Councillor Epiha said the community with septic tanks needed to have time to get used to the idea of a wastewater system, and felt connection could come at a later date.

Councillor Mugford noted that the only thing he would differ on is that he would carry on down the main street. He also made comments about Raeburn Farm and that Council needs a plan for its strategic assets

The Group Manager Organisational Performance noted it would be sensible to step back and look at the funding model.

Councillor Reid referred to the good discussion being held. She did note she had not had time to look at these other options that Councillor Miller had suggested, saying that all options should be looked at. She referred to her concern with the number of submissions setting out the cost burden and that Council needs be mindful of this

Councillor Lemon said that one of the great reasons he has always supported district-wide rating is that it smooths out the cost for all areas.

Mayor Broughton noted that the matter of Raeburn Farm will not be discussed today and other options as shown below will come up as part of future discussions. He also spoke to the matter Councillor Alexander raised where he was concerned of a potential financial conflict of interest from two elected members.

To this, the Chief Executive spoke to conflict advice provided by legal advisors stating that a conflict would exist where an Elected Member or Elected Member's property has greater benefit than anyone else in the affected area in the district. He confirmed that this is not the case in this instance and as such, a pecuniary interest does not exist. Councillor Lemon noted that if Council considered the alternative options, then a conflict may exist at that point.

Other options for Councillor consideration - to come discussion in future meetings:

1. All eligible properties pay ESSS rate from 2022 and get connected as the scheme progresses with a sunset date for this to be achieved of 5-10yrs (no further payment required)
2. Or, District wide rate pays for all on street infrastructure and landowner is liable for connection costs to on street piping (still done in a staged manner)
3. Or, SDC borrows capital amount to fund all connection works and is held as an interest only loan for 10yrs before repayments start (three waters reform would then likely take over) we must at least have the discussion of the likely impact of reform and how we should structure our costs in light of the uncertainty

4. Should Raeburn farm land be considered surplus and applied to the costs of installing infrastructure?

Agreed Council position

Council approves the project and breaks it into the following stages:

*Stage 1: Complete the pipeline to the Pines and require all new developments to connect **immediately**. Install and connect the Main St of Darfield in **2022/2023** for proposed construction with the timeframe for connection being 2023-2024*

Stage 2: Work with Environment Canterbury to determine risk areas around consented and unconsented septic tanks with the timeframe being 2021-2023. Undertake a funding review for consultation as part of the 2023/24 Annual Plan.

Stages 3 and 4 are subject to Stage, with a provisional timetable of:

- Stage 3: Installation of reticulation to high risk areas, (probably those areas with no consents in the older parts of townships) with the timeframe being 2025-2030*
- Stage 4: Installation of reticulation to non-high risk areas, (probably the newer areas of townships with existing discharge consents) with the timeframe 2031-2035*

DECISION 4 – what is your view on funding for maintaining our roads?

Staff comments

Staff acknowledge that submitters are supportive of Council's preferred option to increase the level of general rate-funded maintenance. This additional funding is needed to supplement Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency funding to preserve levels of service and deal with issues of ongoing growth across the district.

Councillor comments

Councillor Miller said in the past there was a targeted rate for remediation on an annual basis. He said adding this to the general rate means the money could get 'lost' and will not be targeted at maintenance. He stated that the collection mechanism was wrong and that he would prefer a uniform targeted rate.

Councillor McInnes disagreed with the option noting there was no clear cut majority from the submissions that there was overall support of this option. She said she had a problem with funding roads in general, not so much maintenance, but building new roads and sealing existing unsealed roads. She said this was a time to look at climate change with transport being one of the biggest problems in this space.

Councillor Reid also supported a targeted rate.

Councillor Lemon said the general funding was insufficient. Having a targeted rate would take into account benefits of growth.

Councillor Lyall said the level of funding from Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency was insufficient. He said every year Council runs into a deficit where we want more done with

less money. He did not think a targeted rate was a good idea and it was not consulted on, but he did think there may be a way the funding can be ring fenced to look at how it was apportioned as the year goes on. He noted his reluctant support of the option and further commented that pressure should be put on Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency to increase funding.

Councillor Epiha said the majority of the concerns were around rural and unsealed roads. He said there will never be enough funding and ring-fencing it was one option, whether it be general or targeted rates.

Councilor Bland agreed saying there was probably not enough money in Selwyn to get roads up to the standard people wanted. He did not support general rate but would like to vote for a targeted rate.

The Chief Executive said Council should consider the option of spending an extra \$1m and would ask staff how it can be spent if it was ring-fenced. He also confirmed that a targeted rate could not be put in place as Council did not consult on this. To consider this would require a special consultative process. Any targeted rate would around \$35 per ratepayer. This could be considered for future years, but not as part of this process.

The Group Manager Organisational Performance stated that there is a statutory 30% cap on uniform rates and Council is currently sitting at 29.7%, so a targeted rate could not be imposed without removing a targeted rate from another area as this 30% cap cannot be breached.

Council's Asset Manager Transportation noted that a targeted rate was more popular in the past because Council was unable to secure sufficient funding from Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency. He said the rate will be used for what it is intended for. The Group Manager Infrastructure also noted that supporting Option 1 is important as Council had not certainty as to the level of Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency funding.

It was agreed that monitoring the spending of the rate on roading maintenance will become an item on the monthly roading reports.

Mayor Broughton stated that Council went through a review a year ago about how roads are funded. He said that going forward Council will need to look at a targeted rate, but that the ability to implement this today is not an option.

Approved Council position:

Approve preferred option.

DECISION 5 – what Is Your View On The Future Roding And Transportation Projects?

Staff comments

Whilst it is acknowledged that there were some comments suggesting the programme as proposed be varied, there were few specific suggestions on how that would be done. Accordingly, staff acknowledge the support for Council's preferred option which justifies the proposed programme as identified in the Consultation Document. It is noted that this programme continues to be reviewed on an annual basis through the Draft Annual Plan process.

Councillor comments

Councillor Alexander agreed with the option noting the Prebbleton community was very specific about what they want. He said he asked staff a week ago for information on some of the small wins to be made around particularly the pedestrian crossing but had not heard back yet. He further commented that he would be happy to support the scheduled programme, but the requests from Prebbleton should be acknowledged. Councillor Mugford concurred with this comment.

Councillor Gallagher noted her agreement with the staff recommendation.

Councillor Miller said he questioned whether Council was getting enough Development Contributions from its growing communities, and he thought that Lincoln and Prebbleton township plans were too far on the horizon. He said it is clear they do not receive the same services as e.g. Rolleston. He said the increasing traffic in Prebbleton and Lincoln causes safety issues and it needed to be recognized as a priority.

Councillor McInnes agreed with Councillor Miller's comments regarding Development Contributions.

Councillor Reid said Council asked about climate change during the consultation and said Council needs to be mindful of not just continuing to increase traffic on the roads. Already Rolleston has the highest vehicle ownership in the country. She said there needs to be another look at where the public transport futures work programme is, ensuring changes are made with positive effects on climate change. She said that as it stands at present she agrees with the staff recommendation and comments.

Councillor Lemon also noted that inequity that Development Contributions can cause. He said that it would be good to be able to revisit this. He noted that there was a lot of work needed to be done in some of the communities, and that work was required to achieve good outcomes. He noted his support for the project but commented that Council has a lot of work to do in some of these communities so they can also see the benefits of growth.

Councillor Lyall said he had an issue with the main street of Prebbleton which is used by 16,000 cars per day with a primary school. He asked whether the speed limit could be dropped to 30kmh as it currently is a disaster waiting to happen. With regards to the project he noted his support but would also like to see the inequity in spend addressed, further stating this has always been a challenge during his time in Council.

Councillor Epiha stated that he had been reflecting on the presenters from Prebbleton, stating that roading improvements in Prebbleton should be brought forward. He noted his support of earlier comments about Development Contributions and that it may come down to sharing the Development Contributions around more. He said with outlying communities it was often not about creating new roads but making the existing roads safer.

Councillor Bland said he supported the decision noting that many internal arterial roads were built because of our reliance on Christchurch City for employment. He said it would be good to have a policy statement where Council would put some more effort into these outlying towns where they can support local employment to reduce travel.

Councillor Hasson highlighted inequities around some of the communities. She said the disproportionate pressure of growth is creating a situation where ratepayers are asked to pick up all the extra costs.

Councillor Reid said traffic calming could be brought forward for Prebbleton as a change in speed limit will not necessarily have the desired effects without calming installations as well. Staff explained the project and the reasons for why it may not be a good time now to lower the speed or look at too many projects as there were other projects progressing which will eventually have an impact.

Mayor Broughton said Council was restricted by legislation as to where Development Contributions can be spent. He said less travel needs to be our future. He looked forward to the Development Contributions review and asked the report to include the current status of the road programme.

Agreed Council position:

Approve the draft priorities unadjusted.

DECISION 6 – what is your view on the future of the new Prebbleton Community Centre?

Staff comments

Staff acknowledge the submitters' support for this project albeit noting that this project is five years away before construction (25/26). Staff will continue with appropriate feasibility discussions with interested parties and will report outcomes to Council together with suggested construction and location options.

Councillor comments

Councillors supported the option and offered up a range of other comments. Councillor Lyall said the timing was wrong. He said the project may be pushed out again for a further three years but he was pleased it was still in the plan. He said it needed to be brought forward.

Councillor Bland asked that it be brought forward, with Councillor Hasson also supportive of this.

Councillor Alexander noted the project seemed to be further along than the planning of Leeston. Leeston was brought forward because of earthquake prone buildings but this Prebbleton project has already been planned and there is a clear need for an appropriate facility.

The Chief Executive said he would be reluctant to see any change to this timeframe as this requires feasibility and resourcing for this to be done. This would also need to go out to go out for separate consultation again. Mayor Broughton said the timing allowed for a couple of years' more growth and to work through design, siting, and then for the construction to start in 25/26.

Council's Group Manager Property said staff would need to talk to the building owners on the domain and these were not short-term conversations. Staff would need to get clarity from the community exactly on what it was they needed. He also confirmed that Council is committed to the new park on Birches Road.

Mayor Broughton said staff should build into the timeline the design phase at 2023/2024 as this will signal to the community that things are happening.

Approved Council position

Proceed with the project as per the staff advice.

DECISION 7 – what is your view on the future of the Leeston Library and Community Centre?

Staff comments

Staff support the completion of this project. It is noted that the Leeston project is a multitude of parts being:

- Community Centre
- Library
- Development / upgrade of Leeston Park
- The needs of users of the park, i.e. Rugby, cricket, netball, small bore rifle shooting (amongst others)
- The repurpose or possible removal of the Leeston Rugby Club building and associated buildings
- The Leeston Medical Centre project and whether it is located on the park, and if so, what land needs to be purchased within appropriate financial viability of that commercial investment activity

Staff will continue to engage with the local community and will also work on the programme to achieve and deliver on the points above through Masterplan for the reserve. The timing of this project will now be spread over the first two years of the Long Term Plan **with construction completed in 24 / 25.**

Councillor comments

Councillor Miller noted that Council must be strategic and ensure it gets the widest range of services. In this instance he thought it was a good solution and goes wider thinking about the future of Leeston and Ellesmere.

Councillor Miller spoke about his experience with the Tai Tapu Community Centre, reflecting on the timeframe for this. His view is that timeframe is about right and this project ticks a number of boxes. He noted that the current building is not up to specification, and Council cannot walk away from this. Councillor Miller then stated that Council prides itself at looking to the future and integrating facilities onto reserves works well. It is noted that the Rugby Club building is uneconomic to repair. He thought both the Leeston and Prebbleton projects could be run simultaneously.

Councillor McInnes said that Leeston was growing but is not well connected or linked to other community centres. She noted a range of views around the Rugby Club building, but the club itself confirmed that it is going to be uninhabitable in 10 years. She stated that Ellesmere needs a place to call a centre.

Councillor Mugford agreed with the way forward, but noted that it will be a complex operation and will take a lot of time to develop. Councillor Reid noted her support for the project.

Councillor Lemon said this was also a complex issue as the rugby club is not a Council-owned building. This is an opportunity for an anchor project in Ellesmere going forward. He noted some confusion in the community around the Lake Road sections, but confirmed there are no pre-conceived outcomes at this point, but rather, has given Council options.

Councillor Epiha said it was a diverse community and supported the project as it would provide a much-needed hub in Leeston.

Councillor Bland confirmed his support of the timeframe, but noted that Council had received feedback from some submitters that consultation or communication had not been that good.

Councillor Hasson commented that these facilities are worthy, but feels that Council will be time-pushed – stating that the timeframe is unrealistic. She noted that with regards to Prebbleton, the townships has been consulted with twice on this facility. She commented that Council has just started consultation with Leeston.

Councillor Alexander said Council should proceed but do so with caution. He said the community might want a much larger venue that what they need. The potential location should be considered carefully.

Councillor Gallagher noted her support commenting that there is still a lot of discussion to be had.

Council's Group Manager Property, said it is important to understand the plan. He too spoke to the consultation activity and spoke to an idea that had been discussed around siting the Community Centre at the Heritage Park. He noted that the Rugby Club have confirmed that they are finished with their building, and the reality is, that if the centre is situated on the Reserve, then the building will need to be removed. He spoke to the Lake Road sites and confirmed that Staff will bring a report to Council at the end of June regarding purchase of another section.

Council's Group Manager Property confirmed that this is a complex procedure. It is envisaged that design work will proceed in 21/22 with construction in 23/24, saying that it may be pushed out.

The Chief Executive said with a number of other large projects coming to an end, project managers will become available. Council would also look at external resourcing if needed.

Mayor Broughton agreed it is a complicated procedure, that whilst there is still a lot of work to be done, there is support for the project. He noted that Council should be realistic with the timeframe and not be overly ambitious and that rushing is not the answer. Council needs to ensure the community is with Council.

Councillor Lemon spoke to the consultation that has occurred to date. He said it was worth noting that the community committee is supportive of the proposal. He noted the Rugby Club is also in favour of the work. Councillor Lemon noted that there has not been a lack of consultation and that going forward Council will be consulting on what the facility will look like.

Agreed Council position

Proceed with the project as per the staff advice.

DECISION 8 – what is your view on the future of the Hororata Community Centre?

Staff comments

The issues between Go Hororata and the Hororata Community Trust have been well-captured through the submission/ hearing process.

Staff will now re-engage with the Hororata Groups to finalise community preference around option 1 with a report back to Council December 2021 with a recommendation.

Councillor comments

Councillors agreed that there be further engagement with the Hororata Groups. The following comments were made around the table:

Councillor McInnes supported the idea of a cultural hub, but including sporting facilities may also be appropriate. There would also be a need to include a transport plan.

Councillor Mugford said Council decided some time ago to build a Hall up to \$4.7m provided the community could come up with \$2m. Council then changed its mind. He asked how many other communities are asked to do the same.

Councillor Reid noted that she was still not entirely sure as to how the building will be used and the expectations around it as there are a lot of factors at play. She said that Heritage NZ advocated for the re-use the old Hall building. She also noted that it is not about the capital build costs, but rather the operational costs over the life of the building. She said she is still unsure as to how this building will be used. Councillor Reid then noted that the submissions are quite split. She said she did not have a preference and would like to hear the other options and Councillor comments.

Councillor Lemon said there was an opportunity to engage with the community and when staff report back in December he would be in a better position to make a decision. He said it was a complicated problem and Council does not have the clarity or surety that this will be the right decision yet.

Councillor Lyall said this was a passionate community who got out and did things. He believed they needed a facility and said the community has the ability to grow if Council could alleviate the water issues. He said the Community may turn their attention to the old hall and possibly restoring it once the new facility was built.

Councillor Epiha said there was strong messaging from the community that they want and need this facility. They have put a lot of effort into it and they were motivated. He added the project should clearly state what the old hall will look like and how it will be protected in the community. He noted caution on getting into a JV with the community and would advise against it.

Councillor Bland said he was reluctant to tell someone they can only have a facility if they put money into it. He said Council should build or plan for a hall and ask the community whether they wanted to add anything to it, out of their own pockets. He did feel Council should give them the certainty of a fit for purpose facility in the very near future.

Councillor Hasson commented on the vibrancy of the community in the 50s and 60s. She said she also supports a fit for purpose building on the reserve for the activities that the domain has. She concurred with Councillor Lyall that the district needs to start preserving

some of its heritage. She said the Hall has the opportunity for a museum to be established to attract people and supports investigation of this.

Councillor Alexander said that Council needs to rationalise its district hall network, saying that it was important to determine the right size of hall in the network. He said he was uncomfortable being held hostage by the community. He commented that he was unsure as to what costs Council is going to carry. He also noted that he was concerned about the retention of the bones of the existing building stating that Council should end up with two buildings in Hororata to maintain and operate.

Councillor Alexander suggested that the Hall is given to a museum to run – noting that they would then be followed with a funding request. He said he is calling for some degree of prudence in its decision-making.

Councillor Miller said Council should not allow communities to engage their own architects with aspirations, and said Council should consult on what was needed, and then control the project.

Councillor Gallagher voiced her support for a new building in Hororata, and stated that there has never been a discussion that Council would be maintaining both buildings. She also referred to this community as very passionate. She stated that she was unhappy about the comments that Councillor Alexander made about the community trying to buy the Council to get a new building. She stated that the Hororata community is willing to put money into this project, but this needs to be worked through.

Council's Group Manager Property said this was one of Council's biggest domains and quite a different one compared to others in the district. He noted that the operational costs are allowed for in the Long Term Plan. He spoke to the \$4.7m figure being at the top end and made reference to the \$3m budget as set out in the Long Term Plan. He added the reserve management plan will get completed as a result of this work. He stated that although the Hororata community is well organised, Council would need to make sure we use this energy correctly.

Mayor Broughton said Council should be the driver of the project. It was agreed that funding arrangements would need to be confirmed. The Chief Executive said he would expect a staff report to Council in December 2021 at which point Council can further debate and make decisions as to the future of the Hall.

Approved Council position

That a report will come back to Council in December 2021 after staff have engaged with the groups in Hororata.

DECISION 9 – changes to policies

Staff comments

Staff acknowledge that the majority of submitters support the proposed changes to Council's Significance and Engagement Policy, and Financial Policies, and recommend that Council adopt these as presented.

Councillor Comments

Councillors agreed with Councillor Epiha noting that Māori development should be considered – all Māori, not just mana whenua.

Approved Council position

Proceed with the preferred option.

The meeting stopped for lunch at 12.20pm and resumed at 1.00pm.

ADDITIONAL FUNDING REQUESTS AND OTHER MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION

The following matters were also discussed as part of the hearing and deliberations processes.

Strategic Partnerships:

| | |
|--------------------------------|---|
| <i>Submitter</i> | Te Ara Kākāriki Greenway Canterbury Trust (TAK) |
| <i>Councillor discussion</i> | <p>The Mayor explained the process of grouping the themes together. Over the next 18 months papers will be presented to Council as to how Council will work with their strategic partners. It provides a level of certainty over a three year period of funding. The recommended start position was merely a starting point for conversation and developed by the Mayor and senior management.</p> <p>Councillors said they would be satisfied with the increase to \$40k as that is what they asked for. The group has gone from strength to strength. It was also acknowledged that having volunteers was beneficial and that bringing some of the work in-house would actually be more costly.</p> |
| <i>Proposed decision</i> | TAK to continue to be a Strategic Partner of Council. Funding to be \$40,000 |
| <i>Agreed Council position</i> | As per proposed decision |

| | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| <i>Submitter</i> | Lincoln EnviroTown Trust |
| <i>Councillor discussion</i> | <p>Councillors agreed that this work was no longer only Lincoln based but Selwyn wide. The group will be encourage to update council. Some Councillors thought \$50k would be sufficient with most Councillors agreeing with the proposed \$55k.</p> |
| <i>Proposed decision</i> | Lincoln EnviroTown Trust to continue to be a Strategic Partner of Council. Funding to be \$55,000 |
| <i>Agreed Council position</i> | As per proposed decision |

| | |
|--------------------------------|---|
| <i>Submitter</i> | Two Rivers Trust, Out There Youth Trust, Selwyn Wairewa Youth Trust, Hope Youth, La Vida Youth Trust |
| <i>Other submitter</i> | 100599 |
| <i>Councillor discussion</i> | A reduction in funding was noted. Councillors agreed with Councillor McInnes noting she would like to have a better understanding of their recruitment policy. To this it was noted that a review is forthcoming. She said no other group this restricted in recruiting from the diverse community they work in. would get any funding. |
| <i>Proposed decision</i> | 24/7 will continued to be funded as a Strategic Partner of Council. Funding to be reduced from \$84,000 to \$70,000 |
| <i>Agreed Council position</i> | As per proposed decision. |

| | |
|--------------------------------|---|
| <i>Submitter</i> | Selwyn Sports Trust |
| <i>Councillor discussion</i> | The good work of the Trust was noted. Discussion was held around the level of funding. Councillor Alexander said he would support a lift to \$45k if the trust could secure matched funding through corporate support. |
| <i>Proposed decision</i> | Majority of Councillors agreed to \$35k and a review as part of the way forward. The Mayor referred to Councillor Alexander's comment around matching, confirming that the funding would be \$35k this year, then reviewed going forward. |
| <i>Agreed Council position</i> | As per proposed decision |

Mana Whenua

| | |
|------------------------------|---|
| <i>Submitter</i> | Te Taumutu Rūnanga |
| <i>Councillor discussion</i> | <p>Mayor Broughton talked about engagement with Te Taumutu Rūnanga as well as the quarterly executive meetings. He said feedback indicated there were many things we would like engagement on but unfortunately Taumutu didn't have the capacity to work with Council. It was noted that Ngāti Moki Marae is a special place in our district.</p> <p>Councillor Alexander said to provide funding for the Marae would essence mean funding a non-Council facility. Councillor Miller said he didn't have enough information to decide on the right funding amount and where it is going. He added he thought that Council's relationship with Te Taumutu Rūnanga was already very strong.</p> |

| | |
|--------------------------------|---|
| | <p>Mayor Broughton said the money would go towards the marae, not for relationship building.</p> <p>The Councillors said they had no objection for a sum of money to be used for the marae but would want to know how it would benefit Council or the Rūnanga for that matter. Councillor Lyall said this marae was Selwyn's marae and it provides the district's residents a way to develop their cultural understanding. He fully supported \$50,000, noting that the Marae needs financial backing.</p> <p>Councillor Epiha said it was an acknowledgement to mana whenua. He reflected on the Treaty noting it was an agreement between the Māori people of New Zealand and the Crown. He said he did not support funding for the operational cost of the Marae, but would support funding to continue the relationship. He said he hopes that the Mana Whakahono a Rohe (MWaR) Agreement goes ahead.</p> <p>Councillor Bland said he was disappointed with the responses around the table and said the marae signifies the delicate thread that give us the Māori history. It was part of the District's heritage and as such the marae is significant to the district.</p> <p>Various discussion was held around the funding requested, noting that clarity is required.</p> <p>The Chief Executive referred to Te Taumutu Rūnanga's original submission. He said it was prudent to set aside an appropriate sum of money and that Council receive a report in this regard.</p> |
| <i>Proposed decision</i> | Council to set up a Mana Whenua partnership Committee. Progress formal arrangements on Partnership and Rangatiratanga. Provide \$50,000 as Significant Strategic Partner. |
| <i>Agreed Council position</i> | Agreed to hold \$50,000 in the budget and have further discussions on what the money will be used for, before making a formal decision. |

Full-sized Hockey Turf

| | |
|------------------------------|---|
| <i>Submitters</i> | Waikirikiri Hockey Club, Canterbury Artificial Surfaces Trust and Canterbury Hockey Association Inc |
| <i>Other submitters</i> | 100212, 100248, 100325, 100310, 100328, 100331, 100282, 100283, 100312, 100390, 100472, 100617, 100619, 100362, 100373, 100622 & 100641 |
| <i>Councillor discussion</i> | Councillors spoke to the quality of the submission, noting that they are in support of the inclusion of the hockey turf. |

| | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| | It was noted by staff that it would be funded by Development Contributions and the Reserve Rate. Staff also confirmed that the ongoing costs of maintaining the pitch would be through the reserve rate and supplemented by usage charges. |
| <i>Proposed decision</i> | Continue with providing full size Hockey Turf in 2021-22. |
| <i>Agreed Council position</i> | Support with some discussion on which side of the reserve to place the full-sized turf. That Waikirikiri Hockey Club be included in consultation about location. |

Full-sized Football Turf

| | |
|--------------------------------|---|
| <i>Submitters</i> | Selwyn United Football Club |
| <i>Other submitters</i> | 100188, 100190, 100192, 100194, 100196, 100197, 100198, 100199, 100201, 100202, 100203, 100205, 100207, 100239, 100240, 100241, 100244, 100245, 100253, 100254, 100255, 100256, 100257, 100259, 100265, 100268, 100277, 100278, 100279, 100286, 100386, 100389 & 100392 |
| <i>Councillor discussion</i> | <p>Staff gave an introduction to this item saying that they have had an in-depth look at this, factoring in growth. It was noted that there will be capacity issues over the next 3-4 years, and it is the most popular sport in the district and they will be struggling for space. It was noted that the Club would lose capacity with the full sized hockey turf going in.</p> <p>The QLDC model for pitches was discussed. Staff commented on funding being unbudgeted, but that it would be partially funded through Development Contributions (\$1m) and the Reserve Rate (\$0.5m). An Annual Plan adjustment for rates would be next year. It was noted that the funding impact on rates would be about \$2 per ratepayer.</p> <p>Comments were made about the operating costs. A discussion was also held around what the wider role of Council is when it comes to funding requests from sporting codes.</p> |
| <i>Proposed decision</i> | Include provision in 2021-2022 subject to discussion with Mainland football and confirmed suitable funding arrangements. Increase reserves Development Contributions accordingly. Both pitches to go in at the same time. |
| <i>Agreed Council position</i> | Councillors supported the recommendation noting there should be a traffic management plan for Foster Park and said there wasn't enough bike parks. |

Gymnastics Facility

| | |
|--------------------------------|---|
| <i>Submitters</i> | Affinity Gymnastics |
| <i>Other submitters</i> | 100291, 100293, 100295, 100298, 100305, 100306, 100308, 100309, 100312, 100324, 100100332, 100340, 100341, 100383, 100410, 100411, 100412, 100437, 100441, 100442, 100443, 100444, 100459, 100480, 100481, 100482, 100591, 100614, 100616 |
| <i>Councillor discussion</i> | <p>Councillor Miller referred to the submission saying they are looking at hand up, not a hand out. He asked how this group fit in with the strategy of council and said staff might need to give Council more information. From a strategic point of view there was a large building in Rolleston that could be fit for purpose and he said he thought Council should assist them.</p> <p>Comments were raised about the use of the Rolleston Community Centre. To this, Councillor Alexander spoke to previously agreed way forward the Rolleston Community Centre Committee.</p> <p>Staff said the group would not be able to fund the build but could part fund it back from their lease. They said pushing this out to December 2021 will allow them to review the work and add it to the strategy. Some potential funding streams were raised by staff which would differ based on the site of any facility.</p> <p>The design phase should take staff up to the end of 2021, with construction probably in the latter part of 2022, through to 2023.</p> |
| <i>Proposed decision</i> | Staff to provide scope, scale and funding analysis for consideration by Council prior to December 2021. |
| <i>Agreed Council position</i> | Councillors agreed in principle provided they got more details at a future meeting. This will also include information on what was going to happen to the existing Rolleston Community Centre. |

Heritage and Historical Facilities / Funding

| | |
|-------------------------|---|
| <i>Submitters</i> | Selwyn Heritage and Historical Network, Ellesmere Historical Society, Leeston Community Committee, Darfield Genealogy and Local History Inc, Hororata Historical Society, Prebbleton Heritage, Heritage New Zealand, Lincoln and Districts Society Inc and Malvern Community Board. |
| <i>Other submitters</i> | 100084, 100087, 100318, 100469, 100321, 100387, 100434, 100128, 100129, 100130, 100178, 100195, 100506, 100516, 100534, 100565 & 100588 |

| | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| <i>Councillor discussion</i> | <p>Councillor McInnes supports a heritage strategy saying that Council does not spend enough money on heritage. She noted that \$50,000 for immediate support is great, but nowhere near enough. Councillor Mugford said a staff report to note who was doing what would be helpful. Councillors agreed that heritage was important.</p> <p>Councillor Bland noted his disappointment that the Burnham Museum submission didn't form part of this document. He said the building was deteriorating quite rapidly.</p> <p>Multiple comments were made supporting a proposed \$20 rate as part of the 2022-2023 Annual Plan and how it fits in with Council's 30% uniform rate cap.</p> <p>Councillor Hasson said if general rates are increased, the biggest percentage of money will come from rural communities, but the biggest users of the facility will be urban. Councillors noted heritage would need a governance group or mechanism to rely on.</p> <p>Regarding the Canterbury Museum submission staff told Council that there was an agreement they would bring displays out to Selwyn.</p> |
| <i>Proposed decision</i> | <p>Council to spend 2021-22 working with heritage sector to inform a Selwyn Heritage Strategy. The strategy will inform future funding and projects including a possible \$20 rate as part of the 2022-23 Annual Plan.</p> <p>Costs to develop strategy included in Yr1 of LTP -\$50,000 in 2021-22 immediate support for Heritage groups.</p> <p>Councillors appointed to support strategy Development (Councillors Mugford & Bland).</p> <p>Prioritise use of Rolleston Community Centre as community, Art, Youth and Heritage space.</p> |
| <i>Agreed Council position</i> | As per the proposed decision. |

| | |
|------------------------------|--|
| <i>Submitter</i> | 100069 – Regimental History Centre |
| <i>Councillor discussion</i> | <p>It was noted that this submission was missed off the pre-work provided to Councillors. Staff comments were that the proposal to utilize space at the Rolleston CC/former Library space for location of the Regimental History Centre has been considered by Council previously.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that a facility of this type could be an asset to the community and provide a more publicly accessible venue. With the impending opening of new community facilities in Rolleston it is difficult to gauge the impact on current space at Rolleston CC (RCC) and, for this reason, it is proposed to make RCC (and the former library space) available for a variety of alternative community uses and to monitor use in the short term</p> |

| | |
|--------------------------------|---|
| | <p>to fully understand how all the facilities will best work together for the community.</p> <p>It is known that some of the existing RCC users will continue to require space and there is also a need to provide space for Council's own requirements (library material storage). There will be an opportunity for groups such as the Regimental History Centre to express interest in utilizing space at RCC in the next few months (noting that exclusive use occupations could potential be considered).</p> <p>It is noted that RCC is an earthquake risk building (40% NBS) and it may be prudent to undertake strengthening works if the building was to be extensively refurbished for alternative uses.</p> |
| <i>Agreed Council position</i> | As per staff recommended comments. |

Arts Representation

| | |
|--------------------------------|---|
| <i>Submitters</i> | Creative Communities and Committee of Arts Heath Selwyn Central Arts Council |
| <i>Other submitters</i> | 100519 & 100654 |
| <i>Councillor discussion</i> | <p>Councillor Alexander said he agreed in general with staff to work on looking at the Rolleston Community Centre future options but with no commitment with anything specific now. Councillors agreed there was a need for more youth spaces.</p> <p>Councillor McInnes noted more youth spaces are needed. She also referred to there being plenty of advice about funding available within Council, but somehow people are still unsure what to do, so perhaps we need to make the messages clearer and more widely available.</p> |
| <i>Proposed decision</i> | <p>To use Rolleston Community Centre as a Community Art, Youth & Heritage space.</p> <p>Council to consider how staff working there could be upskilled to provide programmes focused on Youth, Arts & History.</p> <p>Staff to work with providers and look at Rolleston Community Centre for future options.</p> |
| <i>Agreed Council position</i> | As per the proposed decision. |

Planning

| | |
|-------------------|---|
| <i>Submitters</i> | 100023, 100026, 100043, 100505, 100401, 100222, 100480, 100492, 100508, 100512, 100551, 100552, 100560, 100560, 100562, 100584, 100555, 100563, 100583, 100587, 100612, 100623, 100631 & 100424 |
|-------------------|---|

| | |
|--------------------------------|---|
| <i>Councillor discussion</i> | <p>Councillor Mugford noted that the township of Glentunnel would like the underground light installation work completed.</p> <p>It was noted that a lot of the submissions around town planning, urban expansion and growth are best dealt with as part of the District Plan review.</p> <p>Comments were made on the upcoming National Policy Statements.</p> <p>Councillor Ephraim referred to his support for staff to commence with the Leeston Town Centre study. It was noted that other Township Plans need updating.</p> |
| <i>Proposed decision</i> | <p>Staff to review & look to complete the undergrounding installation of street lighting work in Glentunnel.</p> <p>Staff to look at new planting in Prebbleton as part of main street improvements.</p> <p>Most comments made by submitters will be dealt with as part of the District Plan Review.</p> |
| <i>Agreed Council position</i> | As per the proposed decision. |

The meeting broke for afternoon tea at 3.07pm and reconvened at 3.30pm.

Sportsgrounds and Facilities

| | |
|------------------------------|---|
| <i>Submitters</i> | Ellesmere Archery Club, Rolleston Residents' Association, Sport Canterbury, Springston Community Committee & West Melton Reserve Board |
| <i>Other submitters</i> | 100030, 100218, 100480, 100490 & 100549 |
| <i>Councillor discussion</i> | <p>Planting around reserves to shelter against wind.</p> <p>Plaques on benches in memorial parks;</p> <p>Councillor Lyall noted that he would like to have seen Prebbleton included in comments around cricket pitches.</p> <p>Councillor Hasson referred to comments in submissions about the need for more rubbish bins in reserves, particularly for those who are walking dogs. Councillor Alexander asked if Council was to install more bins for the use of dogs, then would it need to raise the dog registration rate to pay for this.</p> <p>Councillor Alexander then referred to advance the work on the Master Plan for the District Park in Rolleston noting that Foster Park is essentially full. He referred to the need to start boundary planting at the District Park.</p> <p>Comments were made on the need to consider the lighting at sports parks, and that there needs to be a district-wide</p> |

| | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| | <p>approach. Mayor Broughton noted that a report will be ready soon on this and will include community assets on reserves.</p> <p>Councillor Alexander referred to the Rolleston Residents' Association submission on the need for more resting places in townships, so that as people age, they cannot walk as far as they used to. He suggested that this is included in the Walking and Cycling strategy.</p> <p>Councillor Miller supported Councillor Alexander's comments around tree planting at the district wide park, but noted that he will wait for the Strategy document being worked on by staff.</p> <p>Councillor McInnes noted that she too supported the boundary planting at the district park, noting there are lots of groups that can be called upon to assist with planting.</p> <p>It was noted that there is no plan in the 10 year horizon for a new aquatic facility in Darfield / Malvern.</p> |
| <i>Proposed decision</i> | As per staff recommendations attached to each submission |
| <i>Agreed Council position</i> | As per the proposed decision. |

Schools

| | |
|--------------------------------|---|
| <i>Submitters</i> | Hororata Primary School & West Rolleston Primary School |
| <i>Other submitters</i> | 100318 |
| <i>Councillor discussion</i> | <p>Councillors were in agreement with the staff recommended actions.</p> <p>Councillor Alexander noted this agreement with the staff comments on West Rolleston School, but not with the comments in for Hororata Primary school, saying that giving endowment land to schools is an inappropriate use of Council land.</p> <p>Councillor Reid said it was good to see Council is going to work with West Rolleston Primary on their footpath. She said this is a facility that they are wanting to have open for the community, so it is good that Council is working with them.</p> |
| <i>Proposed decision</i> | <p>Councillors and staff to meet with Hororata Primary school with regards to the best use of the land.</p> <p>With regards to West Rolleston Primary School, the Council will proceed as per the staff recommended actions to work with the School on their proposed community bike track, and the speed limit outside of the school as part of their Speed Limit review.</p> |
| <i>Agreed Council position</i> | As per the proposed decision. |

Rates

| | |
|--------------------------------|---|
| <i>Submitters</i> | Federated Farmers & Ellesmere Sustainable Agriculture Inc |
| <i>Other submitters</i> | 100035, 100053, 100304, 100330, 100380, 100426, 100484, 100579, 100635, 100594, 100420, 100531, 100564, 100596 & 100582 |
| <i>Councillor discussion</i> | <p>Councillor Bland noted that a lot of farmers had properties which had been handed down by generations which had gained in value over time which has a substantial impact on the amount of rates they had to pay. He said this was becoming unsustainable for them. He said that perhaps there could be incentives for property owners who add positive environmental features to their properties to have some sort of rates reduction.</p> <p>It was noted that if rates were reduced for some, then others would have to pay more to make up for the shortfall.</p> <p>He also spoke to the issue of the SUIP, particularly as it relates to granny flats. Councillors Lemon and Miller explained the work done as part of the 2019/2020 review. It was noted that there were so many anomalies that in the best interests of fairness, that it was determined, that the current system was the fairest. It was noted that this would be looked at again in 2023 which will work in well with the District Plan Review.</p> <p>Councillor Hasson spoke about the system for charging for water races. She said there could be a system of credits introduced which is part of the future direction of Council to manage climate change.</p> <p>Further comments were made by Councillors on the issue of rates affordability, particularly on those with very large rural properties. It was noted that Councils must adhere to the Rating Act. Further, whilst ratepayers want rates to be frozen or reduced, they still require the same, or better levels of service.</p> |
| <i>Proposed decisions</i> | <p>Nitrates and fresh water are the responsibility of ECAN.</p> <p>Council to continue to work proactively with large and heavy fleets on identifying the best routes.</p> <p>UAGC is set at maximum allowable value.</p> <p>Refer to the SUIP review completed in 2019/2020 and review again in 2023.</p> |
| <i>Agreed Council position</i> | As per the proposed decision and staff recommendations and comments. |

Transport

| | |
|--------------------------------|---|
| <i>Submitters</i> | 100055, 100060, 100077, 100480, 100491, 100518 & 100169 |
| <i>Councillor discussion</i> | Brief comments were made around public transportation, Park and Ride facilities, and other transportation matters. |
| <i>Proposed decision</i> | As per staff recommendations and comments. It was noted that Council submitted to ECAN to trial an around-Rolleston MyWay service similar to the one being used in Timaru. |
| <i>Agreed Council position</i> | As per the proposed decision. |

Environment and climate change

| | |
|------------------------------|--|
| <i>Submitters</i> | Fish and Game, Canterbury District Health Board, Heritage New Zealand, Ellesmere Sustainable Agriculture Inc, Environment Canterbury, Forest and Bird Society, Federated Farmers, QEII National Trust, Sustainable Otautahi Christchurch Inc & Summit Road Society |
| <i>Other submitters</i> | 100108, 100115, 100364, 100210, 100424, 100425, 100436, 100469, 100478, 100549, 100496, 100497, 100448, 100449, 100461, 100491, 100516, 100517, 100535, 100536, 100549, 100552, 100304, 100590, 100593, 100594 & 100618 |
| <i>Councillor discussion</i> | Councillors stated they were pleased that Council would now look at appointing additional staff for climate change and sustainability work. Councillors agreed it was good to see a staff increase proposed. Acknowledgement that climate change is a challenging space to work in as it cuts across so many different business units. Councillor Alexander had concerns around the nitrate levels which is at the level in Selwyn, which the Health Board states should not be given to infants. He asked for a staff report back on what Council's next steps would be, e.g. would wells be dug deeper. Mayor Broughton asked that this be reported as part of the water services monthly update to Council. |
| <i>Proposed decision</i> | As per staff recommendations and comments. Council will employ lead staff member for Climate Change & Sustainability. Staff to meet with submitter 100210 (A. Booth) and report back to October 2021 Council meeting on his plastic recycling initiative. |

| | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| | <p>Council requests CEO to look at staff resourcing for biodiversity. SDC biodiversity strategy to be drafted. Scope to include future funding needs.</p> <p>Noting that Public Transport services are controlled by Environment Canterbury, Council has submitted its plan to increase services in Selwyn.</p> <p>Council will ask Environment Canterbury to engage with submitters about the Coalgate bridge and Coalgate river bed – this will be facilitated by Councillors.</p> |
| <i>Agreed Council position</i> | As per the proposed decision. |

Croquet Facility

| | |
|------------------------------|---|
| <i>Submitters</i> | Croquet Steering Group |
| <i>Other submitters</i> | 100057, 100058, 100086, 100090, 100231, 100231, 100252, 100370, 100402, 100415, 100524, 100525 & 100641 |
| <i>Councillor discussion</i> | <p>Croquet development and irrigation will be mostly funded from development contributions at a cost of approximately \$350k.</p> <p>Councillor Miller said it comes back to the overall sport strategy. He questioned why this would go ahead as opposed to Affinity Gymnastics or any other group. He questioned the equity in the decision compared to e.g. tennis clubs asking for \$20k. To a question from the Mayor as to whether he would like to change it, Councillor Miller said the club brings nothing, not even a constitution, yet Council was prepared to build a facility and hope they come to use. He added he would want more diligence before a final decision. He said the group would need to tell Council how they propose to run it, get a committee together and in particular tell Council how it will run the operational expenditure.</p> <p>Staff said planning has been going on for a number of years. There is a steering group with a significant number of patrons. The large number of people travel into town to play croquet. This will bring something into the District which isn't currently enjoyed here. The Club will also do all of the maintenance themselves so there will be no ongoing costs to Council.</p> <p>The Chief Executive noted that staff would meet with the lead submitter to sort out the details.</p> <p>Councillor Lyall said it should go ahead as this will mean bringing an old sport back to a new facility within the District.</p> <p>Councillor Gallagher asked about a budget for tennis courts to be resurface to which staff said there was one. She asked about courts on council reserves but not owned by Council to which staff said just because a club asset is on Council land doesn't mean Council should maintain it. The first part of the work is to fully understand ownership and present information</p> |

| | |
|--------------------------------|---|
| | <p>in a report to Council. A decision to move to funding of all club assets which are on Council ground brings with it a huge complexity.</p> <p>Councillors agreed with the timelines set out.</p> |
| <i>Proposed decision</i> | <p>Staff note that Council is aware of the increasing demand in the district for a croquet facility. A budget has been set aside in the LTP for development of a dedicated croquet area at Broadfields Reserve with planning in 2022/23 and physical works proposed in 2023/24.</p> |
| <i>Agreed Council position</i> | <p>As per the staff's recommended actions.</p> |

Darfield Recreation Facilities including Aquatic Facility

| | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| <i>Submitters</i> | <p>Malvern Community Board, Sport Canterbury & Coalgate Township Committee</p> |
| <i>Other submitters</i> | <p>100061, 100124, 100455, 100593, 100285, 100288, 100348, 100427 & 100174</p> |
| <i>Councillor discussion</i> | <p>Councillor Alexander said bringing the project forward and starting with construction was a concern. The potential threat of Council amalgamation was much higher than 9 years ago should Selwyn join with its neighbours.</p> <p>Councillor Alexander noted his support for this for 2030. He did not think that the staff assessment of the potential for it has been satisfactory. He supported the recommendation that this is included in the next Long Term Plan and that Council works with Community Groups to identify location and funding.</p> <p>Councillor Mugford said he was disappointed to spend \$1.5m for the current pool and that the project should be brought forward.</p> <p>Councillor Gallagher did not want to spend any money on the existing facility which might only extend its life by another five years. She would like this brought back for a timeline review.</p> <p>Councillor Miller agreed with Councillor Alexander's comments and said it goes back to the wider question of an aquatic strategy for both Malvern and Ellesmere. Mayor Broughton noted that Sheffield needs to be brought into the discussions.</p> |
| <i>Proposed decision</i> | <p>Work strategically with groups in Darfield including the schools to identify opportunities to collate sports & aquatic facilities. Start the conversation in 2021.</p> |
| <i>Agreed Council position</i> | <p>As per the proposed decision.</p> |

Sporting Grounds – Cricket Facilities

| | |
|--------------------------------|---|
| <i>Submitters</i> | Canterbury Country Cricket Association, Weedons Cricket Club & Springston Cricket Club |
| <i>Councillor discussion</i> | <p>Staff worked with Canterbury Cricket Association on the future demand for cricket facilities.</p> <p>The bigger picture is when youth numbers grow - it would be great if we had a space there for a Canterbury country cricket cup, this side of the Waimakariri river. Also for a Canterbury Country Rugby game.</p> <p>Noted the staff strategy coming back to Council.</p> |
| <i>Proposed decision</i> | Ask staff to work with cricket association on a programme for future development. |
| <i>Agreed Council position</i> | As per the proposed decision. |

Skate Park in Leeston

| | |
|--------------------------------|---|
| <i>Submitters</i> | 100080 & 100081 |
| <i>Councillor discussion</i> | Councillor Epiha thanked the staff for their comments as part of the process. |
| <i>Proposed decision</i> | An extension and major redevelopment of Leeston Park is planned from 2022. This will involve developing a Master Plan for the park which will include the skate park and consider any improvements to this facility. There will be an opportunity for community input to this planning process. |
| <i>Agreed Council position</i> | As per the proposed decision. |

Whitecliffs / Glentunnel Walkway

| | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| <i>Submitters</i> | Whitecliffs Township Committee & Coalgate Township Committee |
| <i>Other submitters</i> | 100272, 100428, 100433, 100450, 100320 & 100516 |
| <i>Councillor discussion</i> | It was noted that Council needs to look at connection both ends of path into towns. |
| <i>Proposed decision</i> | <p>The completion of the Whitecliffs to Glentunnel Cycleway is programmed for 2021/22 in the proposed LTP.</p> <p>The pathway proper is considered to start north of SH77.</p> |
| <i>Agreed Council position</i> | As per the staff recommended action. |

Traffic and road safety

| | |
|--------------------------------|---|
| <i>Submitters</i> | Raineys Road Residents & Rolleston Residents' Association |
| <i>Other submitters</i> | 100246, 100251, 100260, 100421, 100519, & 100518 |
| <i>Councillor discussion</i> | <p>Councillor Alexander spoke of a submitter who said she walked from Falcon Landing to the bus in the dark. He said it is a safety issue. Council was one of the owners of the properties in that gap and as such it should fund lights against a future development contribution.</p> <p>Councillor Reid said there was another issue at play here, in that those properties have not yet been developed and therefore there is a misperception it's safe to walk there. There was hardly any traffic there and so not having lights will discourage people to walk there. People don't generally walk where there is no lighting or other people around.</p> <p>Mayor Broughton asked staff to report back to Council as to whether it can future fund lights from development contributions. He said there would be no rating impact.</p> <p>In terms of dust on roads staff said there were dust signs to alert people to slow down and there are also 30k speed signs up. Staff also talked about a nationwide trail of dust suppression equipment.</p> |
| <i>Proposed decision</i> | <p>Carry on with national dust suppression trial. It was noted that there are currently 30kmh signs on Raineys Road to control speed.</p> <p>It was noted that staff will shortly be bringing a report to Council looking at speed limits on unsealed roads.</p> <p>Staff to investigate road condition on Wards Road. It is noted that there is no new funding available for sealing.</p> |
| <i>Agreed Council position</i> | As per the staff recommended actions. |

Coalgate Reserve

| | |
|------------------------------|--|
| <i>Submitters</i> | Coalgate Township Committee & Malvern Community Board |
| <i>Other submitters</i> | 100288, 100427, 100450, 100516, 100569, 100427, 100385, 100397, 100571 & 100288 |
| <i>Councillor discussion</i> | Councillor Mugford asked whether staff could talk to Environment Canterbury to address the issues at the Selwyn River, as it used to be a nice place to go and now there was just bog and trees overgrowing. |

| | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| <i>Proposed decision</i> | <p>Staff to look at including as part of next Tourism Infrastructure funding request. Include toilet provision in 2027.</p> <p>Council will also ask Environment Canterbury to engage with submitters about the bridge and Coalgate river bed. Councillors will facilitate this discussion</p> |
| <i>Agreed Council position</i> | As per the proposed decision. |

Satellite Dump in Darfield

| | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| <i>Submitters</i> | Coalgate Township Committee & Malvern Community Board |
| <i>Other submitters</i> | 100287, 100288 & 100516 |
| <i>Councillor discussion</i> | Questions were asked about funding for the Council waste days. It was noted that it is only a minor operational cost with profits going to the Lions Club. |
| <i>Proposed decision</i> | 4 x per year waste days in Malvern and Ellesmere. |
| <i>Agreed Council position</i> | As per the proposed decision. |

Bowling Facilities

| | |
|------------------------------|---|
| <i>Submitters</i> | Dunsandel Bowling Club & Lincoln Bowling Club |
| <i>Other submitters</i> | 100289 |
| <i>Councillor discussion</i> | <p>Councillor Hasson raised the issue of the Lincoln bowling club who owns the assets and asked what the plan was going forward to upgrade facilities, now that there was a district wide rate on reserves. Mayor Broughton agreed Council needed to think about where the District sits with this issue.</p> <p>Councillor Alexander asked whether in the short term there was any demand for facilities in Rolleston. He said it might be a strategic investment.</p> <p>Councillor Bland said Rolleston does want a bowling green and it could be something for the future but in the short term if Council provided lighting in Lincoln, it could take the overflow from Rolleston.</p> <p>Councillor Lyall said there was a clear need in both communities.</p> <p>It was agreed that Council will wait for staff to complete their Reserve Management Plan.</p> |

| | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| <i>Proposed decision</i> | Staff to work with Lincoln Bowling Club to look into options for another funding source. Include in Reserve Management Plan. |
| <i>Agreed Council position</i> | As per the proposed decision. |

Selwyn Huts Wastewater

| | |
|------------------------------|--|
| <i>Submitters</i> | Selwyn Huts Owners Association, Canterbury District Health Board, & Ellesmere Sustainable Agriculture Inc |
| <i>Other submitters</i> | 100297, 100307, 100329, 100351, 100355, 100358, 100363, 100366, 100367, 100368, 100369, 100376, 100384, 100388, 100399, 100405, 100418, 100419, 100429, 100432, 100438, 100452, 100454, 100460, 100585, 100597, 100607, 100610, 100611, 100613, 100615 & 100490 |
| <i>Councillor discussion</i> | <p>In relation to the Upper Selwyn Huts Mayor Broughton said this issue was about removing wastewater from the discussion on the future of the settlement, and the only discussion going forward with this community should be about climate change.</p> <p>Councillor Hasson said Council should be looking at healthy homes policy with respect to the state of some of the homes and said Council had a responsibility as the lease holder. She also commented that with regards to capital funding – if there was a major disparity, this needs to be assessed with regards to the charging regime saying that everyone needs to pay their share.</p> <p>Councillor Alexander supports the connection, but said that Council should be clear that it does not guarantee occupational beyond 15 years. He said, for the record, he did not support any community receiving subsidies.</p> <p>Mayor Broughton said that Council is making a decision based on the weight of submissions. He said that the community is aware of the costs which are a similar cost to the onsite system was going to be. He noted this should not be a surprise.</p> <p>Staff talked about a package of solutions and the Mayor said it would be easier to draw the hard line under 30 years rather than 15 years. Staff will come back to Council with a report on the licensing issue.</p> <p>Regarding the issue of connection Ellesmere Wastewater to the SSS, staff noting there is time to consider funding.</p> |
| <i>Proposed decision</i> | Connect Selwyn Huts to the Ellesmere to Rolleston wastewater pipe. Reticulation and connection to be funded by the licence fee and the. licence renewal will reflect this project, expectations and funding. |

| | |
|--------------------------------|---|
| | Connect Ellesmere Wastewater to the Selwyn Sewerage Scheme. |
| <i>Agreed Council position</i> | As per the proposed decision. |

Cycleways / cycling

| | |
|--------------------------------|---|
| <i>Submitters</i> | West Rolleston Primary School, Castle Hill Community Assn, & Christchurch-Little River Railtrail Trust |
| <i>Other submitters</i> | 100416, 100480, 100590, 100595, & 100600 |
| <i>Councillor discussion</i> | <p>Councillor Reid said it would be good to look at signage as the trails are not easily found. Staff said they were looking at that and will also look into loading the information on the Selwyn Trails app.</p> <p>Councillor Gallagher referred to the submission from Paul Churton.</p> <p>With regard to the submission from Fiona McDonald, Mayor Broughton said recreational cycle trails should be added to the strategy as this will ensure it was easily accessible. The track itself is not budgeted for.</p> |
| <i>Proposed decision</i> | <p>Review walking and Cycling strategy in light of climate change initiatives and priorities with the review to take place over the next 12 months. This would include looking at a balance between commuter and recreational cycling needs.</p> <p>Consider commuter verses recreation balance.</p> <p>Enhance digital promotion of cycleways information and promotion.</p> |
| <i>Agreed Council position</i> | As per the proposed decision. |

Land drainage

| | |
|------------------------------|--|
| <i>Submitters</i> | Ellesmere Sustainable Agriculture Inc, Malvern Community Board, Federated Farmers & the Department of Conservation |
| <i>Councillor discussion</i> | <p>Councillor Lemon said the land drainage committee will be a good group to engage with at committee level, certainly in the Ellesmere and partially in the Springs Wards.</p> <p>Mayor Broughton agreed that the new drainage structure will make this possible.</p> |
| <i>Proposed decision</i> | The proposal for Council to engage and consult with the community on its proposed plans to extend the land drainage |

| | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| | rating to cover the whole district is acknowledged and intended. The establishment of a district-wide land drainage committee is the first priority. |
| <i>Agreed Council position</i> | As per staff recommended actions. |

Glenroy Hall

| | |
|--------------------------------|---|
| <i>Submitters</i> | 100633, 100644, 100634, 100652 & 100500 |
| <i>Councillor discussion</i> | Councillor Bland wanted to remind people about the Hororata Hall issue with ownerships and said Council needed to be strict. He said he didn't want individuals to put their own money in as it would always cloud the matter of ownership. |
| <i>Proposed decision</i> | Council is to confirm ownership of Glenroy Hall with advice by November 2021. |
| <i>Agreed Council position</i> | As per the proposed decision. |

DELIBERATION MATTERS – SINGLE ITEMS RAISED

All submissions were read and discussed with staff comments and recommendations available within the various Deliberation Booklets available to members of the public.

The following are from single-items raised as part of the 2021-2031 Draft Long Term Plan hearings process which led to further discussion by Councillors and staff:

| | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| <i>Submitter</i> | 100580 – Summit Road Society funding request |
| <i>Councillor discussion</i> | <p>Councillor Bland noted this was not a lot of money and said there was not much native bush in Selwyn and this group was trying to protect it.</p> <p>Councillor Lyall said he supported a one off \$5k and wondered whether they received funding from any other sources. Councillor Bland said they did and also from their own members, but it dried up quickly and organisations such as this, relying mainly on volunteers need consistent funding.</p> <p>Councillor Lemon referred to release of the upcoming NPS on biodiversity and noted this may just be a holding pattern.</p> |
| <i>Agreed Council position</i> | It was agreed that there will be \$5,000 per year over two years pending the review by Group Manager Community Services & Facilities. |

| | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| <i>Submitter</i> | 100653 – Waihora Ellesmere Trust |
| <i>Councillor discussion</i> | All agreed with a point of clarification that the funding would come from general rates. |
| <i>Agreed Council position</i> | Budget \$20,000 to contribute to Te Waihora walkway/Cycleway project. Funds to be held by Council until the Co-governors determine way forward. |

The meeting stopped for dinner at 5.00pm and resumed at 5.30pm.

| | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| <i>Submitter</i> | 100082 – Jason Palmer |
| <i>Councillor discussion</i> | With regard to better cellphone coverage throughout the district Councillor Miller noted that in the wider Selwyn district this was necessary and with COVID everyone learnt we needed to be prepared to work at home. Councillor Alexander also noted this. |
| <i>Agreed Council position</i> | Mayor Broughton noted that he is working with local MP who has also been advocating on the district's behalf. He also noted that the Canterbury Mayoral Forum is also doing some work on this. |

| | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| <i>Submitter</i> | 100126 – Amy Johnson |
| <i>Councillor discussion</i> | Councillors spoke briefly to this submission which was about subsidising dust control measures for residents who live close to a busy shingle road |
| <i>Agreed Council position</i> | As per earlier stated, Council is taking part in a dust suppression trial. |

| | |
|--------------------------------|---|
| <i>Submitter</i> | 100166 – Keith Morrison |
| <i>Councillor discussion</i> | Acknowledged that there needed to be a conversation about the behaviour. Councillors also asked for a drop-in session, rather than a public meeting, so that everyone can come in and tell their side of the story and be heard. |
| <i>Agreed Council position</i> | Staff to arrange appropriate drop in sessions for residents. |

| | |
|--------------------------------|---|
| <i>Submitter</i> | 100167 – Rolleston Scout Group |
| <i>Councillor discussion</i> | <p>Councillor Reid noted Council is now at the stage of moving ahead with the Wordsworth Street extension will go have an impact on the Scout Den. She asked Council and staff to be mindful that they still wish to move from this space. She said it was good to see that staff are going to be talking to them.</p> <p>At this point in time it would be premature for Council to commit to funding support of facility relocation until planning work is completed.</p> |
| <i>Agreed Council position</i> | <p>Council noted that it had a contractual obligation to move the rugby club off the Rolleston reserve but the same does not apply to the Scout Group.</p> <p>The Mayor asked that the staff response be more clearly worded to reflect this.</p> |

| | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| <i>Submitter</i> | 100169 – Serge Collishaw |
| <i>Councillor discussion</i> | Councillor McInnes said while she agreed there was no need for a Rolleston cemetery at the moment, there was an opportunity to do a memorial walkway, including plaques on benches in the district wide park. |
| <i>Agreed Council position</i> | It is noted that there is sufficient capacity in existing cemeteries that are in easy driving distance from Rolleston and, therefore, development of a new cemetery is not warranted at this point in time. It is, however, recommended to continue to monitor this situation going forward. |

| | |
|--------------------------------|---|
| <i>Submitter</i> | 100349 – Chris Benny |
| <i>Councillor discussion</i> | <p>This submission referred to support of the proposal to increase water supply capacity within Darfield, Malvern and Hororata and to add Sheffield to this work program</p> <p>Councillor McInnes said that growth outside main townships is not always good because it creates additional car dependency and increased demand for small local facilities.</p> |
| <i>Agreed Council position</i> | <p>Staff recommend that the Sheffield water supply be added to the list of rural water supplies proposed to fund growth through the 'Rural water charge - additional units'.</p> <p>It was noted that this does not change the charge per unit.</p> |

| | |
|--------------------------------|---|
| <i>Submitter</i> | 100372 – Southbridge Rugby Football Club |
| <i>Councillor discussion</i> | <p>Councillor Alexander asked whether the lights were of poor quality that it was a health and safety issue. He said new training lights should be installed on the reserve.</p> <p>The Chief Executive said the issue will be addressed in the staff report.</p> |
| <i>Agreed Council position</i> | Staff to report on reserve lighting, refresh provided to councillors through a Council briefing. |

| | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| <i>Submitter</i> | 100414 - Kylie Wissel |
| <i>Councillor discussion</i> | <p>Councillor Miller said there was strong support for Lincoln University and Council is to continue to engage with the university about what the hub might look like.</p> <p>Mayor Broughton said it would form part of the economic wellbeing report expected from Council's Group Manager Community Services and Facilities. There would also be an opportunity look at a co-working space.</p> |
| <i>Agreed Council position</i> | There is no funding set aside at present. Refer to staff report when it becomes available. |

| | |
|------------------------------|---|
| <i>Submitter</i> | 100473 – Waihora Park Reserve Management Committee |
| <i>Councillor discussion</i> | <p>Councillor Alexander wanted to support funding for the project. He said he would support between \$10,000 and \$20,000 for a track around the outside as a public benefit.</p> <p>Mayor Broughton said the land was outside of Council's ownership.</p> <p>Councillor Miller asked for clarification about the ownership relationship, noting Council manages it on behalf of DOC, but in reality it is a community that was left on its own and only with the help of Councillor Hasson had Council become involved. He added that there is a once in a 35 year opportunity to chop down trees and the group will not plant pines again but they intend to plant natives. He said Council should consider matching them dollar for dollar and suggested \$20,000.</p> <p>Councillor Hasson said she would support funding because even though they are an incorporated society, it was a complex piece of land with the raceway, Waihora Pony Club and DOC involved. Council is currently relying on volunteers to manage the reserve and fundraise.</p> <p>Councillor Hasson quoted other examples around the District where there appeared to be anomalies in the governance structures, and said the best governance structure for some of</p> |

| | |
|--------------------------------|---|
| | <p>these are incorporated societies. The Mayor said this will be part of the strategic reserves review.</p> <p>Councillor Lyall agreed it needed to be looked at, adding there were a number of reserves like this in the District.</p> <p>Staff noted that this is one of the district's more remote reserves. Council has put about \$50,000 of staff time and resource it to sort out their playground.</p> <p>Mayor Broughton asked if could consider this in the future to which staff said they would discuss with the Committee, and if Council was going to consider changing their view in 12 months, then discuss what the Committee might they be able to hold off doing. It was asked if a track was necessary.</p> |
| <i>Agreed Council position</i> | <p>There is no funding set aside at present. This would be included in the strategic review underway for the District's Reserve Management Plan.</p> |

| | |
|--------------------------------|---|
| <i>Submitter</i> | 100486 – Kirwee Challenge Station |
| <i>Councillor discussion</i> | <p>This submission related to the Kirwee community needing a public toilet on the Main Road opposite Kirwee Challenge.</p> <p>Councillor Gallagher said the township has asked for additional signage for a number of years now.</p> <p>Councillor McInnes said the Kirwee public toilets were not on Google Maps.</p> <p>Councillor Miller agreed there should be signs and Councillor Alexander said the immediate short term step was signage, then Council could consider this under the Tourism Infrastructure Fund (TIF), and then consideration made under the Darfield reticulated wastewater system.</p> |
| <i>Agreed Council position</i> | <p>Council Seek additional funding where it can (TIF), and put a placeholder in the 2026 Plan. Future discussion may include the future of the Kirwee Pub site.</p> |

| | |
|------------------------------|---|
| <i>Submitter</i> | 100488 – Lyttelton Port Company (LPC) |
| <i>Councillor discussion</i> | <p>Councillor Alexander said park-and-ride should not be a threat to any company but rather a benefit.</p> <p>It is noted that an off-road pathway along Jones Rd is planned for 2027/28 to connect to the Weedons Interchange. It is expected land will needed to be obtained to achieve this.</p> <p>Mayor Broughton noted that Council is working with Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency on this work and that LPC will be part of any discussion.</p> |

| | |
|--------------------------------|---|
| <i>Agreed Council position</i> | <p>As per staff recommended actions.</p> <p>It was noted that submission has been forwarded to the Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency to assist in their understanding of LPC views.</p> |
|--------------------------------|---|

| | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| <i>Submitter</i> | 100496 – Paul Comrie |
| <i>Councillor discussion</i> | <p>This submission related to the need for a performing arts centre in Lincoln.</p> <p>Councillor Miller noted there was a similar proposal for an arts centre in Lincoln. He asked if Council could look at discussions with Lincoln High School (MOE) to look at an Aurora type facility like that situated at Burnside High School.</p> |
| <i>Agreed Council position</i> | As per staff recommended actions. |

| | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| <i>Submitter</i> | 100498 – Springston Community Committee |
| <i>Councillor discussion</i> | <p>This submission was about Council making provision for roving secretaries for Community Committees.</p> <p>Councillor Hasson said while Council was waiting a report from staff around giving community committees and further discretionary funds, she would like an indication of what budget has been put aside for committee spend. Staff confirmed that \$50,000 has been set aside for support for committees.</p> <p>Councillor Alexander noted his support for Councillor Hasson's comments saying that there needs to be a budget provision in case we were to establish a residual fund. He said he was pleased to hear there is a sum set aside.</p> |
| <i>Agreed Council position</i> | As per staff recommended actions. |

| | |
|--------------------------------|---|
| <i>Submitter</i> | 100651 – New Zealand Motor Caravan Association Inc |
| <i>Councillor discussion</i> | <p>This submission referred to the potential need for a camper van dump station in Rolleston</p> <p>Councillor McInnes said that NZMCA have their own dump station within their camp at Weedons. It is over-used due to the recent closure of two public sites along SH1. Another public dump station would be a very good idea.</p> <p>Councillor Alexander said that at the Pines Transfer Station may be logical as there is plenty of public areas and it is not too far to pump.</p> |
| <i>Agreed Council position</i> | As per staff recommended actions – not being considered at this point. |

| | |
|--------------------------------|---|
| <i>Submitter</i> | 100629 – Cancer Society of New Zealand (Canterbury West Coast) |
| <i>Councillor discussion</i> | This submission encouraged Council to extend its current smoke free policy to include vaping on council owned land. Selwyn District Council to give robust consideration of shade availability to all major projects. |
| <i>Agreed Council position</i> | Staff will review the Smoke Free Policy in 2021-2022. |

| | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| <i>Submitter</i> | 100550 – Rolleston Residents' Association |
| <i>Councillor discussion</i> | This submission asked Council to create a memorial walk through town noting the need to reinstate the Discretionary Fund. |
| <i>Agreed Council position</i> | In June a report is expected to be prepared for Council that considers the future of Council Committees and their funding. |

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

- Minutes of the Selwyn District Council 2021 – 2031 Draft Long Term Plan Hearings held at the Selwyn District Council Chambers, on Thursday 13 May 2021 and Friday 14 May 2021**

There was no discussion on the minutes.

Moved Councillor Lyall / **Seconded** Councillor Epiha

RECOMMENDATION

‘That Council confirms the minutes of the 2021-2031 Draft Long Term Plan Submission Hearing Minutes held on Thursday 13 May 2021 and Friday 14 May.’

CARRIED

REPORT

- Group Manager Organisational Performance**
Rates Postponement Policy and Development Contributions Policy

Councillor Miller asked a question about age eligibility if the age of superannuation changes. Staff noted the adjustment will occur at that time.

• **Moved** Councillor Alexander / **Seconded** Councillor Lyall

RECOMMENDATION

'That the Council approves the adjustments to the proposed Rates Postponement Policy and proposed Development Contributions Policy.'

CARRIED

CLOSING COMMENTS

Mayor Broughton thanked everyone for the earlier conversations, noting how quickly staff were able to respond to questions asked of them, in order to help the Councillors make well-informed decisions. He said one of the joys of this Council is having a good relationship between staff and Elected Members where all have a mutual understanding towards ensure the best way forward for the district. Mayor Broughton then reiterated his comments of thanks to all involved for their contributions and considerations of all matters raised.

The Chief Executive stated that today's minutes will be put on the 9 June 2021 Council agenda for adoption. He then noted that once the draft of the final Long Term Plan is pulled together it will go through another audit process stating that this should be straight forward process.

The final 2021-2031 Long Term Plan document will be put to Council for adoption at the 23 June 2021 Council meeting.

Mayor Broughton declared the 2021-2031 Draft Long Term Plan Deliberations closed.

The deliberations closed at 6.08pm 20 May 2021

DATED this 14th day of June 2021


MAYOR