

**KAIKOURA DISTRICT COUNCIL MEETING FOLLOWING THE
FINANCE AND POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING ON WEDNESDAY 16
MAY 2007, IN MEMORIAL HALL SUPPER ROOM, ESPLANADE,
KAIKOURA.**

AGENDA

1. Apologies

2. Matters of Importance to be raised as Urgent Business

3. Minutes to be Confirmed:

- *Council 18/04/2007* *page 51*

Reports to be Adopted:

- *Works & Services Committee 18/04/2007* *page 60*
- *Environmental Services Committee 18/04/2007* *page 62*
- *Finance and Policy Committee 18/04/2007* *page 68*
- *Social Services Committee 02/05/2007* *page 78*
- *Tourism & Development Committee 11/04/2007* *page 83*

Minutes to be received

- *Hearings and Applications Committee Formal Hearing 08/03/2007* *page 86*
- *Hearings and Applications Committee 13/03/2007* *page 92*
- *Hearings and Applications Committee 03/04/2007* *page 102*

4. Matters arising from Confirmed minutes

5. Minutes Action List Update

MEETING	ACTION REQUIRED	BY	DATE ACTIONED
	21 FEBRUARY 2007		
Council	Report to Council on the development of a management plan to enhance recreational opportunities and reduce environmental and cultural impacts at Mangamaunu and Kiwa Road.	Environmental Development Officer	This matter will be prioritised within the Officer's work schedule. It is anticipated to be initiated in November 2007.
Council	Write to Regional Land Transport Committee and MP Colin King demanding the Hurunui single lane bridge be upgraded in the funding priority list.	Chief Executive Officer /Mayor	Refer Mayor's Report – Page 236
	18 APRIL 2007		
Council	Staff to report back on the following in terms of Mangamaunu toilet facility	CEO	In Progress

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The type of facility to be put in b) What consents, if any, would be required. 		
Council	Form a strategy with Environment Canterbury, Department of Conservation and Police to manage motorbikes on reserve at South Bay following petition from South Bay residents	Council	In Progress

6. Public Forum

TIME	NAME	SUBJECT	PAGE
1.00pm	Mr P McGahan, 8 Lower Ward Street, Kaikoura	Pedestrian safety – Old wharf to Jimmy Armers beach	121
1.05pm	Kaikoura Marine & Coastal Protection Society (Mr P McGahan)	Old wharf slipway	

7. Hearing of Submissions to Draft Gambling Venue Policy

- **KDC Gambling Venue Policy** *page 125*
- **Copies of submissions received** *page 129*
 - **1.30pm NZ Racing Board**
 - **1.40pm Problem Gambling Foundation – Counselling & Clinical Team**
 - **1.50pm Charity Gaming Association Incorporated**
 - **2.00pm He Oranga Pounmau**
 - **2.10pm Mainland Foundation, on behalf of Shooters Bar**
 - **2.20pm Problem Gambling Foundation – Policy Advisor**

8. Revocation of Resolution – Public Toilet Facility, Kiwa Road *page 223*

9. Recommendation from Social Services Committee

Moved by Councillor McChesney, seconded by S Frizzell and resolved that the Social Services Committee put to Council that the speed limits of the following roads be re-set to 30 kilometres per hour:

- *Deal Street*
- *Moa Road circuit*
- *West End (From Library to West End/State Highway intersection).*

10. Change of Meeting Date

- **The Chief Executive Officer, Mayor and 3 Councillors will be attending the Local Government New Zealand Annual Conference being held in Dunedin 15-18 July 2007. It is therefore recommended that the Council meeting date of 18 July 2007 be changed to Wednesday 25th July 2007.**

11. Canterbury Regional Council Regional Policy Statement Review *page 231*

12. Formation of Subcommittee

- **It is recommended that a sub committee of Councillors be formed for the purpose of considering requests for the naming of roads within the district.**

13. Committee Updates

14. Mayor's Report

page 236

15. Urgent Business

16. Council Public Excluded Session

Moved, seconded that the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting, namely

- a. Confirmation of Minutes of Council Public Excluded meeting on 18/04/2007*
- b. Adoption of Minutes of Works & Services Public Excluded meeting on 18/04/2007*
- c. Receipt of Minutes of Hearings & Applications Public Excluded meeting on 08/03/2007*

The general subject matter to be considered while the public is excluded, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter, and the specific grounds under Section 48(1) and 7(2)(i) of the Local Government Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution are as follows:

General subject of each to be considered	Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter	Grounds of the Act under which this resolution is made
Minutes of the Council Public Excluded meeting held on 18 April 2007	The exclusion of the public from the whole or the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting is necessary to enable the Local Authority to deliberate in private on its decision or recommendation.	Section 48(1)(a) and 7(2)(b)
Adoption of the Works & Services Public Excluded meeting held on 18/04/2007	The exclusion of the public from the whole or the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting is necessary to enable the Local Authority to deliberate in private on its decision or recommendation.	Section 48(1)(a) and 7(2)(b)
Receipt of the Hearings & Applications Public Excluded meeting held on 08/03/2007	The exclusion of the public from the whole or the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting is necessary to enable the Local Authority to deliberate in private on its decision or recommendation.	Section 48(1)(a) and 7(2)(b)



Gambling Venue Policy

1. Objectives

- 1.1 To control the growth of gambling;
- 1.2 To prevent and minimize the harm to the community caused by gambling, including problem gambling;
- 1.3 To control the growth of electronic gambling machine gambling in the district;
- 1.4 To allow those who wish to participate in electronic gambling machine and T.A.B. gambling to do so, safely and responsibly, within the district.

2. Where Class 4 Gambling Venues and TAB Venues may be established

Class 4 Gambling Venues and TAB Venues may be established within the Kaikoura District subject to:

- 2.1 Meeting application and fee requirements;
- 2.2 The venue having a 'host responsibility' and gambling harm minimization policy and staff training program;
- 2.3 Not being a venue primarily associated with family or children's activities.
- 2.4 New venues must provide a separated area for Class 4 Gambling;
- 2.5 Established venues applying to increase the number of gaming machines within the venue must provide a separated area for Class 4 Gambling.

3. Number of gaming machines to be allowed

- 3.1 New venues shall be allowed a maximum of 6 (six) gaming machines for the first 2 years of operation;
- 3.2 Venues with licenses issued after 17 October 2001 and operating fewer than 9 gaming machines shall be allowed to increase the number of gaming machines operated at the venue to 9;
- 3.3 Existing venues with licences issued before 17 October shall be able to increase the number of gaming machines in the venue to no more than 9;

- 3.4 The number of pokie machines proposed for the venue being able to be met within the overall district cap that is specified in this policy;
- 3.5 Where two or more clubs or societies legally and physically combine their premises, they may apply to have up to 9 machines or the sum of the number of machines specified in all the clubs class 4 licences at the time of application, whichever is the lesser of the two numbers.

4. Overall cap on venues and the number of pokie machines in the Kaikoura district

- 4.1 The total number of pokie machines (including all those licensed on or prior to 17 October 2001, in the district may not exceed 60 (Sixty).

5. Incompatibility of Class 4 Gambling Venues

Class 4 gambling venues must not be located in premises that are incompatible with other predominant uses of the premises or of other premises located in close proximity.

6. External Exposure and Advertising

Gaming machines must not be visible from the street, road or highway and no advertising is permitted, including sandwich board and prize money advertising of any description if able to be seen from the exterior of the premises.

7. Host Responsibility

- 7.1 All operational staff to have undertaken training on dealing with problem gamblers;
- 7.2 Gaming Machine venues must display problem gambling material and offer support and supervision for those affected.
- 7.3 Applicants to show existing proactive problem gambling policies and implementation plans, and the ability to monitor and manage these.

8. Applications

Applications for territorial authority consent must be made on the approved form and must provide:

- 8.1 Name and contact details of the applicant;
- 8.2 Street address of the premises;
- 8.3 A site plan covering both gambling and other activities proposed for the venue;
- 8.4 Details of liquor licence(s) applying to the premises;
- 8.5 Any relevant gambling harm minimization policies;

9. Application Fees

These will be set by the Council from time to time, and shall include consideration of:

- 9.1 The cost of processing the application, including any consultation and hearings involved;
- 9.2 The cost of establishing and triennially reviewing the Class 4 Gambling Venue and TAB Venue policy;
- 9.3 The cost of inspecting Class 4 Gambling Venues on a regular basis to ensure compliance with consent conditions;
- 9.4 A contribution towards the costs of triennial assessments of the economic and social impact of gambling in the district.

10. Decision Making

- 10.1 Upon receipt of a complete application form containing all required information and the full application fee, the Council has 30 working days to determine a decision;
- 10.2 The decision on an application will be made at an officer level pursuant to delegated authority and be based on the criteria detailed in this policy.

11. Monitoring and Review

- 11.1 The Council will review the policy within 3 years of its adoption and then within 3 years after that review and each subsequent review is completed;
- 11.2 The Council will monitor the social and economic impact of gambling on the community as part of the policy review process;
- 11.3 The Council may amend this policy as a result of the findings of the social and economical impact monitoring;
- 11.4 Any review of amendment of this policy will be undertaken in accordance with the special consultative procedure outlined in the Local Government Act 2002.

12. Commencement of Policy

- 12.1 This policy is to be adopted by the Council in accordance with the special consultative procedure;
- 12.2 This policy will take effect from the day after it's adoption by the Council.

Revocation of resolution – Public Toilet Kiwa Road

In terms of Standing Order 3.9.15, the following notice of motion has been received for the revocation of part 1 of the resolution adopted by Council at its meeting of 21 March 2007 in relation to public toilets at Kiwa Road. Part 1 being:

“proceed with the installation of a single pan Norski wilderness toilet on the Road Reserve at Kiwa Road at Site A, in close proximity to the Meatworks surf break”.

The notice of motion has been signed by Councillors M Pablecheque, M McChesney and J Diver.

The full resolution adopted by the Council at the meeting on 21 March 2007, pertaining to this item is as follows:

Moved by Councillor Macphail, seconded by Councillor McChesney and resolved to

- 1) proceed with the installation of a single pan Norski wilderness toilet on the Road Reserve at Kiwa Road at Site A, in close proximity to the Meatworks surf break.***
- 2) Staff to work with community members and report back to Council on the development of a management plan to enhance recreational opportunities and reduce environmental and cultural impacts at Mangamaunu and Kiwa Road.***

It is proposed to replace Part 1 with:

“That Council reinvestigate the specific location of a public toilet on Kiwa Road”.

Attached is a report, plan and minutes of the March meeting pertaining to this item.

Environmental Development Officer's Report to Council – 21 March 2007

Proposed Public Toilet Facility – Kiwa Road

The Issue

Following a presentation to council (Feb 2006) by community members concerned with faecal contamination, Council brought together a working party to further investigate the placement of toilet facilities near the Mangamaunu surf breaks.

Working party members: Councillors: J Macphail, M McChesney, Council Staff: N Sherriff, R Vaughan, M Roberts-Saidy, Community members D. Kerrikepa, Managmaunu Marae, D. Lewis, Kaikoura Coastal Plumbing/ Board Riders Association, P. McGahan, Kaikoura Coastal and Marine Society.

Progress

The working party have ascertained the following points which will allow for the placement of a public toilet along Kiwa Road

- A location has been identified as a suitable site to place toilet facilities (Kiwa Road, Kaikoura District Council Road Reserve, refer to map).
- The site does not have access to water supply or electricity.
- Building consents will be required from Kaikoura District Council.
- A fully contained facility will avoid the need to apply for discharge consent from the Regional Council.

Consultation

The working party met with residents and stakeholder on site on Monday 12 March 2007. A total of eight attended the meeting in addition to Council staff, all in full support of placing a public toilet facility along Kiwa Rd to alleviate the faecal contamination currently taking place. The group were supportive of placing a Norksi system (outlined below).

The group were divided in deciding the most suitable location for the toilet facility, some preferring a site closer to the Meatworks surf break (site A), others preferring a site closer to the molok bins (site B).

The table below outlines the discussed advantages and disadvantages of each site

Site A	Advantages	Disadvantages
Meatworks surf break		
	Close to main surf break	Increased use of Kiwa Road, which does not cope with current vehicle use.
	Car park facilities already exist	Considerable distance for local surf school to travel along Kiwa Rd.
	Provide for high numbers of car/tent campers preferring this area	Further distance from other surf breaks.
	Natural contour will shield toilet from road	
Site B	Advantages	Disadvantages
Near molok bins		
	Reduce traffic use of Kiwa	Campers in this area are predominantly

	Road	campervans (self contained)
	Half way between surf breaks	Flat landscape will increase visibility of toilet and increase SH1
		Would require car parking facilities
		Cultural sensitivity issues and conflict relating to Councils Treaty of Waitangi obligations.

Suggested system

Following research over the last 12 months to determine the most environmentally sound, cost effective and suitable toilet system for this sensitive and remote coastal location the Norski system is favoured.

Department of Conservation have recommended the Norski system as a simple, easily maintained and proven solution to faecal contamination in remote and environmentally sensitive areas. Department of Conservation are continuing to place the Norski toilets in remote as well as high use areas.

The system has proven versatile, relatively vandal proof, easily emptied and reliable in terms of environmental discharges. The design can be fitted with sanitary handwash dispensers, eliminating the need for hand washing water. The supplier is based in Blenheim, providing for fast repairs and maintenance as necessary.



Single pan, fully accessible, Norski toilet



Single pan, Norski 'wilderness' system

Capital costs		
Toilet	Cost	
Norski wilderness	\$1,700	
Norski fully accessible	\$9,600	
Tank (3,000 litre)	Cost	Dimensions
Fibre glass	\$3,000	2.3*1.4m
Concrete	\$1,100	2.2* 1.8m
Polyurethane	\$1,050	1.8*1.5m
<i>The above costs exclude installation and transport costs</i>		
Additional costs		
Landscaping	\$2,000	
Track construction	\$1,000	
Car parking area	tba	
Installation costs: excavation, engineering	\$1,600	
Ongoing Costs		
	Worst case scenario	Expected Annual Cost

Emptying	Every month	\$3,600
Cleaning	Every week	\$5,000
Vandalism		\$3,000
Total annual costs		\$11,600

Future Investigation

Based on feedback from the consultation for this project, it is advised that Council further develop a management plan to enhance recreational opportunities and reduce environmental and cultural impacts at Mangamaunu and Kiwa Road.

- Further consideration of placing a toilet at Site B,
- Developing a walking track accessing Mangamaunu and Graveyards surf breaks from Kiwa Road,
- Appropriate consideration of the cultural significance of the area,
- Investigations into feasibility of managing the Kiwa Road Reserve as a camping area.

Conclusion

Due to the high recreational use of the Meatworks surf break from both campers and surfers, it is recommended that a single pan Norski toilet system be placed on the Road Reserve at Kiwa Road at Site A, in close proximity to the Meatworks surf beak. Trialling the placement of a toilet at this location will provide details relating to costs, benefits and effectiveness in reducing faecal contamination and provide insight for placing similar toilets throughout the District.

The material for the holding tank will require further investigation as the aggressive nature of salt water may influence the long term durability of the tank and the depth of the ground water will also determine the suitability of the tank material.

Item	Description	Cost
Toilet	Norski single pan	\$1,700
Tank	tba	\$1,500
Landscaping & track		\$3,000
Installation		\$1,600
Annual costs		\$11,000
Total expected cost		\$18,400

Recommendation

That Council receive the information contained in this report and recommend the following:

1. Proceed with the installation of a single pan Norski wilderness toilet on the Road Reserve at Kiwa Road at Site A, in close proximity to the Meatworks surf beak.
2. That staff work with community members and report back to Council on the development of a management plan to enhance recreational opportunities and reduce environmental and cultural impacts at Mangamaunu and Kiwa Road.

Minutes of Council Meeting held 21 March 2007

PROPOSED PUBLIC TOILET FACILITY – KIWA ROAD

Included in the agenda was a report from the Environmental Development Officer outlining the process undertaken to date in terms of erecting a toilet at a beach location north of the township following a presentation to Council in February 2006 by community members concerned with faecal contamination. A location map was also included showing two possible sites, one just north of the “Meatworks” surf break in Kiwa Road (Site A) and the other just north of the “Graveyards” surf break in Kiwa Road (Site B).

The Environmental Development Officer advised she had undertaken extensive research and discussion with Council’s Asset Manager on a suitable toilet facility and from consultation that had taken place and a recommendation from Department of Conservation of which toilet facility to use it was recommended that Council consider placing a Norski toilet on Site A.

The Norski toilet would not require water or electricity and the site was road reserve vested in Council management.

The Norski toilet facility was made from fiberglass and was used by the Department of Conservation widely. The Environmental Development Officer advised the toilets were relatively easy to repair when damaged and the manufacturer was located in Blenheim.

Councillor Diver asked if Environment Canterbury were involved. The Environmental Development Officer advised Environment Canterbury were not involved as there would be no discharge due to the system being self contained.

Councillor Diver asked what the contract price for cleaning and emptying would be. The Environmental Development Officer advised emptying the facility would cost approximately \$300.00 and cleaning had been calculated from town cleaning rates. While the figures were approximate the Environmental Development Officer believed they were a fair indication.

Councillor Seddon noted when the idea was first mooted, offers of funding assistance had been given and asked if any funding had been provided or was Council fully paying for it. The Chief Executive Officer advised it had been costed as fully funded by Council. No funds had come forward from residents however help with labour had been offered.

Councillor Diver asked if Council would be double checking with Environment Canterbury prior to installing any facility. The Chief Executive Officer advised Council would need to ensure it complied with the law.

Moved by Councillor Macphail, seconded by Councillor McChesney and resolved to

3) proceed with the installation of a single pan Norski wilderness toilet on the Road Reserve at Kiwa Road at Site A, in close proximity to the Meatworks surf break.

- 4) *Staff to work with community members and report back to Council on the development of a management plan to enhance recreational opportunities and reduce environmental and cultural impacts at Mangamaunu and Kiwa Road.*

The motion was put and carried.

Councillor McChesney commended the Environmental Development Officer on the report noting it was the culmination of a lot of meetings, discussions, ideas and desires.

Canterbury Regional Council Regional Policy Statement Review

Issue

On 10 August 2006, the Canterbury Regional Council released a scoping document on the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement. A workshop meeting was held with staff and some Councilors on the Regional Policy Statement Review to date on 16th April 2007. The meeting outlined the policy direction on the following items:

- Natural hazards
- Settlement and the built environment, transport and versatile soils
- Natural features and landscapes

The purpose of the workshop was to provide information on the proposed policy direction as a result of consultation on the Regional Policy Statement Review and to seek comment on the direction outlined in the documentation.

Discussion

Process for Feedback

As stated above, staff and some Councilors attended a presentation on the Regional Policy Statement Review to date on 16th April 2007. The presentation dealt with the review issues to date and the policy direction from the consultation and feedback received. Ecan invite further comments to be sent to them as a result of the presentation and documentation supplied. The date for formal comments is set for **14 May 2007**, attached is the formal comments prepared by Council staff on the review issues of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement. Please note, given the timeframes, this document has already been lodged with Environment Canterbury.

Issues

The policy direction outlined in the review documentation did not fully reflect the position of the KDC and also did not reflect the feedback given. On that basis, it was necessary to prepare a formal comment back to Environment Canterbury.

The issues addressed in the report can be summarized as follows:

Natural Hazards

- Environment Canterbury sought to delineate responsibilities in regard to Natural Hazards. Staff considered that it would be more in keeping with the Act if the Regional Policy Statement outlined agreed responsibilities in regard to Natural Hazards.
- Environment Canterbury sought to control land use through the RPS. Staff considered policies and methods need to be carefully formulated to ensure they can be given effect to through District Plans and are not contrary to community outcomes sought under the Local Government Act for each district.
- No weight was given to issues in regard to people becoming complacent toward natural hazards after a period of time has lapsed and the adverse environmental effects of protection works.
- More research and site specific information was required in regard to climate change before region wide policies can be imposed.
- Land use controls in regard to natural hazards should be site specific and not general

Settlement and the built environment, transport

- Onerous requirements in regard to land use structure planning were suggested as a policy direction. The comment outlines opposition to this approach.
- Settlement and the built environment is considered a land use function of the District Council not a Regional Council function.
- District structure planning for infrastructure and roading is not considered a Regional Council function, unless it involves cross boundary or regional resource management issues.

Versatile Soils

- Objectives, Policies and Methods in regard to versatile soils should also recognise the definition of soil conservation and how conservation of soil contributes to the purpose and principles of the Act.

Natural features and landscapes

- The functions of Environment Canterbury would be better served by introducing objectives, policies and methods that require District Councils to identify and protect these natural features and landscape and provide regionally consistent methodology for achieving this

Conclusion

The comment lodged on the policy direction was considered to be in accordance with Kaikoura District Council principles and the intention of the LTCCP.

Recommendation

With due consideration of the above, it is recommended that the Council make the following determinations:

1. Discussion

That Council receives the information outlined in this report.

2. Feedback

That Council endorses the formal comments on the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement.

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT – CRPS POLICY PAPER

Introduction

The Kaikoura District Council is the northern most Council in the Canterbury Region. Kaikoura is both geographically and physically isolated from the Canterbury Region, and as a result care must be taken to ensure that all changes to the RPS take into account the unique nature of the Kaikoura District and do not adversely affect the functioning, responsibilities and economic viability of the Kaikoura District.

The community has a distinct vision for Kaikoura. That vision is a sustainable future with tourism providing both economic benefit and enhancing local amenities, but not at the expense of the natural or social environment. While tourism is crucial to the economic health of the district, a significant environmental issue facing Kaikoura is the ever increasing visitor numbers. Research conducted by Lincoln University estimates approximately 1 million tourists visit Kaikoura each year and this number is predicted to increase annually by 14%. Although tourist numbers bring significant economic returns by contributing to at least 30% of the district's employment, such a large number of visitors also place significant pressure on the district's infrastructure, natural environment and community.

In response to this issue, Kaikoura District is becoming well known, both locally and internationally for its commitment to reducing impacts on the environment, that may result from the growing visitor and resident populations. Such a reputation has been developed through a number of programs and initiatives including:

- *Green Globe*
- Communities for Climate Protection (CCP)
- Trees for Travellers
- Zero Waste

Comment

The Kaikoura District Council (KDC) comment as follows:

Natural hazards

Issue 1. Statement that s62 of the RMA requires the CRPS to delineate the responsibility for the control of the use of land for natural hazard management. Section 62(i) of the RMA states that the RPS *must state who is the local authority responsible in the whole or any part of the region for specifying the objectives, policies, and methods for the control of the use of land*. KDC do not agree that this can be interpreted to mean that the Regional Council has the duty to delineate these responsibilities through the RPS.

Outcome: The responsibilities outlined in the RPS must therefore be formulated in conjunction with the territorial authorities and ensure that no onerous requirements are imposed on the region as a whole.

Issue 2. Function prescribed by the RMA outlining functions relating to the management of natural hazards. Item 3. the control of the use of land for the purpose (iv) avoidance or mitigation of natural hazards (Section 30(1)(d)). Case Law suggests the duty of Regional Council in the RPS is to the extent of preparation of objectives, policies and methods, to control the use of land. The imposition of rules is the function of the District Council.

Outcome: Policies and methods need to be carefully formulated to ensure they can be given effect to through District Plans and are not contrary to community outcomes sought under the Local Government Act for each district.

Issue 3. Current objectives and policies in the RPS fail to recognise some significant issues in regard to natural hazard management. These issues include, but are not limited to, complacency and the adverse effects of protection works.

Outcome: That objectives and policies should be formulated to recognise that people become complacent when a large period of time lapses since the occurrence of a natural hazard event.

Outcome: The RPS should be formulated to offer some direction on the prioritising of natural hazard protection versus the adverse effects of that protection.

Issue 4. Policy options B. Provide regional policy on climate change.

Outcome: More research and site specific information is required before climate change objectives & policies are included in the RPS. Currently there are too many assumptions in the investigation paper, and too many variables to allow a consistent region wide approach to be implemented. A more extensive study into how climate change may impact each district would be more useful and any policy change to the relevant chapters of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement should be a result of this study.

Issue 5. Policy options C. Provide a clearer delineation of responsibilities between the ta's and Ecan.

Outcome: KDC feel any outlined delineation of responsibilities should be an *agreed* delineation of responsibility between the ta's and Ecan. This matter requires further discussion.

Issue 6. Policy option E. Address risk management more directly.

Outcome: KDC feel that the RPS should direct a requirement of site specific identification of risk. The requirement should be based on detailed on site risk assessment, using hazard maps as a trigger point for further investigation. KDC currently list flood hazard in the District Plan, but rely on site specific flood expert reports prior to making a decision on land use consents, as similar approach could be directed in the RPS.

Settlement and the built environment, transport and versatile soils

Settlement and the built environment, transport

Issue 7. Approach 2. Requiring the development of detailed responses to policies.

Outcome: Any requirements as a result of changes to the RPS should be carefully investigated. All proposed requirements should be robustly discussed with all District Councils. Requiring structure planning does not always achieve the purpose of the Act, as it often results in more development pressure on or conversely, exclusion of certain areas.

Issue 8. Approach 2. Maintaining the current level of detail within the RPS may not be appropriate for Districts outside the UDS. It is not considered that settlement and the built environment outside of the UDS area are a significant resource management issue for the Canterbury Region.

Outcome: It is not considered a regional council function to look at settlement and the built environment where land use in the area is not a significant resource management issue for the region. Settlement and the built environment is considered a land use function and the issue becomes a district council responsibility. The district plan is formulated to manage the growth and development of settlement and the built environment. For Canterbury, areas outside the UDS, hazard areas, coastal areas, landscape or water protection areas, are not considered to be of a regional significance and therefore not considered appropriate for Environment Canterbury to address in the RPS. There is not considered to be any statutory basis for including objectives, policies or methods relating to settlement and built environment for these areas in the RPS. Settlement should be balanced against the adverse effects of settlement, such as Part II matters, it is not considered that regional controls on land use and settlement would achieve this. Rather individual regional resource management matters should be addressed and settlement assessed against these.

Issue 9. A strong relationship between settlement and the built environment and transport exist. However, there is no requirement for Environment Canterbury to include controls unless there is an issue of regional significance. It is not considered that district infrastructure and local roading forms a regional resource management issue, unless there are cross boundary issues.

Outcome: More value would be added to local districts if the RPS only addressed regional issues, such as reticulation and maintenance of major infrastructure and the regional roading network. Requiring structure/infrastructure planning at local level does not add value to the region, but of more significance is the impact of regional infrastructure on small districts. The Regional Council must consider the environmental and social impact of regional and national infrastructure on small Districts and Communities. In addition, the adverse effects of any discharges from any regional and national infrastructure should be considered. More value would be added to the RPS if support was given as outlined.

Versatile Soils

Issue 10. It is considered that versatile soils should be considered as a resource management issue for the region. However, management of versatile soils for production is not considered the only value needed to be addresses in the RPS when considering versatile soils.

Outcome: Objectives, Policies and Methods in regard to versatile soils should also recognise the definition of soil conservation and how conservation of soil contributes to the purpose and principles of the Act.

Natural features and landscapes

Issue 11. Option C. Additional policy invention in regard to natural features and landscapes.

Outcome: While a consistent regional approach in regard to Natural features and landscapes is supported, the addition of maps and identification of features is not considered a Regional function. It is considered that the functions of Environment Canterbury would be better served by introducing objectives, policies and methods that require District Councils to identify and protect these features and provide regionally consistent methodology for achieving this. Incorporation and identification of landscape maps and features in the RPS is not considered effective and may not provide value to the administration and protection of these landscapes and features. Additionally, the identification of *regionally significant landscapes* is not considered appropriate under the Act.

MAYOR'S REPORT

Since April's council meeting :

- I have represented our council live on television in a bath of slime for a “flipper/goggles wearing beach-ball kicking/catching/sliding competition”
I believe my playing partner (8 year old) Ainsley Mackle and I were unjustly not announced as winners but I am considering an enquiry into the result.
- Also appeared on a United States Television Travel programme - “*Richard Banggs – Adventures with Purpose*”. This time to expound the virtues of being a Green Globe community and its attraction to tourism.
- As Mayor I was asked to sign - and did, the Amnesty International Protest regarding the injustices still continuing through china.(As did, I believe, many staff as individuals.)
- ANZAC Day – I represented council and staff and the community at large during the service and wreath laying at the cenotaph. Again, Council provided a wreath for the occasion.
- Along with 56 Mayors, Chairs, Councillors and Staff I attended the ICLEI (Local Governments for Sustainability) *Accelerate Now* conference in Melbourne along with Nicole and Deputy Mayor Barb. At the time of writing this I have been back only a few hours and need to get my head around the outcomes I got from the conference as Mayor, before I make any full report, but 1st impressions
- The highlight for me was the visit to the *Green Building* and *CH2 – Melbourne City Council Offices*. Offering an insight into both the business of converting buildings to attain sustainability and the simple practicalities of designing and building such a thing.
- The information distribution and gathering processes were somewhat lacking throughout the 3 days and I had to really search for practical and meaningful programmes or points to bring home.
- The whole conference seemed to be a celebration for and of, those who manage and are employed by ICLEI. In saying that Kaikoura District council did receive a ‘participation award.
- We, as a community and council are continually recognized by staff and politicians of TLA’s and Councils around NZ and Australia as one that is leading the way in things sustainable. We were often congratulated for that and questioned in depth regarding our processes and progress.
- I believe it can be noted that NZ is way ahead of Aust regarding Sustainability and Climate Change – smaller Aust. districts seem to stop or not even start if outside funding cannot be sought.
- At this early point still, I believe that other potentially valuable ideologies, practical ideas and planning applications can be gained from our attendance. I shall endeavour to collate the ‘good stuff’ and get it out there asap.
- Attached is the correspondence entered into with Hurunui and Waimak Mayors, continuing the campaign for redevelopment/replacement of the Hurunui Bridge – as requested.
- Colin King has advised he will support any move to do this and will be included in appropriate strategies.

Cheers, Kevin.

From: Kevin Heays
Sent: Tuesday, 8 May 2007 10:06 a.m.
To: 'garry.jackson@hurunui.govt.nz'; 'Jim Gerard '
Subject: Hurunui Bridge
Good Morning your worships!

As per my previous email regarding the state or in fact the very existence of the 1 lane Hurunui Bridge as the sole access over the river on State highway One, I have spoken to Colin King MP and he verbally tells me it is also a pet project of his also - to have the bridge redeveloped or replaced.

I intend to pursue this vigorously with Transit and I am asking your help and support as 2 of the 3 Mayors whose districts are directly affected by the problems this bridge can cause to our roads traffic streams.

In the first instance I would like to draft a letter to transit etc and include you both as co-writers and signatories.

Can you get back to me if you are happy to view and sign such a letter and also to embark on this wee campaign with this council.

Cheers

Kevin

Kevin. J. Heays
Mayor
Kaikoura District

*From the Office of the Mayor - Kaikoura District
- Kevin J. Heays -*

03 3195026 www.kaikoura.govt.nz www.kevinheays.co.nz kevin.heays@kaikoura.govt.nz 0276296754

Mr & Mrs G & K Boyd,
Swan Creek

KAIKOURA R.D.1

Dear Gordon and Karen,

This is to thank you for and to acknowledge your deputation and participation at the Council meeting of April 2007.

In particular regard to one of the many points you presented, this Council acknowledges that at the time of your tender documents being processed, you could have been unaware of the possibility of a toilet facility being established at the site within the area the working party has recommended. That is, within the council reserve land on the seaward side of Kiwa Road and generally opposite your land.

Council has agreed that the working parties' recommended site is the most appropriate, and is working through any specific issues relating to the establishment of a toilet facility at that site. Council is fully aware that they may have to obtain specific consents for this work and are currently identifying which, if any, are required.

As has been the case for some 18 months, Councils offer to meet on site to discuss the most appropriate position within site "A," still remains.

I trust this is of some value to you.

Yours sincerely

Kevin.

*From the Office of the Mayor - Kaikoura District
- Kevin J. Heays -*

03 3195026 www.kaikoura.govt.nz www.kevinheays.co.nz kevin.heays@kaikoura.govt.nz 0276296754

Mr R Pengelly
5 Te Wanakau St
Oaro M

KAIKOURA R.D.

Dear Russell,

This letter is to acknowledge your participation and presentation within the Council meeting of April 2007.

Firstly, thank you for utilizing the 'Public forum' format now available each month at Council Meetings, and thank you for remaining within the guidelines outlined.

I believe you have raised some valid points and I can assure you these will be discussed at the appropriate time. May I remind you that the draft annual plan will be available mid- may (ish) for public consultation and the issues you refer to are included in the 'Refuse and Recycling' chapter, and specifically the "Proposed Capital works" and following sections.

I encourage you to submit to the Draft Plan - as this formal process does carry some weight.

Again, thank you for your participation.

Kevin.

*From the Office of the Mayor - Kaikoura District
- Kevin. J. Heays -*

03 3195026 www.kaikoura.govt.nz www.kevinheays.co.nz kevin.heays@kaikoura.govt.nz 0276296754

Messers Howard and Vincent
2 Moa Road
South Bay

KAIKOURA
19 – 04 – 07

Dear Pat and John,

This is to formally acknowledge your presentation and recognize receipt of the petition presented at the April 2007 Full Council Meeting.

Council accepts that there are issues regarding motor cycles in their various forms, in the South Bay area and your petition, your presentation and your suggested possible solutions have assisted us with this recognition.

As discussed, there is more than one agency involved in this issue and we will be entering into discussions with each of these to endeavor to reach a satisfactory solution.

Some of the individual issues you presented seem, I believe, to be quickly rectified and our Staff will be asked to work on these as soon as possible.

Again, thank you for your presentation and petition and in particular the proactive content included.

Yours sincerely

Kevin