

KAIKOURA DISTRICT COUNCIL MEETING HELD AT 9.00AM ON WEDNESDAY 16 SEPTEMBER 2009, IN MEMORIAL HALL SUPPER ROOM, ESPLANADE, KAIKOURA.

AGENDA

1. *Apologies*
2. *Matters of Importance to be raised as Urgent Business*
3. *Open Forum – Session for members of the public wishing to comment on items included in this agenda.*

The Council Meeting will adjourn following this item and will resume following the Finance and Policy Committee meeting.

4. Minutes to be Confirmed:

- *Council 19/8/2009* *page 51*
- *Extraordinary Council 26/08/2009* *page 57*

Reports to be Adopted:

- *Works & Services Committee 19/8/2009* *page 58*
- *Environmental Services Committee 19/8/2009* *page 60*
- *Finance and Policy Committee 19/8/2009* *page 63*
- *Tourism & Development Committee 12/8/2009* *page 64*

5. *Matters arising from Confirmed minutes*

6. *Minutes Action List Update*

<i>MEETING</i>	<i>ACTION REQUIRED</i>	<i>BY</i>	<i>DATE ACTIONED</i>
	<i>18 FEBRUARY 2009</i>		
Council	Inform Council when submissions are due on Environment Canterbury's 1080 Resource Consent	District Planner	Resource Consent application not yet lodged.
	<i>15 JULY 2009</i>		
Council	Investigate future management of drains in the Kaikoura District	Asset Manager	In Progress
	<i>19 AUGUST 2009</i>		
Council	Investigate use of Youth Council Funds remaining from the Skate Park Project	Community Development Officer	In Progress

7. *11.30am NZ Police Update*

- An update from Kaikoura Police will be provided in Public Excluded.

8. *Youth Council*

- A representative from the Youth Council will be in attendance at 1pm to present this item.

9. *Public Forum*

<i>TIME</i>	<i>NAME</i>	<i>SUBJECT</i>
-	-	-

10. *Regional Land Transport Strategy* *page 69*

- James Ryan from Environment Canterbury will be in attendance at 1.30pm to present this item.

11. *Canterbury Water Management Strategy- Identification of points of concern.*

- A representative of the steering group will be in attendance at 2pm to present this item.

12. *Recommendations for Minor Changes to the Kaikoura District Signs Bylaw* *page 70*

13. *Pynes Building West End* *page 72*

14. *Kaikoura Integrated Family Health Centre* *page 73*

15. *Committee Updates*

16. *Mayor's Report* *page 75*

17. *Peninsula Water Tank Mural* *page 76*

18. *Natural Burials* *page 79*

19. *Urgent Business*

20. *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 19/8/2009*
- b. Confirmation of Minutes Extraordinary Public Excluded meeting 26/8/2009*
- c. New Zealand Police Update*
- d. Canterbury Mayors Meeting*
- e. Canterbury District Health Board Meeting*
- f. Public Trust Office*

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 19/8/2009	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)
Minutes Extraordinary Public Excluded meeting 26/8/2009	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)(a)
New Zealand Police Update	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)
Canterbury Mayor Meeting	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)
Canterbury District Health Board Meeting	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)
Public Trust Office	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)(a)

Regional Land Transport Strategy

Background to the presentation:

The Regional Land Transport Strategy (RLTS) is a statutory requirement which sets out the transport outcomes the region wishes to achieve. The RLTS has an important relationship with transport funding and implementation, particularly as New Zealand Transport Agency must take into account the RLTS before approving funding.

It is proposed to complete the development of the next RLTS by June 2011 in order to inform the development of the next Regional Land Transport Programme (the region's bid for national funding) and also provide guidance to local authorities as they prepare their next round of Long Term Council Community Plans.

Our initial focus is to define the issues affecting the region's transport system. In this regard, we are particularly interested in obtaining feedback from Kaikoura District Council.

Once the issues have been drafted and approved by the Regional Transport Committee (in October), it is proposed to seek wider community feedback in November 2009.

Proposed Changes to the Kaikoura District Sign Bylaw

The Kaikoura Signs Bylaw was made operative on January 2009. In the last 9 months, through practical application of the new bylaw, it has become apparent that changes are needed to ensure the bylaw is in accordance with other signs and standards.

Changes are proposed to give greater clarity and to give certainty to applicants and for Council's officers in processing consents. The last change is to ensure signage is in accordance with the amenity Council seeks to achieve through the District Plans Objectives and Policies in the Residential Zone.

Proposed Changes to the Bylaw-

All additions to the bylaw are underlined. All deletions are noted in strikethrough.

1. Section 20.D

DIRECTIONAL SIGNS: STANDARDS (excluding signs on the State Highway)

1. Any sign for which a permit is granted to provide directions to any commercial activity, industrial zone or public facility shall be:

- a. Coloured to a recognised international standard; and
- b. ~~200mm x 0.5m~~ 225mm by 1.2m in dimension; and
- c. Contain only the name of the facility to which it relates.
- d. Not exceed three directional signs per post or location.

The industry standard for directional signs is 225mm by 1.2m and this dimension is specified in the New Zealand Transit Agency Manual of Traffic Signs and Markings. This will enable applicants to order standardized signs which will lower the purchasing cost of these signs and keep the bylaw consistent with New Zealand Transport Agency (formerly Transit NZ).

2. 22.B. RESIDENTIAL ZONES: STANDARDS

A. RESIDENTIAL ZONES: ELIGIBILITY

1. A permit may be issued for ~~a~~ one sign to be displayed on any site in a residential zone if it complies with the relevant standards prescribed in Clause 22.B.

It was the intention of this rule that only one sign should be issued for any residential site. This can be seen by the reduction of the visitor accommodation standard to one sign from two signs in the current bylaw. The change provides clarity for both the applicant and the processing officer.

B. RESIDENTIAL ZONES: STANDARDS

1. Subject to subclauses 22.B.2, 22.B.3 and 22.B.4 any sign permitted in a residential zone shall:
 - a. Have a maximum area of 1.0m² unless the site is located along State Highway 1 whereas the maximum shall be 2.0m²
 - b. Be no more than 3.5meters high.
 - c. Be attached to a building, or be freestanding
 - d. If located on a boundary fence, the area of the sign must be entirely within the area of the fence.

- e. All external light fixtures illuminating a sign shall be shielded so that the light is confined to the surface of the sign and directed away from the public roadways and residential areas*
- f. Comply with Clause 20.A if located along the State Highway*

Signs located along fences are considered to be freestanding signs. The requirement that the sign be located wholly within the dimensions of the fence is to protect the amenity of the adjoining neighbour's.

Process of amendment

Council may resolve to undergo the process of amending the Kaikoura District Signs Bylaw 2009 under Sec 86 and 156 of the Local Government Act 2002.

Recommendation

The Council under section 86 and 156 of the Local Government Act 2002 undertake special consultation to amend the Kaikoura Signs Bylaw 2009 as per the recommendations above.

Pynes Building West End

As of 17 September 2009 Council is the new owner of the property located at 74-82 West End commonly known as the Pynes Building. This building currently houses the Trash Fashion Museum. This location is a key location in the centre of town and it is important for the town centre that life is returned to this part of the town. Council needs to therefore consider options available to it for the use of this facility in the short term while also at some stage considering the long term future of the site.

There are potentially many uses of the existing facility in the short term without Council having to outlay substantial funds for upgrading works. Such short term uses could be;

- Retained for the existing trash fashion outlet only.
- Enable like minded organisations to cohabit with the Trash Fashion display.
- Enable the information centre to be relocated to this site while alterations are undertaken to the information centre, if KITI chooses to do their alterations in the near future.
- Leased out to one individual business
- Leased out to a few smaller businesses
- Developed as a small enterprises and new business hub wherein start up operators could be given an opportunity to “test the market” with their product or service in an early start up mode
- Used as a paddy’s/craft/farmers market facility which could extend out onto the whole site. Again this could bring small business back into the West End.

It is understood that the Trash Fashion group would like to remain onsite however it is also understood that their ability to pay a rental is limited. It is also understood through discussions with Bayleys Real Estate that there are potentially a number of small entrepreneurs who would be interested in starting out on their business path by utilizing some small space within the Pynes Building. Council could call for expressions of interest for its use and/or work with local Real Estate companies to generate interest.

Longer term the site could be totally redeveloped for commercial purposes or it could be a possible site for a relocated Museum.

In the interim it is recommended that Council work with interested parties to ensure the building is occupied and used over the foreseeable future.

Kaikoura Integrated Family Health Centre

Attached is a letter from the Chief Executive Officer of the Canterbury District Health Board in relation to working with Council to investigate the feasibility of an Integrated Family Health Centre being co-located with other community services within the Kaikoura Township.

As can be seen from the District Health Board letter the Board's investigations to date on the replacement of the Kaikoura Hospital has highlighted the need to explore the green fields approach to a new health facility in Kaikoura, and that to endeavour to redevelop the existing site while maintaining existing services is proving difficult to achieve and therefore a brand new facility located off site is considered an option worth exploring.

The Board has advised that the current approach in working with a local authority is a key focus on how it is developing health services across Canterbury. It is noted that the Board would like to explore a green fields option on a site which has minimal environmental risk factors being, storms, flooding, earthquake, tsunami and sea rise.

The Kaikoura Long Term Council Community Plan provides that the community should advocate for health facilities which encompass all health services and agencies necessary to maintain a higher level of well being in our small rural community and advocate for social service agencies to provide a good level of services locally. Working constructively with the District Health Board would enable Council and the community to work for the development of new health care facilities in Kaikoura. Modern, new, well laid out health facilities are needed now in Kaikoura and this request may assist Kaikoura in achieving new facilities sooner rather than later.

It is understood that the Board has a project budget for new facilities however the longer it takes to initiate the project then the greater the potential for those funds to be swallowed up in other major Health Board projects coming up in the foreseeable future. Working constructively with the Board provides Kaikoura with a greater opportunity of securing new health facilities that will take the community forward over the next 20 to 50 years and working with the Board may well result in additional community services being collocated on the same site as a health facility. Such services could include St John Ambulance, Fire Services and others although, having said that neither of those mentioned organisations have been approached or consulted regarding this possible option or opportunity.

The Board has considered some potential sites and would like to work with Council on the possibility of utilizing some of the land currently bounded by Churchill Street, Scarborough Street and Resource Recovery Centre Road as this area seems to be the best site locally for minimizing potential environmental risks.

Working with the Board provides the Council with the opportunity of ensuring that this community does have health facilities that will take us through to the next future generations, consequently:

It is recommended that Council work constructively with the Canterbury District Health Board to progress the establishment of new integrated family health centre facilities in Kaikoura.

The above recommendation does not bind the Council to any future decisions but will enable the two organisations to work closely together to try and achieve a suitable outcome for the community. Should Council agree to the recommendation then if progress is made in terms of meeting the objectives of both organisations and the community then further reports will be brought back to Council with recommendations.

Mayor's Report

Mayors report – September 09

Since my last report a number of **day-to-day activities** have been entered into including meeting various concerned ratepayers on a number of personal, council & govt. dept. issues & conversations. Some resolved amicably – others a little more difficult and ongoing. Generally these have included

- Neighbour disputes
- Rates issues
- Perceived unfairness re: development contributions
- NMIT and their Kaikoura Input.
- KKHS & Council activities.

I was delighted with the **Kaikoura Awards & Recognition Evening**. Thank you to those councillors who could be there. I believe the speakers and presenters were an interesting and adequate mix of officialdom and local. I have only received positive feedback and recommend that the triennial format continue. Thank you also to staff and management for their invaluable input.

The first of the Mayors Office and T & D Committee sponsored **Economic forums** was held on Monday the 7th Sept. I have to say I was somewhat disappointed with the numbers attending (approx 25) after the express call to “back” such forums from the business community and individuals. However, by the time this goes to Council we would have held the second in the series of three forums-replies at this juncture indicate a better attendance.

The first forum did include some very pertinent ideas, methods, trends etc which were relevant to the small business world we live in. I look forward to the remaining 2 sessions.

Please refer to Public Excluded agenda for the remainder of my report.

Cheers

Mayor Kevin

Peninsula Water Tank Mural

At its meeting on 15 April 2009 Council resolved that a seascape mural be painted on the peninsular water tank by J More. At that meeting Council had been advised that J More, as part of a nationwide conservation effort to help raise public awareness for Hector and Maui dolphins, was responsible for stenciling dolphins on walls and fences throughout New Zealand and that his next public awareness project was to raise the profile of Basking Sharks as these had once been seen around our coast but were now seen less often than previously. At that time Council considered that the drawing of such a mural on the tank would be a positive replacement for the previous mural that had had some graffiti tagging done to it and subsequently had been painted out leaving a grey tank.

The mural was completed in late May and in June the Mayor received a letter signed by a number of local business people and tourist operators advising that while there was general approval of the mural on the tank and it was a marked improvement on what had been there previously, there was concern that the image of a large Basking Shark would convey the wrong message to visitors to Kaikoura and those who were uninformed about various shark species. Consequently the group requested that the Basking Shark be removed from the mural. Council received the delegation of the signatories at its meeting in July and agreed to further consider the issue of the removal of the Basking Shark from the mural. It is now two months since receiving that delegations and Council should now make a decision on whether the Basking Shark remains as part of the mural or is painted out and/or replaced with something else.

It is fair to say that the inclusion of the Basking Shark on the mural has caused some lively debate within certain circles of the Kaikoura community with views ranging from a Basking Shark has not been sighted in Kaikoura for a number of years therefore has no association with Kaikoura, to the fact that the shark used to be seen frequently around the Kaikoura coast and is part of Kaikoura's history and therefore should remain. Views tend to be polarized either you are happy with the shark remaining or you think it needs to be removed at all costs.

The issue had been raised through the Kaikoura Star which had called for a survey of residents to gauge their views on the issue. Perhaps the overall lack of response to the request for feedback was an indication that the whole issue is not such a big deal within the community but is a major issue for some specific individuals or organisations one way or the other. If Council believes the Basking Shark has no association with Kaikoura then it should remove the Basking Shark. If on the other hand it believes it does have an association or did have an association prior to the numbers being substantially reduced then there is no reason why it should not stay.

In their letter to the Mayor dated 23 June 2009 the group requesting that the shark be removed from the mural identified eight key points in their argument for the removal of the shark. Their eight points were;

1. The Basking Shark has no relevance to Kaikoura.

As Council knows this statement is factually incorrect, Basking Sharks have been caught in Kaikoura waters in the past and parts of that body have been commercialized. It is definitely fair to say however that the sightings have been substantially reduced in the last few years. In fact it is believed one has not been seen for a couple of years.

2. A mural in such a visible and visited location should be focused on highlighting what is iconic and unique about Kaikoura.

One can not disagree that the site is visited by many tourists to Kaikoura and murals could be utilized to promote and highlight what is iconic and unique about Kaikoura. It is noted that there are numerous other murals around the township that actively promote or highlight the whales and dolphins

that frequent our part of the South Island coast line. Perhaps in future we should be highlighting crayfish and the growing attraction of fur seals and sea birds.

3. The majority of visitors and marine enthusiasts that visit Kaikoura would not distinguish a basking shark as being a non threatening species.

It is unsure whether the writers of the letter had surveyed their visitors or marine enthusiasts to reach their conclusion as no back up information was provided. However, one would think that if one was a marine enthusiast they would potentially be able to differentiate between different types of sea creatures, but they may not.

4. Related to the prominent display of a shark being totally inappropriate and insensitive to the feelings and fears of many that associate the open water with sharks.

It is fair to say that sharks do inhabit our coastal waters and there are many species of shark in the open sea and to suggest otherwise is merely hiding the facts. Up until a few years ago you used to be able to go diving with sharks in Kaikoura and it was not uncommon to have whale watching, swimming with dolphins and shark diving all within a relatively close location of each other.

I recall when Whale Watch was talking about their proposed large display wherein they would be featuring all the species of marine life within our area including the different species of shark. The idea behind the concept was to educate the public on what is in the ocean including the good the bad and the ugly. This area has been known to have a large number of different species of shark in the area including at times White Pointers, yet that has not curtailed the amount of surfing done in the area and it certainly has not reduced the number of snorkelers nor reduced the numbers going swimming with dolphins or seal swimming.

5. 'We believe the location of the lookout will directly associate viewers with 'what is out there,' and reinforce the perception that the sea is a feeding ground for sharks'.

The sea is a feeding ground for sharks and in the case of the Basking Shark their meals are plankton. Our ocean is one of the more under researched parts of our planet yet it covers three quarters of the earth's surface. If we can increase the public's knowledge and understanding of what is out there then the better our chances are of ensuring that we have a sustainable marine future in our area. There are certainly parts of the world where the oceans or seas have been destocked of fish life due to human endeavour and the aim of identifying the Basking Shark was to bring that aspect of our activities to the knowledge of more people. From an educational perspective the Peninsula water tank is an ideal location to broadcast the message that the Basking Shark and the Hector and Maui Dolphins are now endangered species.

6. Suggests that even if an interpretation plaque was added, not everyone has the time to read an explanation or has English as their first language. The mural should tell its own story.

Be that as it may, the vast majority of visitors to Kaikoura can either speak or at least understand English and any interpretation panel would enhance whatever was on the mural whether it was a Basking Shark, a Giant Squid, a Common Dolphin or a Hutton Shearwater. Some people will just look at a mural while others will take the time to read what is written about what the mural represents.

7. Kaikoura is now a location famed for whales and dolphins and that is what we would like to see reinforced to our visitors.

There is no question that Kaikoura is famed for whales and dolphins and domestically it is also famed for crayfish and fishing. In this particular case however, the mural was not being used as an advertising hording but was specifically to depict a number of endangered species. If that is not what is desired then the mural could be or should be substantially altered to represent what we have an

abundance of however, that certainly was not the view when Council made its decision in April to promote a seascape mural that highlighted some endangered species.

8. If there was an intention to feature endangered species, then the southern right whale would have been more in keeping with Kaikoura.

There are probably numerous endangered species that visit our waters probably more infrequently than they used to and certainly if Council constructs more water storage tanks then there would be no reason why other endangered species could not feature on those tanks and could in it self become tourist attractions. It is understood that the Southern Right Whale is currently not yet as “threatened” as Basking Sharks.

Council needs to decide whether this mural is for educational purposes and is to contain species that are threatened or endangered or whether it is a tourist promotion mural which highlights the abundant variety of species within our waters. The two are very different. If we wish to highlight what people can commonly see in our area then Basking Sharks, Maui Dolphins and Hector Dolphins should all be removed and replaced with other species of marine life. However, if Council believes that the mural was to make a statement about currently endangered species then there is no reason why the current creatures on the mural should not be retained.

The mural artist has advised he is prepared to make changes to the mural if that is Council’s desire. At this stage however, he is currently in the United States and it is unsure what his travel arrangements are or when he will be back in New Zealand. It is understood he went to the States for our winter.

The operators who suggested that the Shark be removed have not demonstrated what economic impact the retention of the Shark is having either on their specific businesses or the local Kaikoura economy as a whole. If there is a genuine adverse economic impact on our local economy as a result of the Shark, then Council could review its desire to publicize endangered species in order to assist the local community. Until that adverse impact has been demonstrated then Council should not, if it wishes to use the mural for educational purposes, remove any of the threatened or endangered species from the mural.

It is therefore recommended that Council decline the request to remove the Basking Shark and that it reconsider such a request if a substantial adverse economic impact was demonstrated and proven to be effecting local Kaikoura businesses.

Natural Burials

Background

At the Social Services Committee meeting held on the 5th of August Eco-burials were raised. It was decided at that meeting that a formal request should be made to Council regarding whether there was an area where this could be contemplated in Kaikoura. As a result Council staff was asked to investigate the possibility of providing such a service within the Kaikoura Community.

The report is divided into two sections:

1. Legislative and Planning Issues
2. Location (or lack thereof) of Possible sites

Natural Cemeteries

This section of the report is to consider the possible matters of consideration for operating a natural cemetery within the Kaikoura District. The following are characteristics that distinguish a natural cemetery from a traditional cemetery;

- Embalming is kept at a minimum
- Coffins are designed to quickly compost
- Coffins are buried one meter deep

By having these special characteristics the rate of decomposition is quickened within the earth, thereby producing a more fertile soil. This is in contrast to a traditional method where the body is embalmed, placed in a coffin often made with Medium Density Fiber board (MDF) and plastic handles and buried 2 meters deep.

Natural cemeteries do not use headstones but rather mark the grave with a tree or shrub. Relatives can locate graves using GPS coordinates. While the planting of trees and shrubs does add to the benefits of a natural cemetery, the use of headstones could be seen as more of an aesthetic or personal choice.

The Kaikoura District could benefit from the practice of natural burial even within the traditional aesthetic of the current cemetery. The benefits of natural burial include:

- Enrich the soil from burial
- Reduce the use of embalming chemical which include formaldehyde
- Reduce the possibility of contaminants to ground water and soil from coffins
- Allows locals to bury relatives in a sustainable fashion
- Compatibility with other Council initiatives such as Green Globe and Communities for Climate Protection
- Increase of birdlife within the cemetery area (optional with the plantings of natives)

Natural Cemeteries and requirements under the Resource Management Act

In terms of the Regional Council Rules; resource consent would be required under the *CRC Land and Vegetation Management Plan, Kaikoura* for earthworks with a maximum depth greater than .5m which is a discretionary activity. Resource Consent would also be required for much of Kaikoura under the Rule WQL48 –*Use of Land for a New Cemetery or Extension*.

Any land on an unconfined aquifer, within 50 meters of a stream, or flood plane would need consent. This would include all land within the area known as the Kaikoura flats and does not include the current cemetery on Scarborough Street.

In terms of the Kaikoura District Plan, resource consent would be required in the rural, residential and settlement zones for a commercial activity. Depending on the location of the cemetery (say in relation to water bodies, in a landscape overlay or archaeological area or site) further consents may be required.

As this is a preliminary assessment the need for natural burial may be subject to other requirements depending on the proposed location.

Possible Sites for Natural Burials.

Factors outside planning issues that need to be taken into consideration when choosing a site for natural burials are:

- a. Proximity to potential users
- b. Topography of land

There are three possible avenues when identifying sites to be used as a natural burial site namely:

1. Lands owned by Kaikoura District Council
2. Lands owned by Department of Conservation that has been targeted for the Trees for Travellers project.
3. Other Lands - Individually owned, for example lands owned by a Church Group.

1. Lands Owned By Kaikoura District Council

Lands owned by Kaikoura District Council within the urban area are fairly limited with the only two sites identified from the rating database. No sites were identified within the Kaikoura flats and or within the rural area. The sites identified are:

- Existing cemetery
- Tar depot.

Existing Cemetery

Separate and apart from the plots that have already been created there is approximately 2ha of land available for burials which has to date not been divided into lots. The Draft Natural Burial Policy of Kapiti District Council suggests that at least half a hectare of land is necessary for establishing a feasible forest system.

One of the main advantages of creating a natural burial area within the existing conventional cemetery is that it eliminates the need for any additional resource consent. It would also create a sanctuary within the town for birds and other wild life and create a park setting which could showcase the work of Trees for Travellers whose headquarters is across the road. It would integrate the old cemetery with a new approach so that members of the Kaikoura community who wish to be buried near relatives would have more choice.

This report has not looked at whether the soil at the cemetery would be appropriate for this type of burial. However the recycling center could provide compost for burial.

Tar Depot

This site has been allocated for future development such as a Council Office and indoor sports complex.

2. Lands owned by Department of Conservation

The Department of Conservation owns significant hectares of land within the Kaikoura District. Council would need to work with the Department to ascertain their willingness for the District to use their lands as a Natural Burial Cemetery.

Any partnership gained could be integrated into the whole Trees for Travellers programme where Council currently uses Department of Conservation land for this programme.

3. Other Lands

The possibility exists that there are other sites within the district that could be used for natural burials. In earlier days, most burials were carried out within church yards or within lands owned by churches;

the possibility exists that churches within the District may be open to the idea of natural burials and is willing to accommodate this within lands own by the church.

Conclusions

From the above and information at hand it appears that the only site owned by Council that can accommodate natural burials is within the existing cemetery, however the possibility exists where lands owned by others could be used once the relevant planning issues are resolved.