

## **CANTERBURY REGIONAL COUNCIL**

### **JOINT CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL/CANTERBURY REGIONAL COUNCIL COMMITTEE**

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE JOINT CHRISTCHURCH CITY /CANTERBURY  
REGIONAL COUNCILS COMMITTEE HELD ON WEDNESDAY, 16 FEBRUARY 2000  
IN COMMITTEE ROOM TWO OF THE CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL, TUAM  
STREET, CHRISTCHURCH FROM 4.00 P.M.

#### **CONTENTS**

1. APOLOGIES
2. MINUTES OF MEETING – 17 NOVEMBER 1999
3. MATTERS ARISING
4. DEPUTATIONS AND PETITIONS
5. UPDATE ON THE CROSSING BUS INTERCHANGE - ROUTES AND TRAFFIC  
MANAGEMENT
6. STOCK TRUCK EFFLUENT UPDATE
7. MANAGEMENT OF PITS/LANDFILLS AND EFFECTS ON GROUNDWATER  
AROUND CHRISTCHURCH
  
8. EXTRAORDINARY AND URGENT BUSINESS
9. NEXT MEETING – 15 MARCH 2000
10. CLOSURE

#### **PRESENT**

##### **Christchurch City Council**

Councillors A Crighton (Deputy Chairperson), D Close, P Harrow, C Manning and R Wright  
from 4.30 p.m.

##### **Canterbury Regional Council**

Councillors V Campbell (Chairperson), K Burke, H Hay (until 5.20 p.m.), D Shand, J Waters,  
P Yeoman and R Johnson.

#### **IN ATTENDANCE**

M Mora, A Wilkie and R Cave (Riccarton Wigram Community Board) and Crs M Oldfield  
and R Little (Canterbury Regional Council) and M Crean (Press).

## **PUBLIC IN ATTENDANCE**

Nil.

## **STAFF PRESENT**

### **Christchurch City Council**

J Fletcher, D Hinman, P Roberts, W Brixton, E Van Torr, A Watson.

### **Canterbury Regional Council**

J Talbot, W Thomas, I McChesney, K Taylor, L Fietje, V Smith, S Hayward, M Bachelts and E Brussovs.

## **1. APOLOGIES**

An apology was received and sustained for Cr S Wells, for lateness from Cr R Wright and early departure by Cr H Hay.

### **Mid Term Changeover**

Cr Campbell welcomed members and observed that the chairing of meetings and servicing of the committee now fell to the Canterbury Regional Council.

## **2. MINUTES**

The minutes of the previous Committee meeting held on 17 November 1999, as circulated, were taken as read and confirmed as a true and accurate record.

Waters/Crighton

## **3. MATTERS ARISING**

- (a) Cr Waters asked when an update on Bottle Lake (Clause 3) would occur. Staff agreed to follow up this item.
- (b) Cr Burke asked if the Christchurch City Council and Canterbury Regional Council visions for the Regional Land Transport Strategy had been approved by the City Council. Advice was that they had been received.

## **4. DEPUTATIONS AND PETITIONS**

Nil.

## **5. UPDATE ON THE CROSSING BUS INTERCHANGE – ROUTES AND TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT**

Mark Bachels (CRC) spoke to the report and provided a brief summary of the history and presentation on the present position in relation to bus routes. It was noted that analysis was leaning towards the “Spine” option with layovers at Hoyts (or Bass Street) behind the Casino, the Polytechnic, Christchurch Hospital (Riverside), and Christchurch Womens on Colombo Street. The matter of a two-way Lichfield Street which was more toward the “Cross” option was a longer term consideration due to the need for further consultation. It was noted that the interchange would be opened in two stages with 50% of services using it by November 2000 and the rest by April 2001. The following points were made in subsequent discussion:

- Cr Crighton was concerned at the increase in bus traffic in and around the hospital etc. and the effect on the tourism and cultural activities. Staff were to provide the expected increase in bus movements as a result of the Riverside layover.
- The question of variation of bus contracts and also the terms of recently let contracts were raised. Staff advised that there were legal and contractual impediments to achieving any variation despite the perceived efficiency benefits to operators. The recent contracts had been let prior to the interchange being a formal proposal.

Paul Roberts (CCC) spoke to a plan of the proposed traffic management measures proposed for the Square and Colombo Street. The objective was to reduce traffic congestion. Subtle measures to retain the benefit of reduced congestion yet not encourage cruising traffic were planned for the Square. The proposals had been favourably received by the CCC City Services Committee and approved for consultation prior to adoption in April 2000.

In subsequent discussion, the Committee sought clarification of proposal details, effects on property owners, methods and scope of consultation and surveys. Staff advised that feedback so far had been positive and it had been found from surveys that 25% of shoppers were bus users.

### ***Resolved***

*That the information update on interchange bus routes and traffic management be received.*

## **6. STOCK TRUCK EFFLUENT UPDATE**

Ian McChesney (CRC) spoke to the report, advising that a non-regulatory Industry Code of Practice had been released in June 1999 and the working party was focusing implementation of the code with stakeholders. The Code required a total commitment of all levels i.e. farmers standing stock, transporters provide containment trays and in transit holding tanks and the provision of up to five sites in the region for end point collection. Those sites would be in Kaikoura, Amberley, Ashburton, Timaru and Sheffield/Springfield. Priority was being given to the Amberley and Tinwald sites. The question of funding construction and maintenance of the receiving sites was considered to be an “exacerbator” responsibility (i.e. the industry), and Transfund

would be approached with a proposal with Transit New Zealand being the manager as an extension of its state highway responsibility.

In subsequent discussion it was revealed that:

- The reception sites would cost up to \$100,000 each.
- Members wondered if the offer of regional or local contribution might assist Transfund reach a positive decision.
- While Canterbury was at the forefront of this matter nationally, Otago had put in place a temporary system funded from their own resources.
- The question of disposal of other material such as campervans effluent and littering along state highways was raised.
- Mr Mora (Riccarton Wigram Community Board) observed that the stock effluent situation had not improved and that the Code of Practice was too equivocal. The Committee noted that further education was needed and that the system needed to proceed as a package deal as each component and party relied on co-operation and action of the others. It was noted that standing stock was in fact good farming practice.

### ***Resolved***

*That the update on stock truck effluent disposal be received.*

## **7. MANAGEMENT OF PITS/LANDFILLS AND EFFECTS ON GROUNDWATER AROUND CHRISTCHURCH**

Ken Taylor introduced the report and the presentation approach of CRC staff to the subject. He emphasised that holes in the ground had implications for groundwater, particularly where the aquifers were unconfined as in the west of Christchurch.

Shirley Hayward provided a presentation on the CRC technical report "Groundwater Contamination by Hydrocarbons in Canterbury from April 1988 to June 1999". (Copies were available for members at the meeting.)

The report covered ambient trends in hydrocarbon contaminants under the groups chlorinated hydrocarbons, Btex and Polynuclear Aromatic Hydrocarbons. Most effects around Christchurch were in the first aquifer and covered sites at Johns Road, Wigram and between Blenheim Road and the Heathcote River. The contaminants were from industrial and/or landfill activities but the actual sources were not known. The Committee was given explanations about the behaviour and persistence of different contaminants. The monitoring would be extended in future to deeper wells.

In response to further questions about remediation, staff advised that the Regional Hazardous Waste Strategy would address this and other contamination. A local government conference remit passed last year would be followed up in relation to national imperatives.

Leo Fietje spoke about the regulatory aspects of two sites at Owaka Road and Abletts

pit. He outlined the monitoring that had occurred and the compliance sought to consent conditions and remediation needed to obviate environmental effects. While there was still some work to be done to remove non inert products, e.g. tyres, the owners were complying with their consent conditions and would eventually reduce the visual effects. Monitoring of bores down gradient had revealed little change in water quality.

Mike Mora said the situation had been raised four years ago and was essentially the same today. He questioned the compliance of the company with conditions and if the time was not right for enforcement. A video of the sites was shown.

CRC staff cautioned that enforcement processes had appeal provisions which could mean no action for a year while the Environmental Court process took its course. It was also noted that the City Council was proposing to purchase the lake on the Owaka site for restoration and recreation purposes.

After some further discussion about how to deal with the visual effects Cr Manning moved, seconded by Cr Burke:

***Resolved***

*That the Joint Committee request the Canterbury Regional Council Enforcement Section to take all practical steps to clean up the Owaka Road and Abletts Tip sites and report back on progress to the next meeting of the Committee.*

The motion was put and carried.

The Committee also agreed that more involvement between the CRC and Community Boards should be fostered, for example, through joint tours of sites of concern.

**8. EXTRAORDINARY AND URGENT BUSINESS**

Nil.

**9. NEXT MEETING**

Scheduled for 15 March 2000.

**10. CLOSURE**

The Chairperson declared the meeting closed at 6.15 p.m.

CONFIRMED

DATE \_\_\_\_\_ CHAIRPERSON