



AGENDA

Environmental Services Committee Meeting Tuesday, 8 June 2021

Date Tuesday, 8 June 2021

Time 9.30am

Location Council Chamber
District Council Building
King George Place
Timaru

File Reference 1425661

Timaru District Council

Notice is hereby given that a meeting of the Environmental Services Committee will be held in the Council Chamber, District Council Building, King George Place, Timaru, on Tuesday 8 June 2021, at 9.30am.

Environmental Services Committee Members

Barbara Gilchrist (Chairperson), Gavin Oliver (Deputy Chairperson), Cr Allan Booth, Cr Peter Burt, Cr Richard Lyon, Cr Paddy O'Reilly, Cr Sally Parker, Cr Stu Piddington, Cr Steve Wills, Tewera King (Mana Whenua) and Mayor Nigel Bowen

Quorum – no less than 2 members

Local Authorities (Members' Interests) Act 1968

Committee members are reminded that if you have a pecuniary interest in any item on the agenda, then you must declare this interest and refrain from discussing or voting on this item, and are advised to withdraw from the meeting table.

Paul Cooper

Group Manager Environmental Services

Order Of Business

1	Apologies	5
2	Identification of Items of Urgent Business.....	5
3	Identification of Matters of a Minor Nature	5
4	Declaration of Conflicts of Interest	5
5	Chairperson's Report.....	5
6	Confirmation of Minutes	6
6.1	Minutes of the Environmental Services Committee Meeting held on 16 March 2021.....	6
7	Reports	11
7.1	Road Naming Report - Seadown Properties Subdivision Washdyke	11
7.2	Review of Public Alerting Siren System.....	20
7.3	Final Consideration of Plan Change 22 and Operative Date	40
7.4	Appointment of Members to the District Licensing Committee	43
8	Consideration of Urgent Business Items.....	45
9	Consideration of Minor Nature Matters.....	45

- 1 Apologies**
- 2 Identification of Items of Urgent Business**
- 3 Identification of Matters of a Minor Nature**
- 4 Declaration of Conflicts of Interest**
- 5 Chairperson's Report**

6 Confirmation of Minutes

6.1 Minutes of the Environmental Services Committee Meeting held on 16 March 2021

Author: Jo Doyle, Governance Advisor

Recommendation

That the Minutes of the Environmental Services Committee Meeting held on 16 March 2021 be confirmed as a true and correct record of that meeting and that the Chairperson's electronic signature be attached.

Attachments

- 1. Minutes of the Environmental Services Committee Meeting held on 16 March 2021**



MINUTES

Environmental Services Committee Meeting Tuesday, 16 March 2021

Ref: 1425661

**Minutes of Timaru District Council
Environmental Services Committee Meeting
Held in the Council Chamber, District Council Building, King George Place, Timaru
on Tuesday, 16 March 2021 at 9.30am**

Present: Barbara Gilchrist (Chairperson), Cr Allan Booth, Cr Richard Lyon, Cr Paddy O'Reilly, Cr Sally Parker, Cr Stu Piddington, Cr Steve Wills, Mayor Nigel Bowen

In Attendance: Council Officers

Chief Executive (Bede Carran), Acting Group Manager Environmental Services (Erik Barnes), District Planning Manager (Mark Geddes), Governance Advisor (Jo Doyle)

Community Boards:

Lloyd McMillan – Temuka Community Board
John McDonald – Pleasant Point Community Board
Janene Adams – Geraldine Community Board

1 Apologies

Resolution 2021/4

Moved: Chairperson Barbara Gilchrist

Seconded: Mayor Nigel Bowen

That the apology received from Cr Gavin Oliver and Cr Peter Burt be accepted and leave of absence granted.

Carried

2 Identification of Items of Urgent Business

There were no items of urgent business.

3 Identification of Matters of a Minor Nature

There were no minor nature matters.

4 Declaration of Conflicts of Interest

There were no conflicts of interest.

5 Chairperson's Report

Since the last Environmental Services Committee, the Chairperson has attended the Biodiversity Champions meeting, took part in a story and awarded prizes to a champion recycler, climate change workshop facilitated by the Canterbury Mayoral Forum, Crusaders/Highlanders event, met with acting Group Manager for Environmental Services, LGNZ climate change symposium, OTOP meeting, international women's day celebration, hearings committee related to dog

control, directors interviews for Venture Timaru, Tenders and Procurement Committee meetings, youth sector network, council meetings and workshops related to the LTP.

Resolution 2021/5

Moved: Chairperson Barbara Gilchrist

Seconded: Cr Steve Wills

That the Chairpersons report be accepted.

Carried

6 Confirmation of Minutes**6.1 Minutes of the Environmental Services Committee Meeting held on 2 February 2021****Resolution 2021/6**

Moved: Cr Steve Wills

Seconded: Cr Sally Parker

That the Minutes of the Environmental Services Committee Meeting held on 2 February 2021 be confirmed as a true and correct record of that meeting and that the Chairperson's electronic signature be attached.

Carried

7 Reports**7.1 Update on Feedback to the Draft District Plan and Agreement of Next Steps for the District Plan Review Process**

The Committee was presented with the feedback received on the Draft District Plan (DDP) and sought Council approval for the process to finalise the Proposed District Plan (PDP).

The feedback received has been categorised as minor changes, standard projects and special projects. Further workshops will be held before the PDP is brought to Council for sign off.

It was noted that some special projects may require further consultation.

A successful Hui was held at the Arowhenua Marae to discuss the Maori multi-purpose zone.

Resolution 2021/7

Moved: Chairperson Barbara Gilchrist

Seconded: Mayor Nigel Bowen

1. That the Environmental Services Committee:
 - (a) Note the feedback on the Draft District Plan;
 - (b) Approve Option 1 to finalise the Proposed District Plan.

Carried

8 Consideration of Urgent Business Items

There were no items of urgent business.

9 Consideration of Minor Nature Matters

There were no minor nature matters.

The Meeting closed at 9.41am.

.....
Cr Barbara Gilchrist
Chairperson

7 Reports

7.1 Road Naming Report - Seadown Properties Subdivision Washdyke

Author: Nathan Hole, Team Leader Consents and Compliance

Authoriser: Paul Cooper, Group Manager Environmental Services

Recommendation

That:

1. The report be received.
2. That the name 'Peeress Street' is approved.

Purpose of Report

- 1 To refer a road naming proposal to the Committee.

Assessment of Significance

- 2 This matter is considered very low under the Council's Significance and Engagement Policy.

Background

- 3 The road to be named is on land subject to Plan Change 22 and two granted subdivision consents. The road traverses both subdivisions (being Stage 1 and Stage 2 of the site development).
- 4 The new road has been formed in accordance with the proposed subdivisions, with the first 100m of road adjoining Washdyke Flat Road due to vest as legal road as soon as the survey plan deposits.
- 5 Once the road is named then street numbers and addresses can be created for the new development.

Discussion

- 6 Section 319 of the Local Government Act 1974 provides Council with the power to name roads. Council's Delegations Manual provides authority to the Environmental Services Committee to name roads in accordance with the Naming of Roads, Private Roads and Private Ways Policy (Attached).
- 7 The Policy invites developers to submit three naming options with reasons stating the preferred option.

Options and Preferred Option

- 8 The developer has submitted three options listed below in order of preference:
 - 8.1 Washington Drive
 - 8.2 Peeress Drive
 - 8.3 Doncaster Crescent

- 9 Reasoning is attached to support the three options.
- 9.1 Option 1 is to recognise Bill Washington's history with Washdyke, but does not meet clause 4.8(d) of the policy as Mr Washington is a living person.
- 9.2 Option 2 is supported, although Peeress "Street" rather than "Drive" is recommended after consultation with Council's Land Transport Manager. Street is considered to be more appropriate when considered against the policy, and is consistent with other street names at Washdyke. The proposed change has also been discussed with the applicant's planning consultant who did not oppose the recommendation.
- 9.3 Option 3 does not meet clause 4.8(l) of the policy as Doncaster Street already exists at within the District at Washdyke.
- 10 Option 2 as "Peeress Street" is the preferred option.

Consultation

- 11 The applicant has stated that they have not undertaken consultation with any external parties.
- 12 Council's Land Transport Manager has been consulted and supports Option 2 with the amendment to Peeress Street.

Relevant Legislation, Council Policy and Plans

- 13 Section 319 of the Local Government Act 1974
- 14 Council Policy: Naming of Roads, Private Roads and Private Ways

Financial and Funding Implications

- 15 Clause 4.11 of the policy sets out that the sign(s) and their installation will be met by the person requesting the naming, meaning there will be no financial or funding implications for Council.

Other Considerations

- 16 There are no other matters for consideration.

Attachments

1. Timaru District Council Naming of Roads, Private Roads and Private Ways Policy [↓](#) 
2. Applicant Road Name Options with Reasons [↓](#) 

18/05/2021

Naming of Roads, Private Roads and Private Ways Policy - Timaru District Council

1.0 Purpose

This Policy addresses the naming of roads, private roads and private ways.

2.0 Background

The Local Government Act 1974, Sections 319(1)(j) gives Council authority 'to name and to alter the name of any road and to place on any building or erection on or abutting on any road a plate bearing the name of the road'. Names are generally required for new roads in subdivisions, or when previously unformed roads are constructed. In certain circumstances private roads and private ways are required to be named. In addition, existing roads, private roads and private ways may be renamed.

This policy defines the requirements for naming roads and private ways in the district.

3.0 Key Definitions

The Local Government Act 1974 defines private way, private road and road as follows:

“private way means any way or passage whatsoever over private land within a district, the right to use which is confined or intended to be confined to certain persons or classes of persons, and which is not thrown open or intended to be open to the use of the public generally; and includes any such way or passage as aforesaid which at the commencement of this Part exists within any district”

“private road means any roadway, place, or arcade laid out or formed within a district on private land, whether before or after the commencement of this Part, by the owner thereof, but intended for the use of the public generally”

“road means the whole of any land which is within a district, and which—

- a) immediately before the commencement of this Part was a road or street or public highway; or*
- b) immediately before the inclusion of any area in the district was a public highway within that area; or*
- c) is laid out by the council as a road or street after the commencement of this Part; or*
- d) is vested in the council for the purpose of a road as shown on a deposited survey plan; or*
- e) is vested in the council as a road or street pursuant to any other enactment;*

—and includes—

- f) except where elsewhere provided in this Part, any access way or service lane which before the commencement of this Part was under the control of any council or is laid out or constructed by or vested in any council as an access way or service lane or is declared by the Minister of Works and Development as an access way or service lane after the commencement of this Part or is declared by the Minister of Lands as an access way or service lane on or after 1 April 1988;*

18/05/2021

Naming of Roads, Private Roads and Private Ways Policy - Timaru District Council

g) every square or place intended for use of the public generally, and every bridge, culvert, drain, ford, gate, building, or other thing belonging thereto or lying upon the line or within the limits thereof;—

but, except as provided in the [Public Works Act 1981](#) or in any regulations under that Act, does not include a motorway within the meaning of that Act or the [Government Roading Powers Act 1989](#)”

4.0 Policy

4.1 Compliance with Australian / New Zealand Standard

Council expects compliance with the Australian/New Zealand Standard - Rural and Urban addressing AS/NZS 4819:2011 (thereafter referred as the Standard). Where there is conflict with this policy and the before mentioned standard the standard shall prevail.

4.2 Naming of Roads

a) All formed roads shall be named.

b) Unformed roads will only be named if a name is required for addressing purposes. Properties adjoining an unformed road will be allocated property addresses in terms of the formed road which they are accessed from.

4.3 Naming of Private Roads

Private roads will only be named if more than five primary address sites are, or are likely to be, accessed off the private road.

4.4 Naming of Private Ways

Private ways will only be named if Land Information New Zealand refuse to accept numbers for the properties off the private way.

4.5 Name Components

Every name shall consist of a name element followed by a road type. The road type shall be selected from Section 4.9 of this Policy.

4.6 The Process for Naming New Roads, Private Roads and Private Ways

The subdivider is invited to submit three names (in order of preference) with reasons for the suggestions, along with details of any consultation undertaken^[1]. The Environmental Services Committee will consider the proposed names and determine the road name in the context of this Policy.

18/05/2021

Naming of Roads, Private Roads and Private Ways Policy - Timaru District Council

4.7 The Process for Renaming Roads, Private Roads and Private Ways and the Naming of Existing Legal but Previously Unformed Roads

a) Any request to rename an existing road/private road/private way or to name an existing but previously unformed legal road will be forwarded to the Group Manager Environmental Services to determine whether the request is appropriate.

If appropriate, the Environmental Services Committee will determine if any further consultation is required having regard to the Council's Significance and Engagement Policy. If no further consultation is required, the Environmental Services Committee will determine the renaming request.

If further consultation is required, the consultation will be conducted by Council staff prior to the renaming being determined by the Environmental Services Committee.

b) When a road, private road or private way is requested to be renamed, a minimum of 80% of the property owners on that road/private road/private way must approve of the change, unless Council's Environmental Services Committee determines otherwise. There is no guarantee that a request will be approved.

c) Where a road/private road/private way is physically realigned and requires renaming, the approval of property owners will not be sought. In such a case Council will give advanced warning to property owners of the renaming and will pay for any reasonable costs the landowners incur as a direct result of the renaming.

4.8 Name Selection Criteria

The following factors shall be taken into account when selecting private way, private road and road names under 4.5-4.7:

a) Local historical or geographical significance.

b) Well known, or previously well known, names of farms or properties located on the land to which the new road relates, or in its vicinity

c) Maori names of local significance. Appropriate consultation and advice from Te Runanga o Arowhenua Society Incorporated should be sought.

d) Names of local residents who have achieved prominence in their chosen fields such as arts, sport, commerce, politics, local government, military, etc. Naming after persons living is generally avoided. Permission of surviving relatives should be obtained where appropriate.

e) Continuing an established theme in a neighbourhood.

f) A significant feature in the area (for example, geographical feature, landscape, flora, fauna). Naming after features which do not exist in the area should be avoided (for example, naming after native trees or plants that are not evident in the area, or views that cannot be identified).

g) Where an existing road is being extended, the road extension will be the same as that of the existing road.

h) Names cannot be offensive, racist, derogatory or demeaning.

18/05/2021

Naming of Roads, Private Roads and Private Ways Policy - Timaru District Council

- i) Diacritical marks, special characters, hyphens, numerals, suffixes, prefixes and directional indicators shall not be used in road name.
- j) All road signs for private ways shall be annotated "Private" at the applicants expense.
- k) The Council may not necessarily accept the marketing name for a development as a road name for any road within a development.
- l) The name element of a road name, regardless of any difference in the road type, shall not be the same spelled similar or sound similar to a road already in existence within the District. Proposed road names will be checked against Councils Road Assessment and Maintenance Management database^[2] to avoid duplication.

4.9 Road Name Types

a) Road name types shall be selected as outlined in *Appendix B Road Types –AS/NZS 4819:2011* as follows:

Road Type	Abb.	Description	Open ended	Cul-de-sac	Pedestrian only
Alley	Aly	Usually narrow roadway in a city or towns.	✓	✓	
Arcade	Arc	Covered walkway with shops along the sides			✓
Avenue	Ave	Broad roadway, usually planted on each side with trees.	✓		
Boulevard	Blvd	Wide roadway, well paved, usually ornamented with trees and grass plots	✓		
Circle	Cir	Roadway that generally forms a circle; or a short enclosed roadway bounded by a circle.	✓	✓	
Close	Cl	Short enclosed roadway.		✓	
Court	Crt	Short enclosed roadway, usually surrounded by buildings.		✓	
Crescent	Cres	Crescent shaped roadway, especially where both ends join the same thoroughfare.	✓		
Drive	Dr	Wide roadway without many cross-streets.	✓		
Esplanade	Esp	Level roadway along the seaside, lake, or a river.	✓		
Glade	Gld	Roadway usually in a valley of trees.	✓	✓	
Green	Grn	Roadway often leading to a grassed public recreation area.		✓	
Grove	Grv	Roadway that features a group of trees standing together.		✓	
Highway	Hwy	Main thoroughfare between major destinations.	✓		
Lane	Lane	Narrow roadway between walls, buildings or a narrow country roadway.	✓	✓	✓

18/05/2021

Naming of Roads, Private Roads and Private Ways Policy - Timaru District Council

Road Type	Abb.	Description	Open ended	Cul-de-sac	Pedestrian only
Loop		Loop Roadway that diverges from and rejoins the main thoroughfare.	√		
Mall		Wide walkway, usually with shops along the sides.			√
Mews		Roadway in a group of houses.		√	
Parade	Pde	Public roadway or promenade that has good pedestrian facilities along the side.	√		
Place	Pl	Short, sometimes narrow, enclosed roadway.		√	
Promenade	Prom	Wide flat walkway, usually along the water's edge.			√
Quay	Qy	Roadway alongside or projecting into the water.	√	√	
Rise	Rise	Roadway going to a higher place or position.	√	√	
Road	Rd	Open roadway primarily for vehicles.	√		
Square	Sq	Roadway which generally forms a square shape, or an area of roadway bounded by four sides.	√	√	
Steps	Stps	Walkway consisting mainly of steps			√
Street	St	Public roadway in an urban area, especially where paved and with footpaths and buildings along one or both sides.	√		
Terrace	Tce	Roadway on a hilly area that is mainly flat.	√	√	
Track	Trk	Walkway in natural setting.			√
Walk	Walk	Thoroughfare for pedestrians.			√
Way	Way	Short enclosed roadway.		√	√
Wharf	Whrf	A roadway on a wharf or pier.	√	√	√

b) An individual's full name will only be used where the name is of reasonable length and the first name needs to be used to correctly identify the individual being commemorated. Full names longer than 15 letters will not usually be considered. In these instances, consideration will be given to using only the surname.

c) Short names for short streets are suggested for practical reasons.

d) Symbols intended to add emphasis to a letter e.g. à should not be used, to ensure the clarity of signs is maximised.

4.10 Sign Specifications

When the new road, private road or private way name is confirmed, the sign is required to comply with the Council Road Name Sign Specifications.

<https://www.timaru.govt.nz/council/publications/policies/naming-of-roads,-private-roads-and-private-ways-policy>

5/6

18/05/2021

Naming of Roads, Private Roads and Private Ways Policy - Timaru District Council

4.11 Sign Costs

a) The cost of sign(s) and their installation will be met by:

The person requesting the naming or renaming of existing private roads and private ways; or

Council: for previously unformed roads and roads being renamed; or when naming has occurred as a result of LINZ not agreeing to number a property(s) on the private road/way; or if agreed by Council's Land Transport Manager.

b) Ornamental road signs and ornamental development area signs will not be allowed in the road reserve. If a developer erects their own ornamental road and development area name sign(s)^[1] on private property, in addition to the Council road name sign, and that ornamental road name sign is damaged, stolen, or needs maintenance or repair, Council will not be responsible for carrying out any such work or paying for any associated costs.

4.12 Registration of Road Names

In accordance with Section 319A of the Local Government Act 1974, if the Council names any road, private road or private way for the first time, or alters the name of a road, private road or private way, the Council will as soon as practicable send a copy of the relevant resolution to the Registrar-General of Land and the Surveyor-General.

[1] Three proposed road names with the same name component but different road types are not acceptable. e.g. Poplar Street, Poplar Close, Poplar Place would not be considered three different road names.

[2] Road Assessment and Maintenance Management Software

[3] The erection of an ornamental name sign or post may require a resource consent under the Timaru District Plan. If the sign is to be positioned within road reserve, it will also require consent from Council to occupy the road reserve under Local Government Act 1974. Applications for these consents will be considered on its merits, may or may not be granted.

Adopted Environmental Services Committee 24 July 2018

Option 1: Washington Drive

In the late 1960's Bill Washington developed his first building on Hilton Highway, Washdyke. His first buildings included a store on the main highway, a car wash, and the original site for Washingtons Exploration on Seadown road.

Mr. Washington now owns many buildings in Washdyke and continues to improve what he calls 'The Gateway to Timaru'.

Bill Washington oversaw fundraising to enhance Washdyke by planting trees along Hilton Highway and is behind the development of the industrial business park on Washdyke Flat Road.

Option 2: Peeress Drive

George and Jane Washington and family of Rebecca, Mary, Thomas, John, Robert, Jeremy and Anthony left London docks on 26 March, 1874, bound for Timaru, New Zealand.

After 118 days aboard the ship Peeress, the family arrived in New Zealand.

Twenty-four families set up home at Patiti Point and the Washington family set up home at Arowhenua where the government provided houses and ¼ acre of land and were able to rent to own.

Descendants of this family still live in the South Canterbury district.

Option 3: Doncaster Crescent

The Doncaster Hotel was erected around 1854 at Washdyke.

The hotel contained eighteen bedrooms, three sitting rooms, dining room, bar and kitchen.

There were also stables and loose boxes, which were useful at race time.

For many years, this area was known as Doncaster.

7.2 Review of Public Alerting Siren System

Author: Lamorna Cooper, Emergency Management Advisor

Authoriser: Paul Cooper, Group Manager Environmental Services

Recommendation

That the Environmental Services Committee

1. Accept and approve

- (a) the recommendations of the Emergency Management Unit, supported by external report from Ignition Group to
 - (i) upgrade 3 electronic sirens at Caroline Bay and Pareora
 - (ii) decommission 10 selected sirens
 - (iii) replace 8 critical sirens and;
 - (iv) undertake public education programme to support and advise community

Purpose of Report

- 1 This report summarises the history, uses, changes and current national direction for sirens being used within a hazard and risk management framework. It analyses our current Public Alerting Siren System (PASS) and arrangements, the results from an external review of that system (report attached) and proposals for modifying the Timaru District system to ensure compliance with the Technical Standard TS03/14 (National Emergency Management Agency).

Assessment of Significance

- 2 The Public Alerting Siren System (PASS) is not listed as a Strategic Asset in the Significance and Engagement Policy.
- 3 Over the last 10 years all new siren installations have occurred with due consultation with the community they serve, usually via the Community Board or a community-driven working group. This has been accompanied by the development of Community Response/Evacuation Plans and this has become the pre-requisite for any siren installation.
- 4 The de-commissioning of any siren array is therefore considered 'of significance' and warrants an assessment of the residual risk, community resilience provided by other options and the ease (and costs) of upgrading arrays for compliance.
- 5 The degree of significance is Low to Medium.

Background

- 6 The first arrays of the Timaru District Public Alerting Siren System (PASS) were installed post WWII, and during the Cold War more for Nuclear warning than any natural event (anecdotal). Several were then installed for flooding warning, coastal inundation and tsunami warnings.

Very few of these sirens were loud enough to be heard any further than 100m away and being mechanical, they would seize up if not tested regularly.

- 7 Past reports to Council have recommended new sirens be installed in places where communities, tourists and businesses have been identified as 'at risk' from hazards such as flooding, coastal inundation, gas/chemical exposure and tsunamis. This has resulted in the installation of new arrays over the past 10 years to cover Pareora (2), Caroline Bay, Waipopo/Opihi/Petersen Park, Washdyke and Rangitata. The current siren arrays being replaced are Milford Lagoon and North/Turnbull Streets (June 2021).
- 8 The National Emergency Management Agency has determined that all sirens used for tsunami warning are to comply with Technical Standard TS03/14 (NEMA). This includes the tone that they use and their ability to have a voice-over capability. The deadline for compliance has been extended by NEMA to 31 March 2021. A number of our existing siren arrays do not comply with this standard.

Discussion

- 9 Our District is affected by multiple hazards, many of which are present in the coastal and river mouth environments. In addition to this there is limited communication available for some of those communities where cell sites are not present or have limited and inconsistent coverage. Additionally, the hazards tend to geographically isolate those communities quickly and so rapid evacuation can be compromised. While some communities have Emergency Management Volunteer teams and/or volunteer Fire Brigades to assist with evacuations, others rely solely on the self-response of the residents. Add in an aging population, people living in marginal areas because they (ironically) feel more secure there and this can all increase the risk from whatever hazard affects them.
- 10 While there has been a full consideration of these factors for installations in the last 10 years, the same cannot be said for the older mechanical sirens.

Options and Preferred Option

- 11 Due to the nature of the direction from NEMA to decommission all non-complying sirens a 'do nothing' option is not considered.
- 12 The external review undertaken by Steve McDowell of Ignition Group supports the internal review and CAPEX funding options identified in the Emergency Management Activity and Asset Management Plan 2021-31 and that includes:
- 13 Decommission and remove 10 sirens which do not comply and are not in high risk flooding or tsunami areas.
- 14 Replace 8 mechanical sirens with compliant electronic ones to cover areas of high risk from one or more hazards.
- 15 Upgrade 3 newer electronic sirens so they comply with the NEMA Standard.
- 16 Investigate one site (Stratheona Huts) to determine what methods of alerting would work for that specific community, including (but not specifically) a siren array.
- 17 All of these recommendations support an increased level of resilience and safety for our communities.
- 18 All options are in line with TDC's statutory obligations (CDEM Acts).
- 19 The decommissioning of a large number of out-moded sirens is cost effective.

- 20 The risks, over the intervening 6 years are marginal, as the most important arrays will be the first ones to be upgraded, followed by successive phases of replacement arrays and finishing with the full removal of the decommissioned units. If at any stage the siren arrays being decommissioned or upgraded need to be used then they may be available, assuming they have not seized up in the coastal environment.
- 21 The value to the community includes that of psychological ease, knowing that there is a sufficient warning system available when needed. This encourages development and settlement.

Item	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28
3 High Value siren upgrades	\$56k						
8 Critical Siren Replacements		\$86k	\$86k	\$86k	\$86k		
10 Decommissioned sirens				\$24k	\$24k	\$36k	\$36k
Public Education (Media, Printing etc)	\$7k	\$7k	\$3k	\$3k			

Consultation

- 22 Proposed upgrades and decommissioning plans have been incorporated into the Long Term Plan via the Emergency Management Activity and Asset Management Plan 2021/31.
- 23 The decommissioning/upgrading of our Public Alerting Siren System has been discussed at Senior Leadership (SLT) meetings
- 24 The Chair of the Canterbury CDEM Coordinating Executive Group (our CE) has signed off on undertaking measures to ensure compliance with NEMA direction.
- 25 A report went to the Environmental Services committee meeting on 16/3 regarding a significant review of the Districts emergency siren network necessitated by direction given from NEMA (National Emergency Management Agency).

Relevant Legislation, Council Policy and Plans

- 26 Strategic direction is driven by the Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002 and 2016.
- 27 Recognition and treatment of hazards and risk in the regional context is directed by the Canterbury CDEM Group Plan, including decisions made by the Coordinating Executive Group with regard to national direction and standards.
- 28 In high risk communities we work with the specific community to develop response or evacuation plans, which may include the use of siren arrays to assist with evacuation warnings.
- 29 While the tsunami Siren Standard is not legislation, it's written within the framework of the CDEM Acts and the expectation from NEMA is that it will be followed (from Regional EM Advisor Peter Cameron).

Financial and Funding Implications

- 30 Full costings for siren CAPEX work has been included in the Emergency Management Activity and Asset Management Plan 2021-31.

Other Considerations

- 31 Changes in siren array placement and replacement will require updating a number of community and operational evacuation plans, procedures, mailing lists and communications plans. All of these are managed by the Emergency Management Unit.
- 32 Additional training for those on the Siren Test Roster will be provided by the Emergency Management Unit.
- 33 Public education campaign outlining the new siren sound and message, the removal of old school sirens and upgrading of some in areas of greater risk. Note: this has already started with older sirens no longer being tested monthly and messaging via media and Facebook.

Attachments

1. **Report to Timaru District Council Review of Siren Arrays** [!\[\]\(00454fbbe8db418db0de5eebfa916a08_img.jpg\) !\[\]\(fd0f3d0c9a8d9b3ff3951bcf7c4bf0c0_img.jpg\)](#)



Report to Timaru District Council

Review of Siren Arrays

Prepared for Timaru District Council Emergency Management

Advisor by

Steve McDowell

Ignition Group Limited

Ph 027 627 3606

Email steve@smcl.co.nz

This version dated 25 March 2021.

Contents

Introduction.....	3
Emergency Warning Systems.....	4
Sirens	5
Technical Standards for Sirens.....	6
Timaru District.....	7
Timaru District Public Alerting Siren System Network	8
Consultation	9
Analysis and Recommendations.....	10
Conclusion	12
Schedule 1: Analysis of Timaru Tsunami Sirens	13
Schedule 2: Survey Findings.....	14

Introduction

The Timaru District Council is undertaking a review of the effectiveness of siren arrays within its communities and has asked Ignition Group Limited to prepare a report that includes the following objectives:

- Consideration of egress/access for potentially isolated communities
- Positioning of infrastructure in relation to areas covered by sirens
- Review the current siren array positions in relation to the known hazards:
 - coastal inundation
 - tsunami
 - River flooding
 - estuary inundation
 - industrial hazard (gas/chemical)
- Identify those siren arrays that are not serving a purpose in relation to actual hazard and or lifelines infrastructure (such as roading)
- Identify those siren arrays that do support communities, infrastructure, and evacuation routes from high risks

We have undertaken a desktop review of relevant best practice literature relating to the use of sirens as part of an emergency warning system. We have also reviewed siren location maps showing tsunami shore exclusion and evacuation zones, as well as other documentation provided by Timaru District Council. We undertook a focused survey of a small number of affected residents as an indication of community views on sirens. We have used this information to form a view on the Councils current siren arrays. Please note that we have not undertaken any physical inspection of the sirens or the locations where they are situated.

Emergency Warning Systems

Internationally there are many different ways emergency warnings are provided to the public. These range from television and radio broadcasts (including break-through broadcasts), sirens, web and cellphone alerts, physical broadcasts from mobile vehicles, and word of mouth. The research stresses the importance of multiple emergency warning systems. No one approach, system, or type of infrastructure or technology will be sufficient and people like to receive information in different ways¹. The appropriateness and mix of warning systems must be considered within the specific local context to ensure it is fit for purpose. Public acceptance and trust in a warning system is also critical to its success.

In New Zealand, emergency warnings are currently provided through a number of channels, namely mobile phone alerts, sirens, television and radio broadcasts, and through the use of websites, social media and apps. Nationally, the National Emergency Management Agency (NEMA) and Civil Defence Emergency Management Groups (CDEM Groups) have adopted a system of emergency mobile alerts (EMAs), which are messages about emergencies sent to capable mobile phones by authorised emergency agencies. The alerts are designed to keep people safe and are broadcast to all capable mobile phones from targeted cell towers. This enables rapid dissemination of alerts to targeted areas using a special broadcast channel that is permanently on and unaffected by cellphone traffic.

Education is also an important feature of an emergency warning system. A 2020 Colmar Brunton disaster preparedness survey (commissioned by NEMA) revealed that “almost 85% of New Zealanders know to evacuate if they are near the coast and a long or strong earthquake happens”. As well, 88% of those surveyed had taken at least one action to prepare for an emergency, such as having emergency supplies available. The survey also found that radio was ranked as the highest source of information during or immediately after a disaster (at 56%). Only 36% mentioned Civil Defence as a source of information and of these, only 11% referred to emergency mobile alerts as a source of information.

Another interesting response from this survey related to the types of event that people associate with the word “disaster”. For 51%, it means earthquake. Tsunami and floods were only associated with “disaster” by 14% and 9% of people respectively. This suggests that New Zealanders are much more likely to perceive a significant risk to life resulting from an earthquake, rather than a tsunami or flood. This may though have changed for some communities after the recent tsunami alert on 5 March 2021 following a series of significant regional earthquakes.

¹ NOAA Social Science Committee. (2016). *Risk communication and behavior: Best practices and research findings*. Silver Spring, MD: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

Sirens

Sirens form part of New Zealand's audio emergency warning system. A report prepared in 2013 as a background to the preparation of a standard for the use of sirens in tsunami warnings provides the following guidance of the issues related to the use of sirens in a New Zealand context². The use of sirens for emergency management purposes is a long-established practice in New Zealand.

- Their use for tsunami warnings has grown significantly since the south-east Asian tsunami event of 2004. This has often been at the request of local communities and sirens are now widespread across New Zealand.
- Sirens cannot be effective without public education and awareness. This includes understanding the importance of natural warnings, ensuring education programmes are maintained through time, visitors and people who may be unable to hear sirens are targeted, and emphasising the need for individual preparedness and responsibility.
- There needs to be a regular, budgeted maintenance programme.
- A national standard for the siren signal and its meaning is essential. The public must know what a siren means and what action they then need to take. There may be confusion in places where sirens are used for other non-public alerting purposes (such as rural fire service volunteers).
- Sirens can be good for special conditions, such as in remote and/or confined communities, areas where there is limited or no cell phone coverage, and where tourists and/or transient populations are located.
- They can be one of the most effective means of outdoor mass notifications.
- However, people may not pay much attention to them and may not understand what they mean (particularly as they do not receive an instructional warning message). This can create public confusion, particularly amongst visitors.

Sirens are one means of alerting the public to an emergency. They are good in certain circumstances and form part of the overall emergency warning system. The experience of Councils across New Zealand "suggests that sirens can be effective in providing initial warnings, that they can generate interest in tsunami hazards and emergency management"³. They are not however, as effective as other alerting systems such as mobile phone alerts or mobile PA systems.

² Morris, B., & Leonard, G. S. (2013). *The use of sirens for tsunami warning in New Zealand: Supporting information for the "Standard for the use of sirens in tsunami warnings"*.

³ Morris, B., & Leonard, G. S. (2013).

Technical Standards for Sirens

The Ministry of Civil Defence and Emergency Management has issued a Technical Standard [TS03/14] for Tsunami Warning Sirens, which provides for national consistency in the use of sirens for tsunami warnings. Key features of this Technical Standard are as follows.

- Sirens are one public alerting option among many and also need to be linked to continuous public education programmes and evacuation planning activities.
- They should be used as an all-hazards alerting mechanism and not only for tsunami warnings.
- They are appropriate for events that by their nature enable a warning to be issued with time to seek further information and respond. An example is an international or regional earthquake which may cause a tsunami, or a potential flood event resulting from a period of significant rain. They are not regarded as effective for local source tsunami events (with less than an hour's travel time to the coast).
- The national standard siren signal for tsunami warnings is a multiple tone signal that rises repeatedly with time. This signal can only be achieved by electronic sirens and is different to the signals used by emergency services (including fire sirens).
- The meaning of signal-only sirens used in tsunami warnings is to "seek further information".
- Sirens can also have a public address function which can include a live or recorded message.
- Sirens need to be properly maintained and tested on a regular basis.
- Communities should, where possible, be involved in awareness raising, testing, and decisions on expanding or de-commissioning siren systems.

The Technical Standard also requires a hazard and risk based approach to a decision to use sirens for tsunami warnings. Factors to be considered include:

- The purpose of sirens and the hazards and risks they will be used for.
- The nature of tsunami hazards from local, regional, and distant sources (including travel time, likely extent of inundation, and relative risk).
- The nature of the communities at risk.
- The availability of other public alerting options.
- The full costs involved in installing sirens (including maintenance, testing, public education, and public expectations around siren use).

The Technical Standard also recognises that each community is unique and a "one size fits all" approach is not appropriate. Key considerations when considering the types of sirens to use include.

- Reliability of local power and phone networks.
- Availability of alternative systems.
- How sirens will be activated.
- Audibility Factors.
- Useful operating life.
- Ability to fund sirens.
- Durability to the local environment (such as salt spray and wind).
- PA capability.
- Whether sirens meet the requirements of the Technical Standards.

Timaru District

The Timaru District covers 2,602 square kilometres and as at the 2018 census, has a population of approximately 46,300. Timaru is the largest community, housing nearly two thirds of the total population of the district. The next largest community is Temuka (4,470), followed by Geraldine (2,700) and Pleasant Point (1,370). Smaller coastal communities include Pareora (with approximately 465 residents), Waipopo and Milford Huts (348), and Rangitata Huts (168).

The Council's vision for emergency management is:

To build resilient communities by empowering individuals, organisations, and communities to support each other, thus reducing the impacts of emergencies, enabling quicker recovery and reinjection.

Customer expectations are identified in the draft Emergency Management Asset Management Plan 2021-2031 as follows:

- Support them to be prepared for disasters
- Provide them information on events and risks
- Help them cope with disasters
- Assist them to recover from disasters.

The top hazards for the Timaru District based on likelihood, consequence, impact and manageability are identified in the Council's Civil Defence Emergency Management Plan 2015-2025. In order of priority, they are as follows.

- Electricity failure
- Dam failure
- Disruption of fuel supply
- Earthquake alpine fault
- Earthquake (local)
- Port Incident
- Flooding (eastern foothill rivers)
- Heavy rainfall
- Human disease pandemic
- Air accident
- High winds
- Rail accident
- Snow (ice)

Tsunamis (local, regional, or distant source) and coastal inundation are also identified as risks requiring additional techniques. This includes the use of sirens.

Timaru District Public Alerting Siren System Network

The Council has a Public Alerting Siren System Network, with 27 sirens.

- There are 5 new electronic sirens that comply with the Technical Standard (North & Turnbull Streets, Milford Huts, Flemington Street, Waipopo, Barrett Road (Washdyke 2) and Rangitata Huts).
- There are three sirens that can be repurposed to comply with the Technical Standard (Pareora 1 and 2, and Caroline Bay sirens).
- 18 sirens are older mechanical sirens which do not comply with the Technical Standard. Of the 18 mechanical sirens, 10 are not located within areas identified by the Council as high risk areas.
- One siren (located at Timaru Harbour) has already been decommissioned

The mechanical sirens are used to alert people to the need to obtain further information. The electronic compliant sirens are either run as a monthly 'test' with an audio to suit or as an 'evacuate now' signal, also with a voiceover providing instructions. The process also includes a pre-notification of an evacuation, which is provided to the local radio station and Council's Public information Manager. For many, this will be in addition to the emergency mobile alerts. However, some communities have poor or no cellphone coverage.

The Council has undertaken preliminary work to identify options for the siren system. The preferred option involves the following.

1.	Repurpose the Pareora 1 and 2, and Caroline Bay sirens to comply with the national Technical Standard. The estimated cost is \$56,000.	\$56,000
2.	Decommission 10 sirens situated within areas in Timaru that are not located as high risk. This will cost in the region of \$15,400 per siren. This includes a part-cost per siren for public advertising across a four year period, removal and burial of decommissioned equipment and poles, remediation of site, and annual safety assessments until they are removed, plus 10% contingency.	\$154,000
3.	Replace eight of the current non-compliant sirens situated within higher risk areas with new sirens that meet the Technical Standard. This is estimated to cost approximately \$344,000 and will provide a consistent service, which also includes a messaging service.	\$344,000
Total		\$554,000

Two possible further locations have been identified for new sirens, namely Stratheona Huts (Pleasant Point) and Blandwood (Peel Forest).

Consultation

A survey was undertaken of residents who live close to a siren or are part of the emergency response network. There were 21 responses. The results are contained in Schedule 2. Key findings are as follows.

- Sirens are considered an effective mechanism to alert the community to a pending threat or other emergency.
- Sirens are the preferred emergency warning system, outranking emergency mobile alerts.
- A voice-over facility was considered very useful.

Participants also indicated that the following factors should be considered when selecting a preferred option for a warning alert system.

- Ability to reach the widest number of people.
- The wishes of the local community.
- The location (remoteness, ease of access, and prevailing winds for example).
- The costs of installation and ongoing maintenance.
- The cost of having an alert system per person against the level of risk, noting that long term it may be cheaper to ban or relocate people from high risk areas than provide alert systems.
- The ruggedness of the system and ability to operate if internet or phone connectivity is disrupted.

It must be noted that removal of any emergency warning sirens is a controversial issue. Several councils have faced public backlash when deciding to decommission or silence tsunami and fire station sirens.

Analysis and Recommendations

An analysis has been undertaken of the existing siren network based on the requirements of the Technical Standard. This also includes the two new sites identified at Pleasant Point and Peel Forest. This is contained in Schedule 1.

Relevant considerations when reviewing the siren network are as follows:

- Tsunami is a risk to coastal properties within or near to the Tsunami Shore Exclusion Zone and Tsunami Evacuation Zone (and in adjacent low lying areas) within the Timaru urban zone and other coastal locations.
- Flooding is a risk for some of the more remote communities.
- There are sirens used for toxic chemical/gas leak (Pareora and Washdyke 2) and dam failure (Bulters Huts, Milford Huts, and Waipopo/Opihi Huts/Peterson Park).
- Some of the at risk communities have limited or no cellphone coverage and no alternative escape routes.
- Sirens are used as a way to manage the tsunami, flooding and chemical/gas leak risk in these communities, many of which are mechanical and do not comply with the Technical Standard.
- There are also sirens located within Timaru urban areas that are not within or near to the Tsunami Shore Exclusion Zone and Tsunami Evacuation Zone and are situated above a 16m land elevation (based on the CD Siren Locations maps provided). These areas appear to be at a lower risk from tsunami.

Using these considerations, our recommendations are as follows.

Recommendation 1

There are eight areas within the tsunami risk zone that are served by mechanical sirens which do not comply with the Technical Standards. These communities should be prioritised for new sirens which comply with the Technical Standards.

Siren	Location	Elevation	Risk type	High Risk Zone?	Other Relevant Factors	Cellphone Coverage	Alternate Evacuation Routes	Current status	Recommendation
1	Timaru, King & Royal St	10m	Tsunami	Yes	Only siren in that location covering areas close to the coastline	Yes	Yes	Mechanical Siren	Replace
7	Timaru, Grassmere St	<10m	Tsunami	Yes		Yes	Yes	Mechanical Siren	Replace
8	Timaru, Caroline Bay	16m	Tsunami	Yes	Only siren in that location covering areas close to the coastline	Yes	Yes	Mechanical Siren	Replace
11	Timaru, Evans & Waimataitai St	>15m	Tsunami	Yes	Only siren in that location covering areas close to the coastline	Yes	Yes	Mechanical Siren	Replace
12	Timaru, Hospital, Queen St	16m	Tsunami	Yes	Only siren in that location covering areas close to the coastline	Yes	Yes	Mechanical Siren	Replace
18	Timaru, Sophia St, TDC Main Library	16m	Tsunami	Yes	Will cover locations currently covered by Sirens 16 and 9	Yes	Yes	Mechanical Siren	Replace
19	Timaru, Jellicoe St	>15m	Tsunami	Yes	No other sirens cover this area	Yes	Yes	Mechanical Siren	Replace
21	Timaru (Butlers Huts)	<10m	Tsunami/ Dam Failure	Yes	In Exclusion Zone	Limited	No	Mechanical Siren	Replace

Recommendation 2

There are three communities which have newer electronic sirens. These are in higher risk areas and should be upgraded to ensure compliance with the Technical Standards.

Siren	Location	Elevation	Risk type	High Risk Zone?	Other Relevant Factors	Cellphone Coverage	Alternate Evacuation Routes	Current status	Recommendation
23	Timaru, Caroline Bay Park	<10m	Tsunami	Yes	In Evacuation Zone	Yes	Yes	Electronic Siren	Upgrade
24	Paparoa, Turnbull St	<10m?	Tsunami/ Chemical & Gas Leak	Yes	Close to Evacuation Zone	Limited	No	Electronic Siren	Upgrade
25	Paparoa, The Avenue	<10m?	Tsunami/ Chemical & Gas Leak	Yes	Close to Evacuation Zone	Limited	No	Electronic Siren	Upgrade

Recommendation 3

There are also some areas within Timaru which are covered by mechanical sirens (10 sirens) but are not within higher risk areas for tsunami and flooding. These areas also have cellphone coverage and in some cases, also fall within the coverage zone of another siren. Given the cost to replace an existing mechanical siren (\$58,400 being \$15,400 for decommissioning of the existing siren and \$43,000 for the new siren), it is recommended that these sirens are not replaced. Further, as they do not comply with the Technical Standards, they should be decommissioned to avoid confusion.

Siren	Location	Elevation	Risk type	High Risk Zone?	Other Relevant Factors	Cellphone Coverage	Alternate Evacuation Routes	Current status	Recommendation
3	Timaru, North St & Grey Rd	>16m	Tsunami	No		Yes	Yes	Mechanical Siren	Decommission
4	Timaru, Church & Regent St	>16m	Tsunami	No		Yes	Yes	Mechanical Siren	Decommission
5	Timaru, Concor & Otis Rd	>16m	Tsunami	No		Yes	Yes	Mechanical Siren	Decommission
6	Timaru, Guinness St	>16m	Tsunami	No		Yes	Yes	Mechanical Siren	Decommission
9	Timaru, Stafford & George St	<10m	Tsunami	Yes	Covered by proposed replacement of Siren 18	Yes	Yes	Mechanical Siren	Decommission
13	Timaru, Glenliff & Spring Rd	>16m	Tsunami	No	None	Yes	Yes	Mechanical Siren	Decommission
14	Timaru, Arun St	>16m	Tsunami	No	None	Yes	Yes	Mechanical Siren	Decommission
15	Timaru, Washdyke Flat Rd, St-1 (Washdyke 1)	10m	Tsunami	Yes	Industrial area. Covered by new siren at location 26	Yes	Yes	Mechanical Siren	Decommission
16	Timaru, Stratford & Beswick St	10m	Tsunami	Yes	Covered by proposed replacement of Siren 18	Yes	Yes	Mechanical Siren	Decommission
17	Timaru, Stratford & Beswick St	10m	Tsunami	Yes	Covered by upgraded Siren 23	Yes	Yes	Mechanical Siren	Decommission

Recommendation 4

There are two further sites that should be considered further for a new siren, namely Stratheona Huts (Pleasant Point), and Blandwood (Peel Forest). These are located within a flood zone and have no alternative evacuation routes. We understand that Blandwood (Peel Forest) now has good cellphone coverage, which would provide access to emergency mobile alerts. However, Stratheona Huts (Pleasant Point), has limited cellphone coverage so should be investigated further for a new siren.

Recommendation 5

That this report be released to the members of the public that participated in the survey process during the development of this report.

Recommendation Summary

With the exception of the recommended additional siren sites at Stratheona Huts (Pleasant Point), our analysis confirms the preliminary option put forward by Timaru District Council in its draft Emergency Management Activity and Asset Management Plan 2021-31.

Conclusion

Timaru District Council's siren network is an important part of its emergency warning system. It is one method to alert residents in high risk locations of the need to obtain further information in the event of an emergency. They are particularly valuable for communities that do not have cellphone coverage and who, therefore will not get emergency mobile alerts. They are however, only one part of a wider approach required to emergency management.

The Council will need to upgrade a number of its older mechanical sirens to bring them up to date with the Technical Standards. It also has the opportunity to rationalise its siren network to those that are located within higher risk communities. This will focus Council spending on providing fully compliant sirens in high risk areas, which support the wider emergency warning system covering the Timaru district.

Schedule 1: Analysis of Timaru Tsunami Sirens

Siren	Location	Elevation	Risk type	High Risk Zone?	Other Relevant Factors	Cellphone Coverage	Alternate Evacuation Routes	Current status	Recommendation
1	Timaru, King & Royal St	10m	Tsunami	Yes	Only siren in that location covering areas close to the coastline	Yes	Yes	Mechanical Siren	Replace
2	Timaru, North & Turnbull St	10m	Tsunami	Yes	New Siren 2020/21 (Compliant)	Yes	Yes	Electronic Siren	No action needed
3	Timaru, North St & Gray Rd	>16m	Tsunami	No		Yes	Yes	Mechanical Siren	Decommission
4	Timaru, Church & Regent St	>16m	Tsunami	No		Yes	Yes	Mechanical Siren	Decommission
5	Timaru, Goncor & Otape Rd	>16m	Tsunami	No		Yes	Yes	Mechanical Siren	Decommission
6	Timaru, Guinness St	>16m	Tsunami	No		Yes	Yes	Mechanical Siren	Decommission
7	Timaru, Grassmere St	<10m	Tsunami	Yes		Yes	Yes	Mechanical Siren	Replace
8	Timaru, Caroline Bay	16m	Tsunami	Yes	Only siren in that location covering areas close to the coastline	Yes	Yes	Mechanical Siren	Replace
9	Timaru, Stafford & George St	<10m	Tsunami	Yes	Covered by proposed replacement of Siren 18	Yes	Yes	Mechanical Siren	Decommission
10	Timaru Harbour				Covered by Siren 2				Already Decommissioned
11	Timaru, Evans & Waimatitai St	>16m	Tsunami	Yes	Only siren in that location covering areas close to the coastline	Yes	Yes	Mechanical Siren	Replace
12	Timaru, Hospital, Queen St	16m	Tsunami	Yes	Only siren in that location covering areas close to the coastline	Yes	Yes	Mechanical Siren	Replace
13	Timaru, Gleniti & Spring Rd	>16m	Tsunami	No	None	Yes	Yes	Mechanical Siren	Decommission
14	Timaru, Arun St	>16m	Tsunami	No	None	Yes	Yes	Mechanical Siren	Decommission
15	Timaru, Washdyke Flat Rd, SH1 (Washdyke 1)	10m	Tsunami	Yes	Industrial area. Covered by new siren at location 26	Yes	Yes	Mechanical Siren	Decommission
16	Timaru, Stafford & Beswick St	10m	Tsunami	Yes	Covered by proposed replacement of Siren 18	Yes	Yes	Mechanical Siren	Decommission
17	Timaru, Stafford & Beswick St	16m	Tsunami	Yes	Covered by upgraded Siren 23	Yes	Yes	Mechanical Siren	Decommission
18	Timaru, Sophia St, TDC Main Library	16m	Tsunami	Yes	Will cover locations currently covered by Sirens 16 and 9	Yes	Yes	Mechanical Siren	Replace
19	Timaru, Jellicoe St	>16m	Tsunami	Yes	No other sirens cover this area	Yes	Yes	Mechanical Siren	Replace
20	Milford Huts, Milford Lagoon Rd	<10m	Tsunami/ Flood/ Dam Failure	Yes	New Siren 2020/21 (Compliant)	No	No	Electronic Siren	No action needed
21	Timaru (Butlers Huts)	<10m	Tsunami/ Dam Failure	Yes	In Exclusion Zone	Limited	No	Mechanical Siren	Replace
22	Rangitapu Huts, Fire Station	<10m	Tsunami/ Flood	Yes	Covered by new Siren 28	Limited	No	Mechanical Siren	Transfer to fire station
23	Timaru, Caroline Bay Park	<10m	Tsunami	Yes	In Evacuation Zone	Yes	Yes	Electronic Siren	Upgrade
24	Pareora, Turnbull St	<10m?	Tsunami/ Chemical & Gas Leak	Yes	Close to Evacuation Zone	Limited	No	Electronic Siren	Upgrade
25	Pareora, The Avenue	<10m?	Tsunami/ Chemical & Gas Leak	Yes	Close to Evacuation Zone	Limited	No	Electronic Siren	Upgrade
26	Timaru, Flemington St (Washdyke 2)	<10m	Tsunami/ Chemical & Gas Leak	Yes	Will cover location currently covered by Siren 15	Yes	Yes	Electronic Siren	No action needed
27	Waipopo, Barrett Rd	<10m	Tsunami/ Flood/ Dam Failure	Yes	New Siren (Compliant)	Limited	No	Electronic Siren	No action needed
28	Rangitapu Huts	<10m	Tsunami/ Flood	Yes	New Siren (Compliant)	Limited	No	Electronic Siren	No action needed
29	Strathmore Huts, Pleasant Point		Flood	Yes		Limited	No	No Siren	Possible new installation
30	Blendswood, Peel Forest		Flood	Yes		Yes	No	No Siren	Community Requesting installation

Schedule 2: Survey Findings

Timaru District Council - Tsunami Sirens survey results

Introduction

A survey of 29 residents who live close to or are part of the emergency response network were invited to complete an online survey to determine:

- (a) their views on the effectiveness of the current siren system
- (b) their views on other warning system options that may be available.

The survey was conducted by an independent researcher and was live from 25 January 2020 to 18 February 2020.

Respondents were invited via email and 21 completed the survey.

The survey took each respondent an average of 7 minutes to complete.

Results

On the effectiveness of the current siren system

64% - the sirens are easy to hear ("I would definitely wake up if I was sleeping")

36% - the sirens are moderately easy to hear ("sometimes it might wake me and sometimes not")

No respondents said the sirens were difficult to hear.

When asked "have you always heard the sirens when they are activated?" – 87% said yes with 13% saying no. The main reason given for not hearing the sirens was because the respondent was not home. Another reason given was the easterly wind.

Respondents were asked to indicate on a sliding scale between 1 and 10 how they would rate Timaru District's sirens as an effective warning system for threats in their local area (1 being "not effective at all" and 10 being "extremely effective").

The overall effectiveness score for the sirens was **7.4 out of 10**.

Other comments provided on the effectiveness of the sirens were:

- A siren is very effective in alerting the community to a pending threat or other emergency. Our volunteer fire brigade siren [in another location] can be heard for over 1km away whenever there is a call out.
- The main problem I have with the sirens in our area is the wind so sometimes it takes a while to register it
- Sirens are difficult to hear if you are asleep (without your hearing aids) and live in a well-insulated house with double glazing.
- The voice-over facility is very useful, and we think it should be used at every test to see if it is working.
- The Jellicoe St siren sometimes does not sound when activated.
- It is good that you test them regularly. Testing is a good education tool for newcomers into the district to know what the sound means.
- I am increasingly supportive of the need for a siren in Blandswood. Our main hazards (flood and fire) will likely occur with lethal speed. With large amounts of day visitors (trampers and picnickers) – an immediate alarm appears the best option.
- The siren at the fire station is 400m south of us and serves our area well for other local emergencies.

Views on other types of warning alert systems

Respondents were asked which of the following alternative warning systems they were able to receive:

Emergency Mobile Alert or localised push text alerts	35%
Hazard App (Red Cross)	0%
Text message from family or friends	6%
Loud hailers	6%
A radio sting	12%
Standard emergency sirens (like those at fire stations)	24%
A local emergency committee evacuation plan	17%

When asked which of these would be their order of preference as a warning system, the majority of respondents preferred the standard emergency sirens (like those at fire stations) – 60%.

Out of a possible total of 5, the ranking was as follows:

Standard emergency sirens (like those at fire stations) – ranking 4.4

Emergency Mobile Alert or localised push text alerts – ranking 3.3

A radio sting – ranking 3.1

Loud hailers – ranking 2.5

Other – ranking 1.8

When asked “what other district-wide warning alert system might be suggested for consideration?” the respondents provided the following.

Voice over sirens

- sirens with a spoken message about what the alert is for and what to do
- voice over sirens
- the same system that the north side of Rangitata have – motor in the centre with speakers both sides
- a siren is the only realistic option due to limited radio reception, poor cellphone coverage and one access/exit road

People power

- a door knock/visit from an informed neighbour
- community co-ordinated door to door alert around the neighbourhood
- key people to visit surrounding neighbours

Other

- a website people can go to find out what is going on when the siren goes off
- if cell phone coverage was improved then a local text alert system would be a high priority

What factors do you think the Council needs to consider when selecting a preferred option for a warning alert system?

A summary of considerations follows...

1. The ability to reach everyone it needs to reach – the one that alerts the most people at once – widest reach for the widest number of people
2. The wishes of the local community for which the siren is needed

3. A system that caters for the older, less digital generation as well as a system that caters for younger people
4. The location – the remoteness/ease of access/exit and any prevailing winds in the area that may mitigate the effectiveness of the warning system
5. Costs of installation and ongoing maintenance
6. The cost of alert per potential victim against the level of risk – long term it may be cheaper to ban or relocate people from high risk areas than provide alert systems
7. The ruggedness of the system and ability to operate if the internet or phone connectivity is disrupted *[EH - although this is not so relevant to a warning alert system as an ongoing communication system]*

Summary of other information provided in the survey

How far away do you live/work from the nearest siren?

Less than 10 meters	2
Between 10-50 meters	1
Between 50 and 100 meters	5
Greater than 100 meters	8
I do not live or work close to a siren	5

Location of the siren nearest to me...

Guinness St
 North St/Grey Rd
 Grasmere St
 Stafford and Beswick
 Jellicoe St
 Rangitata Huts
 Waipopo
 Caroline Bay
 Church and Regent Sts

70% of the respondents want to receive a copy of this report when finalised.

7.3 Final Consideration of Plan Change 22 and Operative Date

Author: Nathan Hole, Team Leader Consents and Compliance

Authoriser: Paul Cooper, Group Manager Environmental Services

Recommendation

That

1. The Committee approves Plan Change 22 in accordance with Clause 17(1) Schedule 1 Resource Management Act 1991.
2. The Committee approves Plan Change 22 becoming operative from 1 July 2021 in accordance with Clause 20(1) Schedule 1 Resource Management Act 1991.

Purpose of Report

- 1 For the Committee to make the final approval of Plan Change 22 following the close of the appeal period and having received no appeals on the plan change, and set the date on which the plan change becomes operative.

Assessment of Significance

- 2 This decision is not considered significant in accordance with Council's Significance and Engagement Policy.

Background

- 3 Plan Change 22 is a private plan change from Seadown Properties Ltd that sought to rezone approximately 9 hectares of land between Washdyke Flat Road and Washdyke Creek from Rural 2 to Industrial L (Light).
- 4 The plan change was discussed by Council at its 15 December 2020 meeting, where Council resolved to adopt the decision of independent commissioner Mr Allan Cubitt as its own in accordance with Clause 10 Schedule 1 Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA). The Commissioner's decision was to grant the rezoning as requested by Seadown Properties Ltd.
- 5 Council's above decision was publicly notified on 14 January 2021. At the close of the 30 working day appeal period no appeals on the plan change were received, enabling the rules of Plan Change 22 to have full legal effect in accordance with Section 86B RMA.
- 6 The next step in the process is for Council (through its delegated Committee) to approve the plan change in accordance with Clause 17 Schedule 1 RMA, and then specify a date from which the plan change becomes operative. It is at this point that Plan Change 22 will be integrated into the District Plan.

Discussion

- 7 Schedule 1 RMA sets out the statutory process for plan changes.

- 8 Clause 17(1) states that *“A local authority shall approve a proposed policy statement or plan (other than a regional coastal plan) once it has made amendments under Clause 16 or variations under Clause 16A (if any).”* No amendments or variations were made under clauses 16 or 16A.
- 9 Clause 20(1) states that *“Subject to subclause (2), an approved policy statement or plan shall become an operative policy statement or plan on a date which is to be publicly notified.”* Subclause 2 requires public notification of the date when the plan change becomes operative, at least five working days prior to the date on which it becomes operative.
- 10 The recommended operative date of 1 July 2021 provides sufficient time for the public notice in advance of the operative date.
- 11 The power to approve plan changes in accordance with Clause 17 has been delegated to the Environmental Services Committee. No delegation is provided for Clause 20 as this is a formality that follows approval under Clause 17. I have included a recommendation for the Committee to specify an operative date for completeness.

Options and Preferred Option

- 12 Option 1: Make Plan Change 22 operative.
- 13 Option 2: Do not make Plan Change 22 Operative.
- 14 Option 1 is the preferred option and the only real option available to the Committee given that Council has previously resolved to accept the Commissioner’s decision on the plan change as its own.
- 15 As Plan Change 22 is a private plan change the costs associated with this process will be met by the applicant (Seadown Properties Ltd).

Consultation

- 16 The decision on Plan Change 22 was publicly notified with notice served on the relevant statutory parties in accordance with the requirements of the RMA.

Relevant Legislation, Council Policy and Plans

- 17 The process is conducted entirely in accordance with the provisions of Schedule 1 RMA.

Financial and Funding Implications

- 18 There are no funding or financial implications. The application is a private plan change meaning that the costs of processing the plan change will be met by the applicant in accordance with Council’s Schedule of Fees and Charges.

Other Considerations

- 19 There are no other relevant considerations as this is the final step in the plan change process.

Attachments

1. **Plan Change 22 Location Map**



7.4 Appointment of Members to the District Licensing Committee**Author:** Debbie Fortuin, Environmental Compliance Manager**Authoriser:** Paul Cooper, Group Manager Environmental Services**Recommendation**

That the Environmental Services Committee

- (a) Confirms the renewal of a 3 year term for Cr Peter Burt on the Timaru District Licensing Committee (DLC), commencing 09 August 2021.
- (b) Nominates a further new member to the Timaru District Licensing Committee, for a period of 3 years commencing 09 August 2021.

Purpose of Report

- 1 The purpose of the report is for Committee to endorse a further 3 year period for Cr Peter Burt to the District Licensing Committee, and to nominate a further member to the District Licensing Committee for a 3 year period commencing 09 August 2021.

Assessment of Significance

- 2 This matter is not deemed significant under the Council's Significance and Engagement Policy.

Background

- 3 The Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2012 requires each Council to have a District Licensing Committee comprising of at least two members. These members can be elected members or ordinary members of the community who have experience in alcohol licensing matters. In recent years it was decided to select elected members for representation on the DLC as there were not enough hearings being held to warrant the time and effort to remain current with issues for a non-elected member. Members of the DLC can be appointed for a period of up to five years and have the option of resigning at any time.
- 4 Typically, committee members have been elected for 3 year periods. Cr Peter Burt, and former Cr Dave Jack's positions are coming to an end on 08 August 2021.

Discussion

- 5 Cr Peter Burt has been consulted and has expressed an interest on serving a further period on the District Licensing Committee.
- 6 As Mr Jack, is no longer an elected member it is fitting that the Committee consider and nominate a replacement DLC member.
- 7 The Act requires the following in relation to a DLC member:
 - 7.1 They must have experience relevant to alcohol licensing matters;
 - 7.2 Cannot be included in the list if the territorial authority believes that person has, directly or by virtue of his or her relationship with another person, such an involvement or

appearance of involvement with the alcohol industry that he or she could not perform his or her duties without actual bias or the appearance of bias, or

- 7.3 Cannot be included, if the person is a constable, a Medical Officer of Health, an inspector or an employee of the territorial authority.

8 Newly elected DLC members would need to undergo training in the Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2012.

9 Section 187 of the Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2012 outlines the functions of the licensing committee as follows:

- 9.1 To consider and determine applications for licences and manager's certificates; and
- 9.2 To consider and determine applications for renewal of licences and manager's certificates; and
- 9.3 To consider and determine applications for temporary authority to carry on the sale and supply of alcohol in accordance with section 136; and
- 9.4 To consider and determine applications for the variation, suspension, or cancellation or special licences; and
- 9.5 To consider and determine applications for the variation of licences (other than special licences) unless the application is brought under section 280; and
- 9.6 With the leave of the chairperson for the licensing authority, to refer applications to the licensing authority;
- 9.7 To conduct inquiries and to make reports as may be required of it by the licensing authority under section 175;
- 9.8 And other functions conferred on licensing committees by or under this Act or any other enactment.

Consultation

10 Cr Peter Burt has been consulted and has expressed an interest in a further term on the DLC.

Relevant Legislation, Council Policy and Plans

11 The Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2012 and the Mackenzie, Timaru and Waimate District Councils Joint Local Alcohol Policy.

Financial and Funding Implications

12 There are no significant financial or funding implications. There may be additional costs for training which will be met within existing budgets.

Attachments

Nil

- 8 Consideration of Urgent Business Items**
- 9 Consideration of Minor Nature Matters**