

#### 4. CITY OF CHRISTCHURCH ENVIRONMENTAL AWARDS - PROPOSED CHANGES

<b>Submitted by</b> Environmental Awards Judging Panel	<b>Authors</b> Jenny May/Julie Sadler, DDI 941-8438
---	--

The purpose of this report is to seek approval to change the format of the Environmental Awards to enable the awards to become a more effective tool in recognising and promoting the achievement of the city's environmental policies.

##### BACKGROUND

The awards were introduced in 1998 and have been held annually since, with one award being made in each of the following three categories:

- The Natural Environment
- The Built Environment
- Services to the Environment


The awards are currently administered through Our City O-Tautahi, with secretarial support being provided by the Committee Secretariat.

At its meeting on 22 May 2003, the Council resolved to run the awards in 2003 and 2004 and appointed a panel comprising Councillors Anna Crighton, Sally Buck, Carole Anderton and Barbara Stewart, Sir Miles Warren, Dr Brian Molloy and Mr John Dryden to run the awards and judge the entries.

##### REVIEW OF FORMAT

At its meeting on 23 September the Judging Panel gave consideration to a report from Josie Schroder, Urban Design and Heritage Team, recommending a new format for the awards. The purpose of the report was to propose changes that could enable the awards to become a more effective tool in recognising and promoting achievement of the city's environmental policies. The report advised that the Urban Design and Heritage Team had recently organised a series of discussions with Christchurch land development professionals, with a view to identifying non-regulatory methods for achieving, in general terms, more green-fields subdivision development and sustainable urban design. From this meeting it was decided that the most appealing non-regulatory proposal was to develop a prestigious awards based approach. The group felt that such an award could be utilised in a commercial capacity if it were underwritten by the Council, and had a high level of promotional support.

As a potential means of achieving this outcome it was considered that the existing Environmental Awards could act as an umbrella for a number of subcategories, each of which would be managed individually but promoted collectively. The diagram below is a suggestion as to subcategories within the built environment framework.



The report also considered that if the current Environmental Awards were to be the vehicle for this then further marketing and promotion would be integral to ensuring that the awards were used more effectively to engender sustainable design and other environmental benefits. Their profile and branding and appointment of judges on the panel from specific areas within the profession need to be considered as part of the "repackaging".

The report also acknowledged that “Over the past six years the awards have achieved a good degree of success and recognition. However, research to provide the background for this report suggests that it is perhaps timely to reconsider a new format for the awards for 2004.”

A SWOT analysis of existing environmental awards and details of the Christchurch Civic Trust awards are tabled.

### **PANEL’S DELIBERATIONS**

The Panel concurred with the findings of the review and agreed that there was a need to expand and raise the profile of the awards to:

- Increase their prestige both in the community and amongst the relevant professional bodies;
- Meet the original goal of achieving urban design excellence; and
- Go some way to meeting the city’s environmental policies.

The Panel concluded that the following action was required to achieve these objectives:

1. Change the format of the awards along the lines proposed in the staff report.
2. Seek additional budgetary provision for promotional/publicity purposes; redesign of the entry forms and supporting information; awards certificates and plaques; an exhibition on past awards; and the awards function.
3. Consult with other interested parties including property management and developer associations, Institute of Architects, Institute of Landscape Architects, Historic Places Trust Pouhere Taonga, Canterbury Horticultural Society and Christchurch Beautifying Society.

### **FUNDING**

Since establishing the awards the Council has provided a budget of \$5,000 pa for advertising/promotion, administration, printing and the awards function.

Funding constraints are the main reason for the low profile and status of the awards as the Panel has not had the resources to adequately market and promote the awards to raise their profile or to present suitable trophies to the winners.

To run an awards scheme along the lines recommended in the staff report would require a budget in the order of \$30,000, made up as follows:

Advertising, promotion and marketing including design of promotional material	\$10,000
Postage, stationery, printing	\$2,000
Staffing and consultants costs	\$6,000
Awards – format to be decided – ie plaque, certificate trophy etc	\$7,000
Presentation event	\$5,000

The Panel accepts that it would be unrealistic to expect the Council to provide this level of funding annually on an ongoing basis. It is therefore recommending that, in future, the awards be held biennially but funded annually. This would require a modest budget increase of \$10,000 pa which when added to the existing annual budget provision of \$5,000 would provide adequate resourcing for a biennial event.

### **TIMING**

To enable the review of the awards to be undertaken in a measured way and in consultation with key organisations the Panel is also proposing that the awards not be run this year. The tentative timetable for the 2004 awards is as follows:

Consultation:	February
Planning:	March/April
Entries Open:	Late May
Entries Close:	July
Judging:	September
Presentation Function:	October

As it is unlikely the judging of entries and winning entries will be completed in time to report to the final meeting of the present Council in September 2004, it is suggested that the Council delegate to the Panel the power to run the awards, judge the entries and select the winners in each category.

Clause 32 of Schedule 7 of the Local Government Act 2002 authorises local authorities to delegate its powers (with certain exceptions) to a "committee or other subordinate decision-making body ...". The Director of Legal and Secretariat Services has confirmed that the Judging Panel is a "subordinate decision-making body".

- Recommendation:**
1. That the City of Christchurch Environmental Awards be restructured along the lines proposed in the above report.
  2. That, in future, the awards be held biennially, with the next competition being held in 2004.
  3. That it be recommended to the Annual Plan Subcommittee that funding of \$30,000 be provided biennially from the 2004/05 financial year.
  4. That authority be delegated to the Judging Panel to run the awards, judge the entries and select the winners in each category.
  5. That the judging panel hold discussions with other organisations which run similar awards regarding the possible co-ordination of awards.