

URBAN DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
URBAN DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE**

**Held in Waimakariri Room, Environment Canterbury,
Kilmore Street, Christchurch
on Friday 20 July 2007 at 2pm**

PRESENT: Bill Wasley (Independent Chair),
Mayor Michael McEvedy, Mayor Jim Gerard and
Councillors Sue Wells, (to 3.15pm), Bob Parker,
Richard Budd, Alec Neill, Annette Foster, Malcolm Lyall
and Kath Adams.

IN ATTENDANCE: **Christchurch City Council**
Carolyn Ingles, Karen Banwell, Lisa Watson,
Dave Hinman

Environment Canterbury
Laurie McCallum, Josie McNee

Selwyn District Council
Anne Greenup, Nick Regnault

Waimakariri District Council
Simon Markham

Transit NZ
Steve Higgs

Land Transport NZ
Mark Yaxley, Jackie Curtis

Others
Ken Tremaine - Consultant
Jo Appleyard - Christchurch International Airport Co
Ken McAnergney - Christchurch International Airport Co

Committee Secretary
Warren Brixton

APOLOGIES: Apologies for absence were received and accepted from
Sir Kerry Burke, Mayor Garry Moore and Councillor
Kevin Felstead.

1. **CONFIRMATION OF PREVIOUS MINUTES**

The open and public excluded minutes of the previous meeting of 22 June 2007, as circulated, were taken as read and confirmed.

2. **MATTERS ARISING**

Nil.

3. **MONTHLY REPORT - CHAIR**

It was **resolved** that the monthly report of the independent chair be received.

4. **PROPOSED CHANGE TO REGIONAL POLICY STATEMENT**

Ken Tremaine summarised matters as:

- there had been a broad range of input
- this input was now reflected in the report
- it was believed that the stage had now been reached where the RPS can be notified

The Selwyn District Council representatives tabled their desired changes to the text of the RPS which they would wish to see made. These covered:

- (i) Method 5.1 - is beyond what Councils can do
- (ii) Method 4.1 brings in terminology that no other Council uses
- (iii) Policy 12 - difficult to achieve and advice from engineering staff is that it is unworkable
- (iv) Workability of policy 15, Clause (a) was ambiguous
- (v) Inconsistency in the document, and the use of the term 'greenfield'

While it was noted that Christchurch City Council has yet to meet to consider the matter, some amendments or/and clarification would be desirable in respect of the:

- (i) Method 5.1 to read '*territorial authorities shall, through their district plans, introduce measures to support the planned development of key activity centres*'.
- (ii) Method 4.1 to read '*territorial authorities shall identify, through district plans and strategy planning exercises, areas of growth of district towns*'.
- (iii) Policy 12 - this is to be left as written with a single note of explanation.
- (iv) Workability of Policy 15, Clause (a) agreed that some clarification of the intent should be added.

- (v) Workability of Policy 15, no change.
- (vi) inconsistency in the document. In the use of the term 'greenfields' - careful choice of words needs to be made as 'greenfields' has a different meaning to each individual authority. The use of 'existing zoned' or 'undeveloped' need to be appropriate ahead of other changes.
- (vii) Table 2 Development of sequencing for Greater Christchurch 2007-2041 - this should relate to households.
- (vii) Section 32 Report - 1.2.2 - the Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy - add Environment Canterbury as a partner.

It was concluded that perhaps:

- (i) a legal review of the Proposed Change No.1, may be required by some partner Councils before committing to signing off on it.
- (ii) an explanation be added in respect of the terminology used by each Council, which differs, one from the other.

It was **resolved**, that subject to the amendments as put forward that:

- (1) Proposed Change No.1 to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, be approved and recommended to the partner Councils and Transit NZ.
- (2) The partners provide any further advice to Environment Canterbury by 26 July 2007, so that the changes can be publicly notified on 28 July 2007.

5. REGIONAL POLICY STATEMENT - MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENTS

Councillor Annette Foster declared a conflict of interest in a Memorandum of Understanding relating to airport contours and did not take part in the discussion or vote on the resolutions.

The Chairman advised that since the agenda had been drawn up, there had been further work with regard to the memorandums of understanding, with a meeting of Chief Executive Officers the previous evening.

The meeting was adjourned at 2.40pm, following the tabling of the revised MOUs:

- (a) related to urban limits
- (b) airport noise contours

The purpose of the adjournment was to enable various representatives to gain an understanding of each other's position, while noting that the document is not an agreement, and as such the RPS should be free to proceed.

The meeting reconvened at 3.07pm.

Selwyn District Council representatives tabled a revised MOU, No.2, and advised that this was as a result of a legal opinion obtained in relation to the noise contour matter. Selwyn District Council believed it could not sign the MOU on the basis that this was a matter currently before the Court.

However, Selwyn District Council was prepared to draft a new MOU, provided for their position. It was noted that it would be advisable to bring the Airport Company in to the discussion.

Memorandum of Understanding - No.1

It was suggested that this not be an opportunity to introduce any other issues, unless they were as a result of the implications of the Selwyn District Council proposed changes. IMG was directed to meet on the following Monday to consider the amendments, in time to provide advice to the partner Councils prior to their consideration of the RPS.

Memorandum of Understanding - No.2

It was suggested that acknowledgement should be given to the fact that each of the partners have a number of issues which need to be resolved. The approach that should be taken should be a single one that avoids any litigation. Airport Company representatives explained the matter from their perspective, commenting that there had been 10 years of litigation, although there was only one outstanding issue left.

The Airport Company had agreed to look at work they had done on defining the noise contours, as the information utilised was now 17 years old. The new information would be available within the next week and would be carried out on the 2007 basis. However, they did see two difficulties - that of the time frame, and of the current Court proceedings.

It was considered that it would be appropriate for the Implementation Management Group to work through issues first and then pass a draft recommended MOU on to the working party for consideration and that the UDSIC Working Party would then make appropriate recommendations to the August UDSIC meeting. The Chair also noted that this process had to be completed to ensure that amended MOU 2 was placed on the UDSIC agenda which closes a week prior to the meeting.

It was **resolved**:

1. In respect of Memorandum of Understanding, No.1, that this Committee approve it in principle, but subject to the partner Councils staff meeting and reaching an agreement on the issues.
2. In respect of draft Memorandum of Understand, No. 2, that staff meet to consider the matters raised at today's meeting, and when ready the working party meet to consider the outstanding matters, and provide a recommendation back to the next meeting of the Implementation Committee.

It was noted:

- (a) there is the ability to liaise with CIAL
- (b) that Councillor Lyall replace Councillor Foster on the working party

6. IMPLEMENTING THE TRANSPORT GROUP

It was **resolved** that the report be received.

7. MEETING WITH TRANSIT NZ AND LAND TRANSPORT NZ BOARDS

The information was received.

The meeting concluded at 3.55pm