

## **CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL**

### **NOTES OF A SEMINAR MEETING OF THE COUNCIL**

**Held in the Council Chamber, Civic Offices  
on Tuesday 21 February 2006 at 2.05pm**

#### **PRESENT:**

##### **City Council**

Mayor Garry Moore (Chairman),  
Councillors Helen Broughton (from 3.50pm), Sally Buck,  
Graham Condon, David Cox, Anna Crighton,  
Carole Evans, Pat Harrow, Bob Shearing, Gail Sheriff  
and Norm Withers.

##### **Community Board**

Chris Mene

#### **APOLOGY:**

An apology for absence was received and accepted from  
Councillor Sue Wells.

It was noted that Councillor Helen Broughton excluded herself from the Chamber during discussion on the Canterbury Museum.

#### **1. CANTERBURY MUSEUM FUNDING**

Roy Baker, General Manager Corporate Services, tabled three pages of financial statements providing updated information on the funding provisions.

Anthony Wright, Director, supported by Dr Paddy Austin, Chairperson and Nigel Tecofsky, Financial Controller, provided a PowerPoint presentation on the Museum's revitalisation project covering:

- Context
- The revitalisation project
- Funding 1999 project
- Consent/legal process
- Funding 2005 project
- Escalation/design process
- Capital cost
- Operating cost
- Impact on levy
- Community benefits
- Economic benefits
- Cost per visitor

At the conclusion questions and comments were made in respect of:

- The level of co-operation with the Antarctic Centre
- The level of charging being made for the Antarctic display
- The method of counting visitors
- The level of funds raised to date by the Museum
- The extent of discussions held with Central Government and the need for a greater contribution
- Whether there was any planned reduction in the project to keep within budget
- The influence of the Environment Court in the building's design
- Whether there was any cost saving because of the reduced scope of the application
- The Museum's confidence in raising funds from the community
- Aspects of the Museum's charging policy
- Whether the Museum saw itself as part of the entertainment sector
- Whether a loan rather than a grant would be a more applicable funding option
- Whether the \$48 million cost included those of the proposed exhibition

### **Conclusion**

- The LTCCP can incorporate the funding provisions but the challenge is in looking at the increases. How to spread this would be included in the report to the Council.
- It was seen as making sense to spread the costs over 30 years, with the Museum buying the money as a loan.

## **2. CANTERBURY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION – FUNDING**

Chris Pickerill, Chief Executive Officer, provided a PowerPoint presentation covering:

- Overall budget 2005/06
- Employment development
- Action works
- Youth works
- Outside the square (OTS)
- Rakataki and Pasifika Unit (RAPU)
- Works Projects Team
- Workforce development
- The bottom line

Questions and comments were made in respect of:

- The level of input being made by government departments other than WINZ
- The work being done with other ethnic groups
- The difficulty of making choices between the different programmes
- The extent of other funding sources
- The work being done with not-for-profit groups
- Whether WINZ would pick up those people on the ACE scheme if the project was reduced in any way

- Whether rather than ACE, cuts were looked at in terms of career transitions
- The fact that double counting of some employees by different agencies

### **Conclusion**

Budget cuts were to be looked at in terms of the ACE programme and the Career Transition programmes, both which had been identified by the CDC as possible savings.

The seminar concluded at 4.30pm