

**GREATER CHRISTCHURCH URBAN DEVELOPMENT
STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE**

14 SEPTEMBER 2012

AT 9 AM

IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, CIVIC OFFICES, 53 HEREFORD STREET

Committee:

Urban Development Strategy Independent Chair
Bill Wasley

Christchurch City Council
Mayor Bob Parker, Councillors Sue Wells and Claudia Reid

Environment Canterbury
Commissioners Tom Lambie, Peter Skelton and Rex Williams

Selwyn District Council
Mayor Kelvin Coe, Councillors Lindsay Philps and Malcolm Lyall

Waimakariri District Council
Mayor David Ayers, Councillors Jim Gerard and Dan Gordon

Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu
Mark Solomon
Wally Stone

New Zealand Transport Authority
Jim Harland (Observer)

Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority
Roger Sutton (Observer)

Implementation Manager
Keith Tallentire
DDI: 941-8045

Committee Adviser
Rachael Brown
DDI: 941-5249

INDEX

ITEM NO	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO
1.	APOLOGIES	3
2.	CONFIRM MINUTES FROM MEETING OF 13 JULY 2012	3
3.	RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC	9

GREATER CHRISTCHURCH URBAN DEVELOPMENT IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE 14. 9. 2012**1. APOLOGIES**

Bill Wasley.

Note, the meeting will be chaired by Mayor Ayers (Deputy Chair) in Mr Wasley's absence.

2. CONFIRM MINUTES FROM MEETING OF 13 JULY 2012

It is recommended that the Committee confirms the open minutes of its meeting on 13 July 2012.

Attached.

CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL

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

**Held in the Function Room, Civic Offices, 53 Hereford Street, Christchurch
on Friday 13 July 2012 at 11 AM**

PRESENT:

Urban Development Strategy (UDS) Independent Chair
Bill Wasley

Christchurch City Council
Mayor Bob Parker, Councillor Sue Wells

Selwyn District Council
Mayor Kelvin Coe, Councillors Lindsay Philips and Malcolm Lyall

Waimakariri District Council
Mayor David Ayers, Councillors Jim Gerard and Dan Gordon

Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu
Wally Stone

Environment Canterbury
Commissioners Tom Lambie, Peter Skelton and Rex Williams

New Zealand Transport Authority
Jim Harland (observer)

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies from Councillor Claudia Reid, Mark Solomon and Roger Sutton (observer) were received by the Committee.

It was **resolved** on the motion of Mayor Coe, seconded by Councillor Lyall, that the apologies be accepted.

The meeting was adjourned at 11.05 AM, so that the business of the Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority (CERA) Advisory Committee could be completed.

The meeting of the Urban Development Strategy Implementation Committee (UDSIC) resumed at 12.20 PM.

2. RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC

On the motion of Councillor Gerard, seconded by Mayor Coe, the Committee **resolved** to exclude the public on the grounds of *Maintaining Legal Professional Privilege*, as set out on page 43 of the agenda for this meeting.

(Note. Clause 3, on the Judicial Review of the Ministerial Decision in relation to the Regional Policy Statement was discussed in the Public Excluded section of the meeting.)

- 2 -

4. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES FROM 11 MAY 2012 MEETING

On the motion of Commissioner Williams, seconded by Councillor Philps, the Committee **confirmed** the minutes of its previous meeting held on 11 May 2012, subject to the following changes:

- Commissioner Rex Williams be added to the list of members present at the 11 May meeting
- in the title for Clause 6 'design' be changed to 'development'.

5. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

Nil.

6. DEPUTATIONS

Nil.

7. GREATER CHRISTCHURCH TRANSPORT STATEMENT: UPDATE REPORT

The Committee acknowledged the hard work and commitment of staff who had pulled together information from a wide range of sources, so that an outline for the Greater Christchurch Transport Statement (GCTS) could be drafted within the timeframe of one month.

The Committee noted that:

- the development of a GCTS is underway
- the GCTS will be developed through a partnership approach between Urban Development Strategy (UDS) partners*, CERA, Lyttelton Port of Christchurch, Christchurch International Airport Limited, Kiwirail and the Ministry of Transport.

It was **agreed** on the motion of Commissioner Rex Williams, seconded by Commissioner Peter Skelton, that:

- a. although the Greater Christchurch Transport Statement would be a non-statutory document, a Memorandum of Understanding would be developed by Urban Development Strategy (UDS) partners¹ and other key stakeholders to indicate their commitment to the statement
- b. a further report will be provided at the next Committee meeting on 10 August 2012, which will include a draft of the Greater Christchurch Transport Statement for comment
- c. following comment from this Committee, the Greater Christchurch Transport Statement will be presented for adoption by the Committee and referred to Urban Development Strategy partners and other key stakeholders for ratification.

8. BI-MONTHLY IMPLEMENTATION REPORT

The Committee thanked staff for organising the bus tour (noted in the report) and indicated that it had been a valuable exercise both in terms of developing members' understanding of the issues, and as an opportunity to help develop constructive working relationships.

On the motion of Councillor Gordon, seconded by Commissioner Skelton, it was **agreed** to receive the bi-monthly Urban Development Strategy Implementation Report from the Independent Chair and the Implementation Manager.

* UDS partners are the Christchurch City Council, Selwyn District Council, Waimakariri District Council, Environment Canterbury and Te Rūnanga o Ngai Tahu.

9. PROPOSED INITIAL TIMEFRAMES FOR A REVIEW OF THE URBAN DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY

The Committee noted that:

- the purpose of this report was to update on where work is currently at in this area
- it is important to find out where population growth and related areas of pressure will be before a full review takes place
- the outcome of the Judicial Review on the Ministerial Decision in relation to the Regional Policy Statement may influence the timeframes for this review.

On the motion of Councillor Gerard, seconded by Mayor Coe, the it was **agreed**:

- a. That given the current focus on recovery, a full review of the Urban Development Strategy (UDS) is not undertaken during 2012/13, but that instead any immediate re-evaluation of the UDS is undertaken as part of the collaborative development of recovery programmes.
- b. The initial timeframes for a programme reviewing the Urban Development Strategy (UDS):
 - i. *September 2012 to December 2013*: undertake a gap analysis of integrated urban development trends and commission any issues based research (not already covered through recovery programme development)
 - ii. *January 2014 to March 2014*: analyse and report on Census 2013 data
 - iii. *January 2014 to June 2014*: draft a revised UDS and seek UDS partner ratification.
- c. That the timeframes in Recommendation b. above, remain tentative and that a further report be brought back to the Committee in July 2013 to update on these timeframes.
- d. That the approach outlined in Recommendations (a) through (c) above, be reported back to the Urban Development Strategy partner council meetings for their ratification.

10. URBAN DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION MANAGEMENT GROUP WORK PROGRAMME 2012/13

The Committee noted :

- the interim Urban Development Strategy Implementation Management Group 2012/13 work programme outlined in this report
- the proposed approach to undertake a joint alignment and prioritisation process with the Canterbury Earthquake Authority (CERA) to confirm an agreed UDS/CERA work programme going forward.

On the motion of Councillor Gerard, seconded by Councillor Lyall, it was **agreed** that the Committee will consider a further report on the Urban Development Strategy Implementation Management Group work programme, at its meeting in September or October 2012, once the joint prioritisation process is complete.

The Committee noted that future meetings of the CERA Advisory Committee and the UDSIC will be held in the Christchurch City Council Chamber and that the finishing time will be extended to 1 PM.

The meeting closed at 1.10 PM.

3. RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC

Attached.

FRIDAY 14 SEPTEMBER 2012

RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC

Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987.

I move that the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting, namely items 4 and 5.

The general subject of each matter to be considered while the public is excluded, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter and the specific grounds under Section 48(1) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution are as follows:

	GENERAL SUBJECT OF EACH MATTER TO BE CONSIDERED	REASON FOR PASSING THIS RESOLUTION IN RELATION TO EACH MATTER	GROUND(S) UNDER SECTION 48(1) FOR THE PASSING OF THIS RESOLUTION
4	PREVIOUS PX MINUTES)	
5	PROGRESSING A LEGAL STRATEGY AND FRAMEWORK FOR URBAN LAND USE AND EARTHQUAKE RECOVERY PLANNING) GOOD REASON TO WITHHOLD EXISTS UNDER SECTION 7))	SECTION 48(1)(A)

This resolution is made in reliance on Section 48(1)(a) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the particular interest or interests protected by Section 6 or Section 7 of that Act which would be prejudiced by the holding of the whole or relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public are as follows:

ITEM	REASON UNDER ACT	SECTION	PLAIN ENGLISH REASON	WHEN REPORT CAN BE RELEASED
4	Maintaining legal professional privilege	Section 7(2)(g)	Legal advice to remain confidential and privileged	
5	Maintaining legal professional privilege	Section 7(2)(g)	Legal advice to remain confidential and privileged	

Chairman's

Recommendation: That the foregoing motion be adopted.

Note

Section 48(4) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 provides as follows:

“(4) Every resolution to exclude the public shall be put at a time when the meeting is open to the public, and the text of that resolution (or copies thereof):

- (a) Shall be available to any member of the public who is present; and
- (b) Shall form part of the minutes of the local authority.”