

# **CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL**

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

**Held in the Council Chamber, Civic Offices  
on Tuesday 11 April 2006 at 9.30am**

**PRESENT:** Councillor Gail Sheriff (Chairperson),  
Councillors Sally Buck, Graham Condon, Barry Corbett,  
David Cox, Anna Crighton, Pat Harrow, Bob Parker,  
Bob Shearing, Sue Wells, Norm Withers, and  
Carole Evans (from 10.55am).

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Steve Lowndes (Akaroa/Wairewa Community Board)

**APOLOGIES:** Apologies for absence were received and accepted from  
Councillor Helen Broughton and Community Board  
Member Yani Johanson.

Apologies for lateness were received from  
Councillors Sally Buck, Anna Crighton and  
Carole Evans.

### **1. CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL BRAND REVIEW**

The session was introduced by Stephen Hill, General Manager Public Affairs, who explained the seminar was for information and input from those present on a proposed review of the Council's marketing brand. The last review of the Council brand had taken place in 1997, and the merger with Banks Peninsula had raised the issue of refreshing the Council's logo.

Richard Stokes, Marketing Manager, then proceeded to speak to a PowerPoint presentation, which covered the following:

**Why?** (It was noted there are currently 104 domain names across the Council, and 38 separate websites.)

**Objectives**

**Role of the brand**

**Benefits**

**Direction for brand development**

**The brief - what we will do**

**Brand hierarchy**

**Brand development - visual**

**Organisation brand direction**

The following questions and comments were made in respect of the **Organisation Brand Direction**:

- Elected members referred to the Council subcommittee, set up in 1999 to prepare a set of guidelines (known as the “branding bible”), designed to prevent the current divergence happening: Why not simply follow the instructions in the existing tool?
- Consider the use of colour to bring it all together (green and burgundy).
- An example of best practice was cited: CCC Situations Vacant advertisements (in blue) which stand out.
- Stylistic revamp should be considered, but not moving away from the Garden City image: no need for change.
- Ensure there are no spelling mistakes or typos on the CCC websites.
- Would be of value to have Community Board information available on the website and across the organisation.
- Logo: Why not put peninsula hills behind existing logo and recognise Banks Peninsula in any text?
- As a local government organisation, the Council needs to differentiate itself from every other business in town - we have “citizens”, not “customers”.
- Banks Peninsula is a “garden” in its own right, and fits with the city image. Need to promote to the international community.
- Concern was expressed over various draft documents circulated to elected members which have plastic covers and binding: Does not fit with the Council’s recycling aims.
- Utilise local TV, and newspaper advertisements, as substitutes for brochures.
- Discussion ensued on whether or not the strap line should be part of the logo, and whether “Your City/Our City” should be debated again.
- Communication - there is so much material circulated currently which is not readily recognised as being connected to the Christchurch City Council. A request from elected members to set aside time to discuss **what is needed** in the way of communication.
- Why is so much paper used for the consultation process - need to look at other methods.
- Utilise the front windows of Civic Offices more effectively.
- Consider residents who will be 22 years old in 10 years’ time: How does the Council effectively communicate with them? Text messaging?
- Need to differentiate between tools and aims: Elected members need to identify what the Council **wants to achieve**.

### **Proposed Organisation Brand Direction.**

The following comment was made in respect of this heading:

- Visual inclusion of Banks Peninsula - need to be aware Banks Peninsula is not just the Port Hills - also consider economic aspects (tourism/farming/port/beaches/holiday resorts, restaurants etc).

## **Christchurch City Council v Christchurch City**

Some debate then ensued on the proposal to drop the word “Council” and use “Christchurch City” instead, with the aim of (a) putting the focus on the Council’s contribution to the city and (b) appearing less bureaucratic.

The following comments were made in response:

- The Council by its nature is a regulatory organisation. We are “the Council”, eg Council libraries, Council pools etc - identifies to our residents and ratepayers that this is “where your rates go”.
- Keep the word “Council” and give new meaning to the word “bureaucracy” by delivering service.
- Increase the size of the logo.
- It was the wish of the meeting that the new structure ensure consistency with the branding, which may then spin off to consistency with information.
- Refreshing the branding can be done progressively within existing budgets.

### **Brand extensions**

#### **Event and campaign brands**

#### **Associated activities**

**Costs** (could be up to \$10,000)

#### **Benefits**

### **Next Step**

The meeting was advised that the next step would be to bring back a range of branding options for further discussion by elected members.

The seminar concluded at 11am

# **CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL**

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

**Held in the Council Chamber, Civic Offices  
on Tuesday 11 April 2006 at 1.30pm**

**PRESENT:** Councillor Bob Shearing (Chairperson),  
Councillors Sally Buck, Graham Condon, Barry Corbett,  
David Cox, Anna Crighton, Pat Harrow, Bob Parker,  
Gail Sheriff, Sue Wells, Norm Withers, Carole Evans and  
Helen Broughton (from 1.45pm).

**APOLOGIES:** Apologies for absence were received and accepted from  
Mayor Garry Moore, Councillor Anna Crighton and  
Community Board Member Yani Johanson.

### **1. MEMBERS' INTERESTS - RELATED PARTIES**

Diane Brandish advised that New Zealand was following international trend in changing its accounting standards and this affected local authorities. Ken Boddy, Audit New Zealand, provided a PowerPoint presentation showing the transition from SSAP 22 to NZIAS 24.

- Overview
- Why a separate standard?
- Cuts both ways
- The corporate level
- Underlying theme
- The individual level
- Some things change
- Extending the nature - corporate and individual level
- Provides greater clarity and prescription - corporate level
- Public benefit entities exemptions
- Some stay the same - but!
- The Auditor-General's perspective

Questions and comments were made in respect of:

- The requirement to disclose related party transactions, even after having obtained the Auditor-General's approval.
- Whether the \$25,000 individual contract limit had been extended.
- Whether the Council needed to list the outside directorships of its members.
- The new standard seemed to be saying that added proof needed to be shown.
- How "public" was the information that had to be supplied by members of the Council?

- The need for understanding the requirements so that members could assess the particular risks.
- Where a product is discounted to a member, did this constitute part of a normal business transaction?
- Where did the likes of swimming pool entry tickets and parking tickets fit?
- Did the transaction extend to between the member and any subsidiary party?
- It seemed to be moving from voluntary to compulsory.
- What were the relationships between the accounting standards and the local authorities members' interest requirements?
- Is members' salaries or other remuneration automatically disclosed or provided upon request?
- What was the situation applied to the likes of a member serving on a museum board?
- Should members be party to setting their own remuneration levels?
- Did the requirements extend to other family members, such as a sister or brother or even a girl or boyfriend?

At the conclusion of the meeting, a copy of the reporting entity questionnaires, to be circulated to members was tabled.

The seminar concluded at 2.45pm