

# **CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL**

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

**Held in the Council Chamber, Civic Offices  
on Tuesday 25 July 2006 at 9.30am**

- PRESENT:** Mayor Garry Moore (Chairperson)  
Councillors Helen Broughton (from 11.30am), Sally Buck,  
Graham Condon, David Cox, Anna Crighton, Pat Harrow,  
Bob Parker, Bob Shearing, Gail Sheriff, Sue Wells and  
Norm Withers.
- APOLOGIES:** Apologies for absence were received and accepted from  
Councillors Carole Evans and Helen Broughton (lateness)  
and Mr Tony Sutcliffe.
- IN ATTENDANCE:** Yani Johanson and Yvonne Palmer (Community Boards)  
and John Suckling (Mayoral Forum).

### **1. CENTRAL CITY REVITALISATION – PROPOSED STAGE II STRATEGY**

The Mayor in introducing the topic spoke of the history of city malls, the advice he had received from world mayors, including that of the time it takes for any changes to come to fruition. An eye had to be kept on the bigger picture, with the central city being the iconic part of it.

Rather than talk about the CBD, the area focussed on was that within the four avenues. He saw a link from Jade Stadium running up to the Polytechnic, down High Street and extending to Hagley Park. The central city should be a place for all sectors to live and play.

Mike Theelen added that this document is a ‘scene setter’ and, apart from bringing the project up to date, it would be followed by a series of seminars and other activities.

Maurice Roers and Miranda Charles provided a PowerPoint presentation of the Proposed Stage II Strategy, which provided a big picture of where the city was going.

The presentation covered:

- Initiation of efforts aimed at the central city’s revitalisation.
- The basis from which the strategy evolved from.
- The Stage I strategy.
- The vision for the central city as being a vibrant, exciting, safe and sustainable heart of Christchurch.
- The Stage I projects.

- How the Council can impact on:
  - Business
  - Retail
  - Hospitality and tourism
  - Residents
  - Transportation
  - Culture and recreation
  - Heritage
  - Environment
- The project to be a 5 year works programme.
- The executive summary.
- The priorities.
- The bricks.
- The mortar.
- Priority projects and programme map.
- Central city precincts map.
- Next steps.

In the discussion that followed questions and comments were made in respect of the following:

- Need to focus on the really important priorities.
- The need to publicise proposals.
- The need to know what is the first project underway.
- The need to obtain leverage for public art funding.
- The selection of heritage buildings for upgrading is crucial, given the condition of two theatres in the city.
- Whether the strategy should be a few years further out?
- What would the city look like if it had 30,000 people in its centre?
- Were there sufficient beds available in the city for overnight visitors?
- The need to determine the main priority.
- The need to make more friendly for pedestrians given the difficulties of students trying to cross both Madras Street and Barbados Street.
- The need to get on and make quick changes to the City Plan.
- The need for well designed and liveable dwellings/apartments.
- Was the Council making it easier to bring business into the central city or not?
- The need to protect the business centre of the central city and enhance it.
- The need for a wireless broadband loop to be established.
- Whether Wellington with its well laid out civic spaces that allowed you to move from one to the other with ease, should be followed?
- The need to break the action plan down so that progress could be monitored.
- Rather than triennial brochure or the City Scene, newspaper supplement which would cover all of Canterbury should be utilised.
- Light rail was not mentioned until the year 2010.
- Matters of economic development, crime prevention, pedestrian access, should be better emphasised.
- The project dovetailed well with that of the UDS programme.
- The Community Boards could play their part.

John Suckling suggested that it was hard to find a universal solution, the city has spread out more than that of others, because of its flat nature. A bold move was made to make the centre of Christchurch 'unique' and there had to be a way of managing the city and even micro-managing part of it.

There needed to be willingness from all parties and the negative press of recent needed to be managed.

In conclusion, the Mayor suggested that there had to be more dewey dewey and less huey huey. There was a need to get on with it and for the Council to set the priorities. This could include the introduction of wireless technology, getting rid of the one way streets and restricting heavy traffic to the four avenues. Top priorities needed to be determined.

## 2. **CHRISTCHURCH CAPITAL ENDOWMENT INTEREST ALLOCATION 2006/07**

Chris Pickrill, CEO, Canterbury Development Corporation, provided a summary of the PowerPoint presentation, given at the Council seminar of 18 July 2006. This covered:

- Background.
- Funding summary.
- Breakdown in duration of 2005/06 CEF interest allocation.
- The initiatives 2005/06.
- 2005/06 summary of activities.
- 2006/07 summary of proposed activities.

He followed this with a series of answers to questions raised at the earlier seminar covering:

- Unemployment levels.
- Enterprise training.
- Funding split.
- Government funding for youth enterprise, apprenticeships and workforce development.
- Business mentoring.

Ian Bougen, CEO, Christchurch and Canterbury Marketing, provided a PowerPoint presentation covering its request for funding support:

- Development initiatives.
- Banks Peninsula tourism.
  - Background.
  - Current situation.
  - What services will be provided?
- South Island promotional fund.
  - Background.
  - Current situation.
  - What services is/will be provided?

- Potential misunderstanding.

In the discussion that followed questions and comments were made in respect of:

- Whether employment location should be used for economic development type funding.
- Details were sought of how airline routes were secured.
- Whether there was competition from other training providers.

The seminar concluded at 12.35pm.

# CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL

## NOTES OF A SEMINAR MEETING OF THE COUNCIL

Held in the Council Chamber, Civic Offices  
on Tuesday 25 July 2006 at 1.30pm

**PRESENT:** Councillor Graham Condon (Chairperson to 3.10pm),  
Councillor David Cox (Chairperson 3.10pm – 3.30pm).  
Councillors Helen Broughton, Sally Buck (from 1.55pm),  
Barry Corbett, Anna Crighton, Pat Harrow, Bob Parker,  
Gail Sheriff (to 2.45pm), Sue Wells (to 3.05pm) and  
Norm Withers. Messrs Yani Johanson Hagley/Ferryhead  
Community Board) (from 1.45pm) and Bryan Morgan  
(Akaroa/Wairewa Community Board).

**APOLOGIES:** Apologies for absence were received and accepted from  
Mayor Garry Moore, Councillors Carole Evans and  
Bob Shearing.

### 1. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY

Alan Bywater (Programme Manager Strong Communities) outlined the purpose and goals of the seminar; viz, to discuss draft principles and receive direction from Councillors for development of the following areas of work:

- Community Development Strategy
- Community Grants Review
- Community Facilities Plan

Alan also advised that these three pieces of work are being developed in parallel, with the Community Development Strategy providing direction for the other two.

Ingrid Gunby (Senior Policy Analyst), with the aid of the attached overheads (No 1-30), provided a comprehensive explanation on:

- The aims of the Community Development Strategy
- Definition of a strong community
  - Have higher democratic participation
  - Are cleaner and safer
  - Have better educational achievement
  - Have higher economic growth
  - Have lower mortality rates
  - Have a healthier environment
  - More attractive to live, visit and invest

COMMUNITY ORGANISATIONS ARE THE FOUNDATION OF STRONG COMMUNITIES

- Links to community outcomes and the Council's vision
- Strategic directions

- How are we (the Council) delivering?
- Key strategic challenges
- Way of working
- The future? – the Council as a strategic partner

Ingrid responded to the many questions that came forward. Feedback included the following points:

Slide 19 Resources should be focussed on issues/areas of greatest need

**Feedback**

- “Flexibility required to acknowledge this statement”
- “Focus on core areas”
- “Why fund problem areas?”
- “The Council should assist people who help themselves”

Slide 9

- “Acknowledge a changing family structure”
- “Acknowledge rural communities”

Slide 11

- “Include heritage areas”

Slide 20

- “Include heritage initiatives”
- “Include cultural initiatives”

Slides 19 and 27

- “Any adjustments should be in tandem”
- “Long term partnerships (eg 3-5 years) with strategic partners”
- “Work with church groups to keep kids interested”
- “Commissioning v funding – areas of need cut the cloth to suit the budget”
- “Target ‘hot spots’”
- “Focus on needs that provide and have potential for the greatest benefit”

## 2. **COMMUNITY GROUP GRANTS REVIEW**

Paul Cotton (Senior Policy Analyst) outlined the work in progress with this review (copies of overheads No 33-45 attached). The aims of which include:

- Developing and assessing scheme options.
- Developing measure of effectiveness.
- Administering, monitoring and evaluation processes.
- Awareness of community organisations.
- Development of a risk assessment process.

As time restraints prevented the completion of this item, as well as the topic Community Facilities, it was **agreed** they be rescheduled as a seminar at a later date.

The seminar concluded at 3.30pm.