

**CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL**  
**NOTES OF A SEMINAR MEETING**  
**OF THE CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL**

**Held in the Council Chamber**  
**on Tuesday 27 June 2006 at 9.30 am**

**PRESENT:** Councillor David Cox (Chair),  
 Mayor Garry Moore, Councillors Helen Broughton, Sally Buck,  
 Graham Condon, Barry Corbett, Anna Crighton, Carole Evans,  
 Pat Harrow, Bob Parker, Bob Shearing, Gail Sheriff, Sue Wells and  
 Norm Withers, and Community Board member Yani Johanson.

	ACTION	GENERAL MANAGER RESPONSIBLE	COMPLETION DATE
<b>CITY PLAN WORKLOAD</b>			
<p>The City Plan Team Leader, David Mountfort, spoke to a PowerPoint presentation (copy attached) on progress against the City Plan work programme adopted by the Council in March 2005. The matter was last reported to a Council seminar on 26 April 2006, when further information was sought on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Refreshed priorities including Banks Peninsula on same basis as city</li> <li>➤ Budgets, time frames</li> <li>➤ Specific projects, (SAMS), non-family accommodation, wind farms.</li> </ul> <p><b>The following comments and questions arose during the presentation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Q: Is there merit in commencing the Greenfields Variation, given the length of the process?            A: Yes, but at the cost of some other project, plus need to be clear where UDS is going for the long term. Most Living zoned land has already been developed and new zonings can be developed to much higher standards. Many lessons have been learned from the Masham case which can be applied to future cases.</li> <li>➤ With regard to promoting higher density development in inner areas of Christchurch development, L3 and L4 zones are already available, but the market not picking up on these at present. Lack of this sort of development is not because of City Plan.</li> <li>➤ Inner city densification policies/central city development: in place through City Plan, although some design and parking issues.</li> </ul>			

	ACTION	GENERAL MANAGER RESPONSIBLE	COMPLETION DATE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Non-family accommodation. A report will be presented by the end of 2006.</li> <li>➤ Elderly persons housing. Becoming a major problem at present because of numbers of poor quality developments being built under City Plan provisions. Northwood and Yaldhurst developments for “over 50 y.o’s” both exceptions to the “60 y.o” criteria. Report in preparation.</li> <li>➤ Concern expressed at design standards and access issues ie parking, mobility scooters and wheelchairs etc. It was considered the current consultation on the Building Code would address these matters.</li> <li>➤ The potential change of culture resulting from the UDS ie more high-density and infill housing will sit with the City Plan. Especially changes in “Garden City image” and other amenity effects.</li> <li>➤ Noted there was no mention of Brownfields in the presentation ie parts of the city where “urban villages” could be located through redevelopment. Also consider the utilisation of former suburban industrial sites. Most have B4 zoning at present. However, Wigram Airfield and Packe Street are potential redevelopment sites. Work is underway on the matter of the office accommodation shift to the suburbs.</li> <li>➤ Discussion ensued on a review of the City Plan by 2015, either in “bits” or “globally”. The seminar was advised some of the work does amount to a “rolling review” which will provide some major overhauls. All parts of the plan are due for review once any part of it has been operative for 10 years. A programme should be prepared in about two years for a review. Resources should be used at present with completing City Plan and Banks Peninsula plan. Also UDS outcomes may mean a review of L1 and L2 in some parts of the city.</li> <li>➤ Design issues which, in the past resulted in the blank walls of retail outlets fronting streets should be addressed by the Retail Variation.</li> </ul>			
<p><b>Action Points</b></p>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ A Council seminar was requested on forward planning for managing the city’s “hot spots” (relating to stormwater management and drainage issues). Reference was made to Simon Mortlock’s paper on relative issues.</li> </ul>		Peter Mitchell	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Density through high rise in central city (Vancouver examples cited). Investigate work by Bob Rennie and Larry Beasley.</li> </ul>		Peter Mitchell	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ A Council seminar was requested on Banks Peninsula Variation 2 - Rural Issues.</li> </ul>	David Mountfort	Peter Mitchell	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Wind farms – It was agreed by consensus that this issue be left to combination of landscape study and industry initiatives. It was proposed discussions take place with Orion and Geoff Henderson. Acknowledge possible future option to utilise sea currents.</li> </ul>	David Mountfort	Peter Mitchell	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Regular 4 monthly updates to the Council requested.</li> </ul>	David Mountfort	Peter Mitchell	

	ACTION	GENERAL MANAGER RESPONSIBLE	COMPLETION DATE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Page 14 last bullet point – It was agreed by consensus that this bullet point be amended to read, “New projects arising can be commenced if urgency warranted, at the discretion of <i>the Council.</i>”</li> </ul>		Peter Mitchell	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ An “organic” review process not necessarily favoured. An overview of the 10 year review plan was sought with the understanding that the outcomes from SWAP and UDS may have some effect.</li> </ul>	David Mountfort		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ A set of plans for the city rather than one overall plan for the city was discussed as an option. For example separate plans for residential and commercial aspects. This could be raised with the MfE or at a Metropolitan Planning meeting. The City Plan can be split into territorial sections under current legislation. Recognised problem universally. Comment was sought within a month or so, or at the next seminar.</li> </ul>	David Mountfort	Peter Mitchell	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ LGNZ – check commonality of attitude for next conference</li> <li>➤ Papakaianga Zone on Banks Peninsula noted – currently four very important locations under the Small Settlement criteria. Zone will follow cultural pattern and enable elders to live near marae. Promise made to Runanga.</li> </ul>	David Mountfort		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Points of clarification were then raised regarding the list of plan changes attached to the agenda. Item 393/Heritage – bigger priority sought – the list will be checked.</li> </ul>	David Mountfort		

The meeting concluded at 11.30 am

# **CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL**

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

**Held in the Council Chamber, Civic Office  
on Tuesday 27 June 2006 at 1.30pm**

**PRESENT:** Councillor Bob Shearing (Chairperson),  
Mayor Garry Moore (from 1.45pm), Councillors  
Helen Broughton, Sally Buck, Graham Condon,  
Barry Corbett, David Cox, Pat Harrow, Bob Parker  
(from 2pm), Gail Sheriff and Norm Withers

**APOLOGIES:** Apologies for absence were received and accepted from  
Councillors Carole Evans, Sue Wells and Yani Johanson  
(Community Board)

### **1. CHANGES TO 2006/07 STREET RENEWAL/KERB AND CHANNEL PROGRAMME**

Chris Kerr, Acting City Streets Manager, supported by Alix Newman and  
Steve McNeill provided a PowerPoint presentation covering:

- Deep dish channels
- Age profile of kerb and channel
- Kerb and channel programme
- Transfund
- LTNZ comments
- LTNZ outcomes
- CCC responses
- 2006-14 LTCCP revised 10 year renewal programme.
- Next steps
  - confirm 06/07 programme and community board send out information to residents on deferred project
  - resubmit programme to LTNZ for September review
  - review street asset management plan
  - report draft scheme standards to Council for adoption
  - revise 2007/08 plus programme
  - update LTCCP as required

Questions or comments were made in respect of the following:

- It was important that the work in Thornycroft Street proceeded given residents' contribution towards the undergrounding of services.
- Wairakei Road was an arterial road and should be proceeded with.
- There was need to review the extent of consultation carried out through community boards, given the time, effort and cost of this.

- It was important to note that written commitment had already been given to residents of some works.
- It was presumed that there was a separate programme for the Banks Peninsula area.
- It would be more cost effective to reduce the speed limit of certain streets rather than install speed humps, as was the case in Stockholm.
- Some residents may be happy with delays to the programme, as it would mean their street trees are not dug up etc.

It was reported that scheme standards are being developed.

The seminar concluded at 2.30pm