

CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL

NOTES OF A SEMINAR MEETING OF THE COUNCIL

**Held in the Council Chamber, Civic Offices
on Tuesday 12 September 2006 at 9.30am**

PRESENT: Councillor Sue Wells (Chairperson),
Councillors Barry Corbett, David Cox, Anna Crighton,
Carole Evans, Pat Harrow, Bob Parker (from 9.50am),
Bob Shearing, Gail Sheriff and Norm Withers.

IN ATTENDANCE: John Freeman and Yani Johanson (Community Board) and
Willie Palmer (Buddle Findlay, Solicitors).

1. TAYLORS MISTAKE BACHES

Ian Thomson, Council Solicitor, provided a PowerPoint presentation on the subject covering:

- Introduction
- History
- Environment Court
- Boulder Bay
- The White Flipped Penguin Trust
- Taylors Mistake Association Land Company (TMLC)
- Occupation of the Legal Road
- Legal Advice
- Licences to Occupy - General
- Action Taken Since October 2003
- Recommendations
 - The Council in its regulatory capacity, take the appropriate steps to approve the plan change
 - Staff be instructed to carry out further work on the issue of licences to occupy
- Conclusions

The presentation was supported with the distribution of a number of coloured photographs and maps of the Taylors Mistake, Boulder Bay and Godley Heads area.

Questions or comments were made in respect of the following:

- Given the amount of expenditure, why wasn't consultation carried out?
- It had been thought that the plan change was already in place.
- Why had it taken three years since the Environment Court decision for the matter to come before the Council?
- Was there a timeline on finalising this project?

- If the Council agreed to a bach zone, could bach owners outside the zone, shift their baches into the zone?
- Was it possible to say that no licences or road occupation would be granted, but instead allow baches to be shifted into the zone area?
- In the zone definition of “bach” reference was made to site not being used for permanent occupation - would this be upheld?
- Were there reasons why the road could not be shifted or its designation changed?
- The issues of sewage and human waste disposal needed to be addressed.
- Could there not be a win-win situation arrived at using the TMLC proposal.
- Was there not a danger of the bach area becoming too “exclusive”?
- What obligations were there of the Council to be undertaken before it created policy on this matter?
- What responsibilities rested with the Council for rock falls when there were already notices up at one of the bays?
- It was seen that the penguin colony had a significant tourism potential.
- Given the involvement of various parties, advice was needed to be provided to Councillors on whether they could partake in the Council’s decision on the matter.
- Was there the ability of baches to be connected to the sewerage system?
- Were some of the baches that could stay the existing ones on the legal road?
- There was implications through any policy created for other properties around Banks Peninsula.
- Was the plan change consultative process?
- There was opportunity for other baches to link into the services provided to the area.
- What was the role of the Community Board in this matter? Was it a local or metropolitan issue?
- If Community Boards were to play a role there should be no going back over old issues.
- Was there a role which ECan carried out?

CONCLUSIONS

1. A site visit be arranged at which various bach sites, proposed zoning areas, legal road etc pointed out.
2. This be followed by a further briefing prior to any report going to Council covering issues raised at today’s seminar including:
 - Licence issues and special area requirements
 - The role of the Community Board
 - The ability to shift baches into bach zone when created
 - Sewage and human waste disposal measures
 - The obligations of the Council before it creates policy
 - The restriction on elected members to partake in the Council decision
 - Road/esplanade reserve matters
3. A memo is to be issued of the next steps in the process together with a copy of the Environment Court’s decision.

The seminar concluded at 11.17am