

CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL

NOTES OF A SEMINAR MEETING OF THE COUNCIL

**Held in the Council Chamber, Civic Offices
on Tuesday 19 September 2006 at 9.30am**

- PRESENT:** Councillor Sue Wells (Chair),
Councillors Sally Buck, Graham Condon , Barry Corbett,
Anna Crighton, Carole Evans, Pat Harrow, Bob Parker,
Bob Shearing, Gail Sheriff, Norm Withers and
Community Board members Steve Lowndes, Bob Todd
and Yani Johanson.
- APOLOGIES:** Apologies for absence were received and accepted from
the Mayor, Councillor Helen Broughton and Community
Board member Glenda Burt.
- IN ATTENDANCE:** Peter Mitchell and Anusha Guler.

1. STANDING ORDERS

Peter Mitchell introduced the presentation which was based on the latest update from Standards New Zealand and put before elected members to provide an opportunity for discussion.

A PowerPoint presentation covered the following:

- Questions to consider
 - Local Variation
- 2.11.3 - Approval of minutes – could be retained as is.
- 2.13 - Deputations -consensus to stay with 2 days – members of public require this time frame to respond once agendas made public.
- 2.15.1A - Closure motion. Covered in the new Standing Orders – elected members wished to explore further.
- 2.19.6 - Reading of speeches. Change to the model? – will come up for debate at the Council meeting.
- 2.21.6 - Point of order.
- 2.22.1.2 - Casting vote – agreed there are other options available. Westminster system toss of a coin considered fairer than a casting vote. Bring back for further discussion and debate.
- 2.7.1 - Time limits for meetings – eight hours? Apply to Community Board meetings as well..
- 3.23 - Public notification of meeting - Model standing orders built around monthly meetings.

Include definition of a “meeting”, with an agenda and minutes. Define expectations around public notice etc. Council website – is it possible to have access to Council agendas on the website earlier than at present? Members of the public usually seek agenda/information over the weekend, and currently not available.

- **Amendments Included in New Model Standing Orders.** The difference between Recommendations and Resolutions explained. Working parties, and seminars, have no decision-making powers, but appropriate wording would be – “a consensus from the seminar was reached around (whatever) ...”
- Definition of meetings would eliminate any risk from a judicial review.
- Clause 2.2.3 - add elected members’ cell phone details. (For staff access and distribution of information.)
- Clause 2.3.1 – Chairperson of Meeting – appointment of chair for informal meetings discussed. Define power of chair to enforce a code of conduct at informal meetings, and provide a level of consistency with meeting process overall.
- Clause 2.8 – Separate clause for Joint Committees – OK.
- Clause 2.9.5 “Ex-officio” appointment has both speaking and voting rights. Peter to email Councillor Parker to explain in detail. It was noted there is no provision to appoint alternates on the council or council committees.

Provide a “glossary” of terminology.

Amendments by Clauses in New Model cont’d

- Clause 2.10.1 -
- Clause 2.20.1 (2) –
- Clause 2.10.3 – include this information (as an appendix)
- Clause 2.14.5 –
- Clause 2.15.3 – is it necessary for the public advertisements to be as large as they are?
- Clause 3.6.4 – Absence with leave. Insert brackets around “(other than extraordinary meetings)”. Noted the qualifying “Four meetings” and timing, now that the Council meets weekly, (formerly monthly). Elected members can apply for “leave of absence”- timing explained.
- Clause 3.14 Voting –
- Clause 3.17.2 –Minutes of Meeting – is it possible to have more detail in Council minutes by including the wording of resolutions for clarification and ease of understanding. Taping of debates and meetings discussed and ECan method cited. Digital recording – would this be an option, being aware of access to records. Why not include movers and seconders of motions?
- Clause 3.19.6 – Time limit on deputations/presentations - 5 or 10 minutes – no clear steer from elected members on this.
- Clause 3.20.1 - Petition - “Shall comprise less than 500 words” currently. Proposed 50 words had support.
- Clause 3.19.3 – Deputations. Include “sign language”. Include provision for parties making the deputation to pay for interpreter ... Reword to say “may be made in language other than English, and it is the responsibility of the speaker to
- Clause 3.20.3 Petition in English or Maori – provision of an interpreter? – reword “may be made in language other the English - it is the responsibility of the presenter of the petition to provide an interpreter or interpretation”.
- Clause 3.3.6 – Speeches in Maori or English – “official language” needs clear definition with regard to local government.

The seminar adjourned at 11.45am

PRESENT: Councillor Sue Wells (Chair),
Councillors Graham Condon, Barry Corbett (from 1.40pm),
David Cox, Pat Harrow, Bob Shearing, Gail Sheriff (from
1.45pm) and Norm Withers.

APOLOGIES: Apologies for absence were received and accepted from
the Mayor, Councillors Helen Broughton, Sally Buck,
Anna Crighton, Carole Evans and Community Board
member Glenda Burt.

1. **STANDING ORDERS (Cont'd)**

Include Definition of terms – e.g. normative, ex officio, etc.

Discussion re right of/control of media to take photos at meeting –matter of courtesy –
should be notified to Chair at commencement of meeting – include in material to
potential Councillors.

Photos by members of each other ruled by Code of Conduct.

Normative Appendix C –

C5 - Chairpersons recommendations used by CB's but not by Council, should they be
the same.

Informative Appendix F Public Forum – Currently done by way of Deputation.
Appropriate for some issues at CBs - Refer to Governance Subcommittee.

Appendix G Additional Provisions for Tangata Whenua.

Delete – should be equal rights for all

Auditor General's Letter

Implications of holding over amendments for further consideration and advice
by/staff/power of Chair in such matters.

Unfairness of use of amendment to block flow of debate/discussion – staff
recommendation could lie on table or some other procedural method to set aside.

Extensive use of questions, when preferable homework be done. Also issue of constant
interjection by members of concern, but different “style” of members needs to
recognised.

Could have “local” variation to allow discussion on specific matters to take place.

Need to identify reasons for any change to current strategy/policy being followed.

PM – We will work on some words re Notices of Motion etc refer to Governance
Subcommittee – Draft set of SO, put in the local variation, put in the matters raised and
bring back to another Seminar

2. CODE OF CONDUCT

PM reason for seminar – was to be reviewed – working with CB's to get signed up. 1
Also use of Ethic Committee for CB – AG made some comment and High Court
decision re Wellington CC.

PowerPoint

LGA Provisions
Code Provisions
Community Boards

How does Code apply to Councillors appointed to CB's do they uphold.

CCC experience of its Code
What is the process followed? (*Cr Sheriff has not had response to her complaint*)

Wellington CC High Court Case
Alleged Grounds of Breach of Code
Wellington CC Process
High Court Decision
Findings of the Court
Comments by the Court

Rights of Councillors to criticise staff.

Summary of OAG Report
Management of Legal Risk
Key Comments

One sided perspective so far, what's the other side (*complaint by Cr against staff member*)
Topics included by other Councils

Outcomes – In particular

Need to update Code before Elections
Roles & responsibilities of members
Meeting Attendance
Collective decision making

Key Comments
Enforcement of Code
CCC Code
Other Types of Penalties
Conclusion
Next Steps

The seminar concluded at 3.30pm

CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL

NOTES OF A SEMINAR OF THE COUNCIL

Held in the Council Chamber, Civic Offices
on Tuesday 19 September 2006 at 3pm

PRESENT: Mayor Garry Moore (Chairperson),
Councillors Graham Condon, Barry Corbett, Gail Sheriff,
Sue Wells and Norm Withers.

APOLOGIES: Apologies for absence were received and accepted from
Councillors Helen Broughton, Anna Crighton and
Carole Evans.

1. ACCESSIBLE CHRISTCHURCH

Richard Mander (Humanware) and Don Rae (NZ Trade and Enterprise), together with other staff from their two organisations, introduced the concept of Accessible Christchurch.

They gave a PowerPoint presentation covering:

- The key definitions
- Context
- Two key drivers
- Scope
- The vision for Accessible Christchurch being achieved through two sub-projects
 - access through technology
 - access through public services
- Technology focus
- Why Christchurch?
- Technology project mission
- Primary technology objective
- Community objectives
- Economic objectives
- Environmental objectives
- Technology project group
- Initial technology project group
- Project steps
- Positive outcomes for Christchurch
- Why this can and will succeed
- Summary
 - this is an opportunity to make a real difference
 - CCC will need to commit in the near future to providing the public infrastructure that will interact with individual technologies
 - today, we hope the Council sees fit to provide the project with endorsement and support in principle

Richard Mander added that project team could work with the City Council regarding such technology improvements as bus stop co-ordination, library opening hours, data on the web etc.

He noted on the accessibility point of view the difficulties that might be encountered with people using parking meters and these gaps when found would be addressed through university research etc.

In essence it would put Christchurch on the map as a centre of innovation and would attract people to live here.

Ian added that by supporting UCi3 in a partnership would help make the research and development component a reality.

Questions and comments were made in respect of:

- What was stopping the group from introducing new bus stop co-ordination now?

OUTCOME

It was seen that there was a huge need for the technology proposed and that Christchurch could well become the world's first fully accessible city. The City Council was supportive of the principles outlined and its team would work in with the project technology group.

The seminar concluded at 4.17pm