

# **CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL**

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

**Held on Tuesday 21 August 2007 at 11.00 am  
in the Council Chamber, Civic Offices, Christchurch**

**PRESENT:** **Christchurch City Council**  
Councillor Carole Evans (Chairperson),  
Councillors Sally Buck, David Cox, Anna Crighton,  
Pat Harrow, Graham Condon, Bob Parker, Bob Shearing  
and Norm Withers.

**Community Board**  
Yani Johansen.

**APOLOGIES:** Apologies for absence were received and accepted from  
Mayor Gary Moore and Councillor Sue Wells

### **1. EARTHQUAKE PRONE POLICY**

Derek Anderson, Chairperson of the Christchurch Heritage Trust was present together with other members of the Trust to explain their submission on the potential impact of the Earthquake Prone Policy on Heritage Buildings in Christchurch.

Their submission was initially presented as part of the Annual Plan submission process, and was held over at the time, for separate consideration by the Council.

The following points were made:

- There is a 65% chance of an earthquake of magnitude 8 striking Christchurch.
- Many current buildings, while strengthened, would still be destroyed in an earthquake.
- It was not only heritage buildings that would collapse.
- The 2004 Building Act required strengthening to one third of code, which would save lives, but in order to protect the heritage fabric of the building, strengthening to two thirds of the code would be required.

Various photographs of buildings that would be lost to earthquake were shown.

Mr Anderson suggested that the main point of today's presentation is to seek Council willingness for better research on this issue to be carried out. Some work in this direction had been carried out by the heritage section of the Council but wider sampling was required.

The Trust itself had engaged John Hare to carry out some research and he would encourage the Council to join with this.

As a means of building owners being able to fund the strengthening required Mr Anderson suggested:

- Earthquake strengthening would amount to around 37% of current building Government valuations.
- There had over recent years been a 50% increase in value of buildings, and building owners had therefore an increase in equity.
- Building owners needed to be written to to get information on their respective buildings, such as rentals, problems, current use etc. The cost of strengthening buildings in Christchurch would be around \$500 million.
- The Government has allocated \$7 million to Universities to carry out research into this matter.
- \$100,000 is available by way of subsidy from the NZHPT.
- The Earthquake Commission should contribute some funds, given the benefits of this.

The questions and comments that followed, points were made in respect of:

- The City Council has adopted an earthquake policy.
- A large portion of Council's Heritage Fund goes into strengthening.
- It is a real issue for the Council.
- The biggest risk is destruction by neglect.
- There is opportunity to seek more research.

## **CONCLUSION**

Mr Anderson concluded the Trust submissions by suggesting :

1. A fund be established of say an initial \$25,000 of which the Trust would contribute \$10,000 into strengthening of the CBD on a precinct by precinct basis.
2. The facts were needed on which to fully evaluate the situation.

It was decided that :

1. The Council would work with the Trust to implement its Earthquake Strengthening Policy.
2. The process for strengthening Christchurch's buildings be established and information on that be referred to the Council.
  - The first step is the collection of data on individual buildings.

After this is carried out, then the various agencies and parties should get together to determine the path forward.

The seminar concluded at 11.47 am.

# CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL

## NOTES OF A SEMINAR OF THE COUNCIL

Held in the Council Chamber, Civic Offices  
on Tuesday 21 August 2007 at 1.30 pm

**PRESENT:** Councillor Carole Evans (Chair),  
Councillors Helen Broughton, (from 1.47 pm),  
Graham Condon, Pat Harrow, Bob Parker, Bob Shearing,  
Gail Sheriff, and Norm Withers.

**IN ATTENDANCE:** **Community Board** members: Glenda Burt and Paul de Spa

**Council Officers:** Tony Marryatt, Roy Baker, Mike Theelen,  
Jane Parfitt, Carolyn Ingles, Dave Hinman, Stuart Woods,  
Matt Cummins, Terry Howes, Ross Herrett, Maurice Roers,  
and Kevin Mara.

**Representatives** from:

Maunsell Consultants (Brendan Bisley)  
Heritage Tramways Trust (Dave Carr)  
Christchurch Tramway Limited (Michael Esposito, John  
Smith, Steve Lea)  
ECan, (Ken Lawn, Wayne Holton-Jeffreys)  
City Mall Association (Paul Lonsdale)

**APOLOGIES:** Apologies for absence were received and accepted from  
Mayor Garry Moore, Councillors Sally Buck, Barry Corbett,  
David Cox, Anna Crighton, and Sue Wells, and  
Community board member Yani Johanson.

An apology for lateness was received and accepted from  
Councillor Helen Broughton.

---

### 1. TRAM EXTENSION STUDY

Dave Hinman and Stuart Woods spoke to a power point presentation, which reported on the outcome of the study requested by the Council in December 2006 following consultation on the proposed City Mall refurbishment. The status and associated issues of the concrete base and tracks in the High Street part of the mall was also described.

The following comments and questions were raised by elected members and discussed:

- Had consideration been given to running the tram in the opposite direction on the extended loop (High/ Manchester/ Cashel, resulting in the tracks crossing near Hack Circle? Could any noise issues be alleviated?

### ACTION

<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Additional options: (a) has turning around behind the hack circle ( i.e. continue further along Cashel Street and turning at the Holiday Inn Hotel), been considered? (b) or has taking the route right down to the river been considered to ensure the vista is captured?</li><li>• Where will track be located - on the road or footpath? ..in Oxford Terrace? ...in Cashel Mall?</li><li>• Consider a Stage 3 for long term “future-proofing” for a commuter link/ wider link with light rail – e.g. past hospital? Park/ride/walk with light rail?</li><li>• “Future-proof” for AMI Stadium as a destination?</li><li>• Advice sought by elected members on the capital cost per kilometre.</li><li>• It was proposed that “one-on-one” discussions be undertaken as requested with individual elected members to clarify various matters raised during the seminar.</li><li>• Reference was made to Stuart’s report – “variables to be resolved”. The question was whether future tram routes and future light rail routes are to are to be seen as potentially separate projects? To what extent would making decisions now lock these in? Is the proposal for a tourist route catering predominantly for tourists, rather than the basis for a light rail system?</li></ul>	<p><b>ACTION</b></p> <p>Dave Hinman</p>
<p><b>OUTCOME</b></p> <p>The information was received. It was noted it is intended to present a report to the Council on September 20 2007. Council officers were asked to take into account the matters raised during the seminar and provide any additional information as sought by elected members, including the “pros and cons’ of the issues identified.</p> <p>It was <b>agreed by consensus:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>(a) That the proposed route which facilitated turning on the Hack Circle was not an option.</li><li>(b) That the grey dotted line depicting the proposed extension be supported, with a change in direction resulting in a cross-over to be considered as an option.</li></ul> <p>The seminar concluded at 2.40 pm.</p>	<p>Dave Hinman/Stuart V</p>