

# CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL

## NOTES OF A SEMINAR OF THE COUNCIL

**Held in the Council Chamber, Civic Offices  
on Tuesday 28 August 2007 at 9.30am**

- PRESENT:** Councillor Carole Evans, (Chair).  
Councillors Sally Buck, Graham Condon, David Cox,  
Bob Parker, Bob Shearing, Gail Sheriff and Norm Withers.
- IN ATTENDANCE:** Council Officers: Michael Aitken, Barry Cook and Patricia Su.
- APOLOGIES:** Apologies for absence were received and accepted from Mayor  
Garry Moore and Councillors Anna Crighton, Pat Harrow,  
Bob Parker and Norm Withers and Jane Parfitt.
- An apology for lateness was received and accepted from  
Councillor Sally Buck.

	ACTION
<p>1. <b>REVIEW OF TRAFFIC AND PARKING BYLAWS</b></p> <p>Michael Aitken introduced Patricia Su who spoke to a PowerPoint presentation, supported by Barry Cook. (Copy of presentation on file).</p> <p>Questions and comments raised following the presentation included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● Heavy vehicles parked in residential areas as part of business operation – Community Board had been advised the bylaw covered that – is this still the case?</li><li>● Advice given Community Board that parking on riverbanks is currently lawful – why, as it makes a mess and waste of Council resources? Does this advice still stand, and if so, can the Council put restrictions in place to prevent this? Consensus that this matter needs further discussion and definition – might need to be regulated in places, (ie include ‘grassy riverbanks’?) officers will clarify.</li><li>● Noted the Council had previously requested that no consultation takes place over the Christmas period and does not finish at the end of January, ever: move out until the end of February. It was proposed that this bylaw review consultation period was to be extended from November through until February 2008. Elected members requested of the CEO that this be established as Council policy and all units advised accordingly – Councillors keep saying this should not happen.</li><li>● Overnight parking of ‘big rigs’ outside residential areas leads to complaints from starting and warm ups in the early hours of the morning. Recognised there will be a downside as will cause problems for owner/operators.</li></ul>	<p>Michael Aitken</p> <p>Michael Aitken</p>

	<b>ACTION</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● Emphasis during consultation that this is a legislative review required by Central Government. Needs to be simplified and logical for members of the public.</li><li>● Mobility parking –orange mobility card fee penalises users, when the adjacent vehicle can park for free – why?</li><li>● Glass on road at weekends a problems for cyclists in particular –is there any way the council can prevent or enforce?</li><li>● All day staff parking in vicinity of malls draws complaints from nearby residents. How can we get this reprioritised as a City Plan issue?</li><li>● There is a provision for a residents’ permit parking scheme – will that be continued?</li><li>● If transit road works affect off-street parking, is the Council able to do anything for the residents?</li><li>● Vehicles which park on the wrong side of the road are a problem. Section 5 (f) states vehicles must park in direction of traffic flow. Enforceable?</li><li>● Advertising signs on vehicles – need consistency. Councillors and public need to know – clarification sought quickly.</li><li>● Trucks travelling through city streets – tread carefully. Needs to be clear. Page 22 – ‘In some way’ – means what? Suggested the council consult with LTSA before progressing further. ‘Big rig’ parking – ensure there is an even playing field. Council sending the signal that one person has to pay for storage, and another doesn’t.</li><li>● How can the Council incorporate the ‘boy racer’ problem: what can we do, what is possible? Opportunity for a seminar with legal advice? Misuse of Motor Vehicles Subcommittee to consider?</li><li>● It appears some households have 5-6 or more vehicles parked on the street for sale eg through Trade Me. (Noted a licence is required to sell more than 2 vehicles. Unless “de facto” car lots which park vehicles on the street display a “for sale” notice, the Council cannot take action.)</li></ul>	Michael Aitken  Michael Aitken  Michael Aitken  Michael Aitken
<p>2. <b>OUTCOME</b></p> <p>At the request of elected members, officers undertook to bring back a tracked change “draft” version of the bylaw for further consideration; this draft to include comment on changes and identify the category within which each section will now fall.</p>	Michael Aitken and team

The seminar concluded at 10.45am.

# CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL

## NOTES OF A SEMINAR OF THE COUNCIL

**Held in the Council Chamber, Civic Offices  
on Tuesday 28 August 2007 at 10.45am**

- PRESENT:** Councillor Carole Evans, (Chair),  
Councillors Sally Buck (until 11.04am), Barry Corbett,  
Graham Condon, David Cox, Bob Shearing,  
Gail Sheriff (until 11.50am) and Sue Wells.
- IN ATTENDANCE:** Community Board member: Yvonne Palmer  
Council Officers: Catherine McDonald, Stephen McArthur  
and Lincoln Papali'i.
- APOLOGIES:** Apologies for absence were received and accepted from  
Mayor Garry Moore, Councillors Anna Crighton, Pat Harrow,  
Bob Parker, Norm Withers and Jane Parfitt.
- An apology for lateness was received and accepted from  
Councillor Sally Buck.

---

## 2. STRENGTHENING COMMUNITY GRANT SCHEME CRITERIA

Stephen McArthur introduced Lincoln Papali'i who spoke to a PowerPoint presentation. (Copy on file).

In July 2007 the Council adopted the Strengthening Communities Strategy, which incorporated the Community Group Grants Review. The seminar sought the views of Councillors on how to put the Strategy into practice and ensure the involvement of community boards with the process.

Questions and comments raised by elected members during the presentation included:

- The numbering of pages or PowerPoint frames would assist.
- Clarification sought for Community Boards as to why officers are indicating Community Boards are allocated \$425,000?
- Community Development fund is allocated from the \$425,000. Current allocation from SPARC works out at 50c per head, not \$1 for \$1 as recommended. Community Boards are topping up funding to keep up with inflation.
- Clarification sought – did the Council decide on \$1 per head? Noted that any proposed changes will be due for consideration during 2009 LTCCP process.
- Suggested staff prepare a proposal to target funding available from SPARC?

### ACTION

**ACTION**

- Last two points GRANTS FUND SCHEMES – CRITERIA page 1 of 2: does the Council audit ?
- What percentage of the money would come back? Does this sum come back to the Council before being allocated? Some concern if this is the case. It was **agreed by consensus** that a standby list be prepared for the Council to consider funding for prioritised projects.
- Application must be approved by the “Legal entity” and in writing – has to be a Committee resolution on the books. Does the Council need to do this?
- “...including any unpaid debts to Council”... does that refer to loans? Needs to be made clear.
- Grants under \$2,000 - concern expressed if the Council is giving money to organisations which do not have much in the way of governance or structure.
- Y++ : wording... “*may be required...*”, cause for concern.
- Concern at ratepayers funds going to individuals and organisations at a lower quantum – needs to be some regime of credibility.
- Who comprises Metropolitan Funding Subcommittee?
- Page 10: KLO - (Key Local Organisations). Are the first two bullet points setting up something different?
- If KLO is in Council strategy. What is purpose of seminar?
- Are the boards going to be made aware there will be a contestable amount (\$450,000) available each year?
- Specifically targeted at Community Boards? It looks as though it is a Community Board orientated fund.
- Suggested reword – Community Boards will ‘*identify*’, rather than ‘*nominate*’?
- Proposed change in wording: “... *make recommendations for priority key local organisations to be considered...*”.
- \$450,000 should be divided up between the Community Boards?
- Community Boards could validly be asked for feedback on organisations applying for large sums of money. Not in favour of creating another “jam jar” and having boards applying for the funding.
- Governance point – the Council should be involved in the development of the report. Bring back to the Portfolio group?
- “*Religious ministry*”... Further discussion on this frame?
- “Purchase of Land and/or buildings” – the Council could provide a grant for a deposit and prevent rent applications year after year.
- Example of Papanui Youth Centre cited – what can they expect from such a fund? Capital endowment fund? Needs to be set out so clearly understood.
- Provide “x’s” in boxes – in a dash board/simple matrix to come back to Councillors.
- If an application is turned down, can it come to the Council?
- Why end of March? End of June would be better for residents’ groups
- Request for the Strategy to be worded simply– no “policy wonk”.
- Full Community Boards need input – they are the ones who handle these matters.

- 
- Guidance was sought on how to best explain to community groups about Community Outcomes.
  - Cost of auditing significant for small groups/individuals. Consider funding assistance with auditors etc for community groups? Check with the Office of the Auditor General about how to ensure easier process? Suggestions included: Seek a contract with discounted rate for community groups? Talk to larger accounting firms to discuss giving staff the opportunity to do this for the community. Talk to CDC – may be business mentors available?
  - New legislation says Auditor General has total responsibility.
  - Will there be launch of the Strategy?

## OUTCOMES

### It was agreed by consensus:

- That officers revisit the KOL.
- That officers revisit the process and Community Board involvement and bring back to Council for sign off of key policy and detail.
- Communicate in matrix form.
- That an educational workshop for all elected members and community groups (as considered appropriate) be held as soon as practicable in the new term of the Council.

The seminar concluded at 12 noon.

## ACTION

Stephen/Lincoln/Cath

# **CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL**

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

**Held in the Council Chamber  
on Tuesday 28 August at 1.30pm**

### **PRESENT:**

#### **Christchurch City Council:**

Councillor Carole Evans (Chairperson),  
Councillors Helen Broughton, Sally Buck, Barry Corbett,  
David Cox, Bob Shearing, Gail Sheriff and Sue Wells.

#### **Community Board:**

Yvonne Palmer (from 2.06pm) and Yani Johanson.

### **APOLOGIES:**

Apologies for absence was received and accepted from  
Mayor Garry Moore and Councillor Anna Crighton.

### **STANDING ORDERS**

Ian Thomson, in introducing the seminar, advised that this is a follow up from the seminar on the same topic given on September 2006. Arising from that there were a number of matters which there was now an opportunity to discuss.

To assist in the matter copies of the draft Standing Orders, as amended at the previous seminar and the report of that earlier meeting, were circulated.

### **1. CLOSURE MOTIONS**

Various viewpoints were expressed, some in complete opposition as follows:

- It was deemed an undemocratic process - members should have every right to speak.
- It could be unfair if it limits debate.
- It provided some members an opportunity to grandstand or not really address the issue.
- If there is a contrary point of view then there should be no closure.
- The use of the point of order provision should guard against the use of repetition.

The provision of a clause providing for a 75% majority was the preferred option.

## 2. **READING OF SPEECHES**

- In the case of a new member it was not easy talking before the Council and therefore reading of notes should be permitted.
- A stand should be taken against a member who clearly reads something which has been written by another person.
- The reading of notes was seen as appropriate, but not those of a pre-prepared speech.

It was concluded that members should not read speeches that have been prepared by another party.

## 3. **CASTING OF VOTES**

- With many Boards it is by way of collective agreement.
- If it came to a casting vote then the decision was likely to be a bad one, as it had not been worked through properly.
- The mood of the meeting should be followed. It should not be shown as a first step in Standing Orders.

It was concluded that Standing Orders should be waived to enable time for a proper solution to be found.

## 4. **TIME LIMIT**

- Six hours was deemed to be long enough, eight to be too long.
- In other walks of life such as medical, eight hours would be a minimum, so what is the problem.
- There was the risk of items at the end of a long agenda to not get properly debated, as some members may well have left by then.
- It is difficult for a chairperson to sit for a long period and breaks should be held at regular times.
- Six hours should be the limit but with the ability to extend a further two hours to eight hours.

It was concluded that eight hours should be the appropriate time limit but with breaks to be taken at regular times.

## 5. **DEFINITION OF MEETING**

There was no comment.

## 6. **RECOMMENDATIONS AND RESOLUTIONS**

There was no comment.

7. **EX-OFFICIO APPOINTMENTS**

There was appropriate provision in the draft Standing Orders.

8. **ELECTED MEMBERS ON SUBCOMMITTEES**

There needs to be appropriate provision for Council Hearing Panels, where not provided for in Standing Orders.

9. **PETITIONS**

It was concluded these should be limited to 50 words.

10. **DEPUTATIONS**

It should be left to the chairman to have the discretion to extend the time limit where the circumstances warrant it.

As a general rule each speaker should be limited to five minutes with a maximum of two speakers.

11. **ATTENDANCE AT MEETINGS**

There is some confusion as to the rules that apply with a weekly meeting cycle as offered to a monthly cycle, given the length difference of the overall period between the two.

There is need for this to be clearly spelt out in the Standing Orders.

12. **INTERPRETERS**

The Council should provide and pay for interpreters where either English or Maori is used, as they are both the official language of New Zealand.

The question arises as to the situation with other languages or deaf people. To what extent should the Council assist, or should it be up to the individual himself?

The seminar concluded at 2.53pm