

CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL

NOTES OF A SEMINAR OF THE COUNCIL

Held in the Council Chamber, Civic Offices
on Wednesday 11 July 2007 at 9.30 am

PRESENT: Councillor Carole Evans (Chair),
Councillors Sally Buck, Graham Condon, Barry Corbett,
David Cox, Bob Parker and Gail Sheriff.

IN ATTENDANCE: **Community Board Members**
Yani Johanson, Yvonne Palmer and Steve Lowndes.

Council officers

Tony Marryat (Chief Executive Officer),
Jane Anderson (Planner), David Mountfort (City Plan Team
Leader and Jonathan Clease (Consultant Senior Planner).

APOLOGIES: Apologies for absence were received and accepted from
Mayor Garry Moore, Councillors Pat Harrow,
Bob Shearing, Sue Wells and Norm Withers.

An apology for lateness was received and accepted from
Councillor Gail Sheriff.

1. SPECIAL AMENITY AREAS (SAMs)

Jane Anderson and Jonathan Clease provided an overview which captured the history behind SAMs, and the extent of protection provided by the current provisions. Possible options and a summary of the various criteria were outlined.

The following questions and points were then noted:

- How can “ugly” best be defined for the purpose of SAMs?
- Who is SAMs for? Value of street appeal/special attributes/preserving history of city? Not clear.
- Consultation: What level of Councillor involvement will there be in the s32 process?
- **Working party - Priority.** It was *agreed by consensus* the establishment of a working party be given priority, to comprise Councillors and Community Board members working with staff, and to be involved from the outset of the process.
- Is the CCC working in conjunction with ECan being mindful of the special amenity and heritage issues?
- Need to protect existing open space and trees. The inclusion of a provision for a “vegetation analysis” was sought – this to take place before anything happens to a site.

- Ely Street example cited (not a SAMs issue) – does the Council need to ensure an analysis of neighbourhood buildings to prevent a repetition?
- Set back rules – not much point if high fence erected at front of property: need to revisit current provisions.
- Contextual analysis – a request for examples was sought, to be brought back to Councillors. Could consideration be given to incorporating provisions for a Design and Appearance panel/process?
- Heritage issues and options paper from two years ago – where is that at?
- Timeframe – It had been a year since deputations from residents’ groups requested this seminar. How can the Council move quickly/bring forward as a priority to prevent “destructive” development currently occurring? How does Auckland and Wellington deal with this?
- Avon Loop and the placement of a garage bordering the river was cited as an example of people’s expectations not being met. Avon River strategy provides no protection.
- Provide “sticks and carrots” eg Council character grants a step in the right direction. Build on the Council’s existing “conservation covenant”-type incentives. What do other councils do?
- How can the council encourage people to retain character homes/streets rather than give way to developers?
- Consultation process – how will the issues be sifted out e.g. heritage/historical value and council “footing the bill” to assist? Are there good examples of best practice available from the rest of the world on this?
- Would smaller SAM-type groupings provide a more simple solution for difficult areas?

Possible directions:

- Consultation with residents and ratepayers will be paramount – spell out/advise “the Council is looking at doing something to protect the heritage aspects of your area. This will mean but to mitigate this, you can”
- Take a bite-sized approach rather than generic. Urged to resolve some of the issues asap. Identify key heritage areas and rank issues with “scientific study”. Working Party Terms of Reference: to develop appropriate tools. “Proof” working party outcome with cross-section of affected parties, professionals, developers etc.
- Look at future use of older buildings/dwellings the Council could be trying to protect eg those converted for business/professional use and resulting car parking issues.
- An Australian example of resource consent hearings process experienced personally was described – it was suggested research into the format could be helpful. The hearing panel included an independent chair, architect, heritage expert and four elected members. The hearing process dealt with eight resource consents in an hour and a half.
- Identify SAMs and incorporate into a generic approach as part of overview of the city, with “trigger” for different processes for those identified unique areas/SAMs.

- Will the Council have a process where a SAM could be designated quickly? Topic for discussion by the working party?
- Does not need to be “either/or” (high fence, or cars parked in front) – need to ensure landscaping/streetscape in every area.
- Develop framework with hard rules: the Council has been too soft. Proposed the working party consider examples from other cities.
- Need clear guidelines, recognising each SAM established for a different reason – (special character area, historic, heritage, etc) – working party to consider.
- “Time of the essence” to protect character and amenity – prioritise areas with specific problems.
- Some caution urged with public consultation to prevent developers acting ahead of procedures in place.
- Prioritise SAMs, and look at future wellbeing of the city, against economic considerations.
- Look at individual areas so can act quickly to protect. Central city may need special consideration and protection given aim of UDS.
- Work with communities – should be able to prevent matters going to the Environment Court.
- Protect streetscapes – eg “city to the sea” could be treated as a “special” route.
- Recognise the need for balance and wide consultation, and acknowledge the contributions made to the city by developer.
- “Carrot and stick” approach supported. It was proposed (a) the working party meet with owners of properties/staff/elected members to bring about an understanding of individual SAMs; (b) establish the working party before the end of August 2007, for outcome April 2008 in order to keep momentum; and (c) The Chief Executive Officer was requested to comment on an appropriate time frame, noting elected members had “voted on” additional resources for the planning area.
- A simple paper was sought on the aims and objectives of SAMs, and what is and what is not allowed.
- Street trees – need to communicate issues surrounding life expectancy and necessary replacement/replanting programmes
- The consensus was that SAMs remain, with the working party to look at time frame, and refer back to the Council with aims and objectives: need to be stronger than those of the original SAMs.

OUTCOME

The information was received. Council officers were requested to take into account the matters raised during the seminar, provide the additional information as sought by elected members, and facilitate the action points appropriately.

The seminar concluded at 11.30am

CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL

NOTES OF A SEMINAR OF THE COUNCIL

**Held in the Council Chamber, Civic Offices
on Wednesday 11 July 2007 at 11.30 am**

PRESENT: Councillor Carole Evans (Chair),
Councillors Sally Buck, Graham Condon, Barry Corbett,
David Cox, Pat Harrow, Bob Parker and Gail Sheriff.

IN ATTENDANCE: **Community Board members**
Yani Johanson, and Steve Lowndes.

Council Officers:

Tony Marryat (Chief Executive Officer)
Bob Lineham (CEO of Christchurch City Holdings Ltd (CCHL)),
Bill Luff (Contract Manager, CCHL),
Steve Fuller (Operations and Marketing Manager, CCHL) and
Julia Denman (Personal Assistant, CCHL).

APOLOGIES: Apologies for absence were received and accepted from
Mayor Garry Moore, Councillors Bob Shearing, Sue Wells
and Norm Withers.

2. CHRISTCHURCH CITY NETWORKS PRESENTATION (CCNL)

Messrs Bill Luff and Steve Fuller, supported by Julia Denman, provided an update on the establishment of CCNL and the state of art broadband fibre optic network which will progress the economic and social development of Christchurch. At the outset, Bill Luff acknowledged there was a degree of commercial sensitivity about some of the information provided, but it was considered not necessary to exclude the public.

Bill Luff and Steve Fuller then spoke to a PowerPoint presentation, which included the following:

- Milestones since 3Q 2006
- Market summary
- Value Proposition
- Map showing Network High Level Design
- Potential Route Planning Outcomes
- Hagley/Ferrymead wards: CBD and East Spoke
- Spreydon/Heathcote Wards: South Spoke
- Riccarton/Wigram Wards: West Spoke
- Shirley/Papanui Wards: North East Spoke
- Fendalton/Waimairi Wards: North West Spoke
- Banks Peninsula Ward: Lyttelton
- Diversity Segments – Green Sections
- Business Outcomes
- Summary

The major achievement by CCNL was commended and congratulations expressed to the CCNL team by those present.

Questions and comments which followed included:

- CCNL was established as a shelf company
- Presentations to Community Boards sought, ideally for each specific area?
- Likely wireless access in the future?
- Has the Council investigated setting up retail service delivery?

OUTCOME

The information was received.

The seminar concluded at 12.08 pm.