# CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL

## NOTES OF A SEMINAR
## OF THE COUNCIL

### Held in the Council Chamber, Civic Offices
### on Tuesday 24 July 2007 at 9.30am

**PRESENT:**

City Council
Councillor Graham Condon (Chairman), Councillor Sally Buck (to 10.20am), Councillor Barry Corbett, Councillor David Cox, Councillor Carole Evans, Councillor Pat Harrow, Councillor Bob Parker (from 9.50am), and Councillor Bob Shearing.

Community Boards
Glenda Burt (from 10.30am), Steve Lowndes, Yani Johanson and Tony Sutcliffe.

**APOLOGIES:**

Apologies for absence were received and accepted from Mayor Garry Moore, Councillor Helen Broughton, Councillor Anna Crighton, Councillor Gail Sheriff and Councillor Norm Withers.

## 1.    COMMUNITY OUTCOMES BASELINE REPORT

Patrick O'Neill provided a PowerPoint presentation covering:

- community outcomes monitoring
- community outcomes foster co-operation
- community outcomes within CCC
- we monitor nine community outcomes
- the benefits of monitoring
- the Baseline report
  - reporting approach
  - what is being reported
  - how are we reporting
- strategy and planning projects making progress towards outcomes
- where to from here?

In conjunction with the presentation the Baseline Report brochure providing a snapshot of Christchurch's progress towards achieving its community outcomes was tabled.

Questions and comments were made in respect of:

- why was only success stories included in the brochure
- did outcomes link through to the RFS system
- there was need to be honest with where some of the gaps were
- was there a link with the various government agencies, including Police, District Health Boards etc

- there should be a link to show what the Council's intention is to address the outcomes.
- there was need to emphasize that this was the start of the communities 'wish list', which was being worked on, but more partnerships are needed if progress is to be made
- did the Council benchmark these outcomes against other cities
- a template was needed for such on a nation wide basis
- what was the process that was in place, going forward to work in with the community
- figures contained within the report needed to be quantified as to what was causing particular trend, issue etc.

In conclusion it was pointed out that this was a Baseline Report, not a progress report. One hundred and twenty (120) matters were monitored but it would be impossible to cover everything.

**Outcomes**

- a broader range of stories could be looked at for inclusion
- material could point to areas where the Council is working in (but note that other agencies were involved)
- both the good and the bad needed to be monitored as to progress
- there is need for the documentation to inform how the Council's policies etc were being progressed

## 2. METROPOLITAN SPORTS FACILITIES PLAN

Stephen McArthur in introducing the topic referred to the need to have a plan in place in time for the 2009 LTCCP, in regard the requirements in particular.

John Filsell provided a PowerPoint presentation covering:

- seminar purpose
- development to date
- plan goal
- output
- strategic fit
- planned scope
- not included
- facilities location map
- flow chart
- current cricket facilities
- suggested development of priority criteria
- process
- strategic fit map
- scope graph
- alignment between strategy principals and plan criteria

Questions and comments were made in respect of:

- the plan proposed would enable people to see just where Council is moving with its facilities
- there was need to get the different sporting clubs together to tell the Council what they needed, what assistance was required etc
- the facilities plan should be limited to a maximum of five codes
- did we know if we had all the sports types in Christchurch included
- it could be that a metropolitan facility may not met the needs of everyone in the community
- rather than facilitate any major sporting facility, it may be better to provide a backup otherwise it could be seen as the Council providing the major source of funding
- various sporting codes of a major nature, such as golf, archery, roller blading, fencing, the Lyttelton Recreation Centre and Swimming Pool etc, were not shown
- where did cultural facilities fit into the mixture
- was it better to provide for a wide range of sports, or look at what might be able to be provided within our budget
- it was time to communicate the fact that not every type of facility to be provided for in Christchurch
- in any plan there was need to ensure efficient use of facilities and for the aging population were included
- it might be possible to adapt major facilities to accommodate a wider range of activity, than to provided further new facilities

**Outcomes**

It was seen that there is a need to:

- sort out the gaps to see what the Council could provide or assist with, without raising too many expectations
- communicate - Council can not provide for all major sporting facilities, but instead might have to subsidise travel, sponsorship to other cities.
- the Council was not there to facilitate provision of a sports facilities, by providing all the funding, but more there to provide support to the various sporting codes in their provision of the facility

The seminar concluded at 12.05pm

# CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL

## NOTES OF A SEMINAR
## OF THE COUNCIL

**Held in the Council Chamber, Civic Offices
on Tuesday 24 July 2007 at 1.30pm**

**PRESENT:** Councillor Sue Wells, (Chair), Councillors Graham Condon, Barry Corbett, David Cox, Carole Evans, Pat Harrow, Bob Parker, and Bob Shearing.

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Community Board member: Yani Johanson (from 1.50 pm). Council Officers: Tony Marryatt, Adair Bruorton, John Filsell, Stephen McArthur, Carolyn Robertson, and Sally Thompson.

**APOLOGIES:** Apologies for absence were received and accepted from Mayor Garry Moore, Councillors Helen Broughton, Anna Crighton, Gail Sheriff, and Norm Withers.

An apology for lateness was received and accepted from Yani Johanson.

| | ACTION |
|---|---|
| **1. LIBRARIES 2025 PLAN** | |

Stephen McArthur introduced Carolyn Robertson and Sally Thompson, who were supported by Adair Bruorton. Carolyn and Sally spoke to the "Libraries' 2025 Facilities Plan" PowerPoint – a copy was tabled.

Questions and comments which arose included the following:

**1.1 GENERAL**

- How many customers are using computers at the libraries?
- Recognise "one size does not fit all" when considering community libraries. Ensure the Council endeavours to meet the needs of the local communities by accommodating needs and different styles.
- AddingtonNet (Community Learning Centre) cited as an existing service which fulfils a similar function – "Do they fit into this at all?"
- Ensure the Council's long term intentions are conveyed in a positive manner to the community should it become apparent that, over time, consideration may need to be given to some libraries being replaced.
- Also acknowledge that volunteer libraries, schools, university libraries are all major sources.

|  | **ACTION** |
|---|---|

**1.2** **SEVEN PRINCIPLES**

- **Access:** Include provision to "enhance access" to words "Maintain and enhance"?
- **No 5:** Add words under No. 5 – to make it clear there is a range of types of libraries.
- Noted that the **Outreach** service is about to be reviewed.
- **Include:** "Committing to uphold the relevance of the city's libraries to the community"
- **Access to information on Net:** now easily available at home – be aware of potential to scenario change. Overseas benchmarks – what do these figures show?
- Are libraries likely to become **"Information exchanges"** rather than focusing on books? (Response to Harry Potter books cited to counter this.)
- Currently **6 million items issued per annum** – lots of books, but also combinations (DVDs, etc.). Number of books issued is trending upwards.
- **No 3:** Needs stronger wording – "*can* strengthen communities" queried.
- **No 1:** Broad statement means co-location will be encouraged where appropriate. Expectation is written into Strengthening Communities Strategy.
- A **function of Libraries** is providing interface for the community.
- **No 6:** "affordability" considered wrong word, says "tilt slab" rather than diversity. (For example, the South Christchurch Library would not have happened). The CEO suggested No 6 does not have to be in here, but will need a note that this will be presented as part of the LTCCP for future consideration.
- **No 1:** Would help (with level of public understanding) to list two or three of the key strategies with which the Council is aligning "right up front".
- **No 1:** Is this not inherent in what the Council does anyway? "A holistic approach" would mean more to members of the public.
- **Christchurch has iconic libraries** which reflect the local community. Promote this aspect to the wider public. Will planning and design reflect that each library is unique? Principle sought to cover this. Suggested photographs/ promotional material be made available in other libraries – propose bus/travel to another part of town - "this is Parklands week"?
- **No 7:** "Long-lasting design, and good return" – could be clearer?
- Libraries' **role to "stimulate thinking"** – nothing in here to present a principle to be stimulating - part of wider issues, including obesity. New Plymouth example cited, where the library and museum are very interactive.

- **Why do people get a DVD from the library**? Response – "one-stop shop" plus diversity of information, **accessibility and affordability**. Agreed by consensus these two points should be captured in one of the principles.

- Need to **foster joint/shared services and facility development** with neighbouring authorities (e.g. Selwyn district).

- Libraries have **free cable TV** – access to coverage of sporting events and NZ music month cited.

- **Promote card** (with libraries listed) further. A promotional brochure showing bus routes etc encouraging people to visit was suggested.

- **Libraries Advent calendar** for December?

### 1.3    CRITERIA

- **Aim** is to assess and determine options for current and future locations of libraries; job for the Working Party.

- **Co-location** (school library in Akaroa cited – brings different age groups together.) **"Evaluate"** current locations. Look to increase, not decrease options.

- **"Define library network"** – different statement from "options". Concern this could be interpreted as libraries being closed.

- **Clear process** needed.

- **Summarise feedback** from two years back. Residents want small libraries. State, "What we are not going to do is reduce the service to community."

- **Working Party to determine criteria.**

### 1.4    WORKING PARTY (WP)

- **Terms of Reference** (ToR) will need to be endorsed by the Council.

- **Aim of the WP** is to involve key stakeholders early in the process.

- **Set limits** in general terms as to what the Council is expecting.

- **Supportive of diverse** membership of Working Party, and an **external chair**. **Community Boards** need to have considerable **ownership** over process.

- **Key will be the outcome** – need to say what it is the Council wants to achieve. Say "We recognise we got it wrong two years ago – this is what we are going to do now."

- **Media "buy in"** – involve a media /communication-type person – CHCH Star?

- **WP membership:** Suggested approach be made to: Joe Bennett, Philip King, Margaret Mahy.

| | ACTION |
|---|---|
| • **Not clear on "criteria"** – need clear decision around how WP ties in with political group at the table, relationship to Council, portfolio groups etc, and also staff input. (success of the Development Contribution WP cited – may need workshops with the Council to ensure information updates, and signoff as appropriate). | |
| • **Why a WP approach for this issue**, and not for this morning's topic? (Metro Sports Facility Plan – John Filsell responded. Not appropriate, based on nature of the sector, as a multi-faceted issue, and an outcome which will rely strongly on strategic work already completed.) | |
| • **Timing:** Agreed that the ToR to be agreed to by existing Council, and start the process in the new term of the Council. | |
| • **WP to formulate an agreed process.** | |
| • **Community Board meeting on Tuesday 14 August**: Discuss with Community Board chairs to facilitate membership of WP prior to report to the Council. Push out timing of Council report to allow time for community boards to consider. | |
| • **Libraries' Issues** presentation to that meeting. | |
| • **First meeting of WP post-election.** | |
| • It was noted that **Community Boards can look at levels of service, and have community advisers in place.** The example of the bylaw reviews process, which facilitated public consultation, and a draft plan then put to the Council and community boards – **why not consider the same process for this? Raise with Community Board chairs – ensure process is appropriate?** | |
| • The **involvement of key stakeholders** as part of the planning process *at the outset* was considered key to this proposed WP approach. | |
| • **Staff to prepare a "mock up" draft ToR and circulate.** | |
| **OUTCOME** | |
| • **Timing:** Agreed that the ToR to be agreed to by existing Council, and start the process in the new term of the Council. | |
| • **Community Board Chairs meeting on Tuesday 14 August**: Discuss to facilitate membership of WP prior to report to the Council. Extend timing for report to the Council to allow time for Community Boards to consider. **Staff to prepare a "mock up" draft ToR and circulate.** | Stephen, Carolyn and team |

The seminar concluded at 3.10 pm.